

Media Analysis Paper
New York Times vs. The Australian

May 1, 2003

Jennifer E. Freeman
JT412

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION.....	2
AUSTRALIA	3
HISTORY	4
LOCATION, GEOGRAPHY AND POPULATION	5
GOVERNMENT.....	6
SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONDITIONS	6
SOCIETY.....	7
PRESS SYSTEM	7
BACKGROUND ON <i>THE AUSTRALIAN</i>	9
BACKGROUND ON <i>NEW YORK TIMES</i>	10
MEDIA ANALYSIS.....	11
<i>NEW YORK TIMES</i> COVERAGE SUMMARY.....	12
<i>THE AUSTRALIAN</i> COVERAGE SUMMARY	15
COVERAGE COMPARISON.....	17
IN CONCLUSION... ..	21
REFERENCES.....	23
APPENDIX A – ARTICLES FROM THE <i>NEW YORK TIMES</i>.....	24
APPENDIX B – ARTICLES FROM <i>THE AUSTRALIAN</i>	38

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

My comparison of coverage by the *New York Times* and *The Australian* of U.N. weapons inspectors in Iraq and the affect they had on regional reaction and participation in the conflict showed that both papers had relatively unbiased coverage. However, there were instances where reporters left the door open for reader interpretation of some of the points contained in the article.

The coverage by these two papers differed somewhat. The *New York Times* seemed to carry more direct coverage of the responses to the weapons inspector's work, while *The Australian* contained information that more directly affected the Australian population and participation in the war.

Review of both papers brought up issues around the information presented – in terms of who the information was obtained from, what information might have been omitted, what underlying tone was the reporter trying to get through to the reader, and why certain issues or facts were included.

While the information covered by the papers may have differed slightly between the *New York Times* and *The Australian*, the process of analyzing the articles provided me with insights into the papers, the topic itself, and helped me to realize that my thought process regarding media information has changed over the past few months.

INTRODUCTION

It was my sincere hope that the work of the U.N. weapons inspectors would prevent a U.S. war with Iraq. Unfortunately, the U.S. proceeded with the invasion. During this time there was a lapse in coverage of the work of the U.N. inspectors, as they were not conducting their searches during the war.

As the war is no essentially over, there has been some coverage by the *New York Times* of the requests of France to have the U.N. resume their inspections. This coverage, however, has not been as thorough as it was prior to the war; the situation in North Korea and “clean up” activities in Iraq seem to have filled this space.

I chose *The Australian* for my comparison with the *New York Times*. Australia is a country that is close to my heart. A former job provided me the opportunity to travel to Sydney five times in 13 months, and I found myself strongly connected with that country. I was working on obtaining a Visa to work there on a more long-term basis when the company I worked for went into receiver ship and I found myself unemployed.

During my stays in Sydney I frequently read the *Sydney Morning Herald*. Initial research on this project determined that the majority of the *Sydney Morning Herald's* coverage of my chosen topic was through the Associated Press or AFP (Agence France-Presse). This paper did not seem to have staff directly reporting the stories, so I opted to review coverage in *The Australian*.

I began monitoring the coverage of the U.N. weapons inspectors by the *New York Times* and *The Australian* in mid-February. I found that there was overall more coverage of this work by the *New York Times*, but *The Australian* did have reporters who were authoring a number of their own articles; a distinct difference from the coverage of the *Sydney Morning Herald*. In reviewing coverage prior to the war, it became clear that *The Australian* was not directly covering the work of the U.N. weapons inspectors, but were covering how the threat of war was being reacted to around the world and how the U.N. was handling the entire situation.

The onset of the war on March 19th, however, caused a break in the work of the inspectors and, thus, in the coverage. After the war, the *New York Times* followed up with some of the activities of Hans Blix, lead inspector, and the activities of the inspectors based on a push by France to end sanctions against Iraq (*New York Times*, 4/23/03).

So, while the work of the U.N. weapons inspectors was unable to prevent war, the coverage between the two selected media outlets can still be analyzed, even with an abrupt end in the coverage.

AUSTRALIA

I chose to compare the *New York Times* with a newspaper in Australia because it is a country I have a personal connection to. My five trips to Sydney totaled about four months in that beautiful city. The Australian people are warm and friendly, and I still have close friends and business contacts there.

History

Many people think Australia's culture is identical to that of America because they speak English and love American television shows, movies and music. The reality is that Australian culture is more similar to British and European cultures. Europeans "discovered" the continent of Australia in the 16th century, during a time of vast world exploration.

Captain James Cook (of Bounty fame) conducted a number of expeditions to Australia in the second half of the 1700's, exploring the eastern coast of the continent. He is well known for establishing a settlement in the area now known as Sydney. In fact, there is a replica of the Bounty that takes tourists around Sydney Harbour today.

In the late 1700's, England began using Australia as a solution to their problem of overcrowded jails, sending mostly "white collar" criminals to the area to be imprisoned there. They also sent prison guards and their families to watch over the prisoners.

Not long after, free settlers began moving into this new settlement. Today, the area first settled is called The Rocks and is located just west of the south side of the Sydney Harbour Bridge. An interesting fact about the Sydney Harbour Bridge is that it was built from each shore in to the middle, and the builders were unsure if the bridge would actually meet correctly in the middle until the building was complete; luckily their measurements were accurate! The settlers forced the indigenous peoples, the Aborigines, out of their native lands, much as the Americans did to the

native Indian population. As the flora and fauna of the area were foreign to the settlers, there was a strong risk of starvation for many years.

The discovery of gold in the mid-1800's brought even more people to Australia in search of their fortunes. England still ruled over Australia, and this greatly influenced their governmental and societal structures. Queen Elizabeth II appears on their paper and coin monies.

Location, Geography and Population

The continent of Australia is located in the southern hemisphere, between the Indian and Pacific oceans. It is approximately 2,966,150 square miles in area (about the size of the continental 48 U.S. states), with its highest elevation at 7,316 feet above sea level. U.S. travelers to Australia need to pack appropriate clothing as Australia experiences opposite seasons from the U.S.

Australia has with a total population of approximately 17.75 million people, 1% of which are Aboriginal. Nearly 90% of the population lives along the coasts of the country, as the interior land offers an environment that is too hot and dry to support much life. Australia is divided into a total of eight states: New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, Northern Territories, Western Australia, Tasmania and Australian Capital Territory which includes the nation's capital of Canberra.

Government

Australia is part of the Commonwealth of England, and is still ultimately ruled by Queen Elizabeth II who is represented in the Australian government by a governor-general. They are a “demographic federal constitutional monarchy” (Berlitz). The federal government of Australia is ruled by a Prime Minister (currently John Howard) who is elected by a majority in Parliament. As in the U.S., personalities greatly influence Australian politics.

There are three primary political parties in Australia (Fodor). The Australian Labor Party (A.L.P.) is the traditional organized labor party, and is typically anti-monarch. The Liberal Party is conservative, typically urban middle-class. Prime Minister John Howard is from the Liberal Party. The National Party is most commonly comprised of the rural population.

All Australian citizens are required to vote; with the exception of Aborigines, who have the choice of registering to vote. If an Aboriginal citizen registers, they are required to vote. Elections are held at the local, state and federal level.

Socio-Economic Conditions

An Australian dollar is currently worth approximately 62 U.S. cents. Australia’s main exports include beef, lamb, wool, wheat, nickel, and coal and iron ore. They are also well known for the opals. Current economic concerns in Australia are inflation, unemployment and balance of trade. Until the 1970’s there was a strong

“white Australia” trade policy (Fodor), then more trade lines opened up with Asian countries.

Society

Like the U.S., Australia is a melting pot of many different peoples. From the native Aborigines to the European descendents to people from a wide variety of Asian countries, Australia is truly a mixture of different experiences. The diversity is apparent in more than just the differences of race; the types of music, food, art and architecture show the depth of cultural influences that mingle in Australia.

Overall, Australia is a very technology-savvy society. They are in the top ten nations in the world in terms of mobile phone usage.

Press System

The press system in Australia can be categorized as “western.” The media are free to cover stories as they see fit, with no influence from the government.

Most major cities have their own daily newspaper. There are two national papers (*The Australian* and *The Financial Review*) and regional tabloids (the *Daily Telegraph-Mirror* and the *Herald-Sun*) that are also popular.

Three major players dominate the media in Australia: Rupert Murdoch, Kerry Packer, and Conrad Black. Much of their coverage is considered “sensationalist” (Fodor) as they cover a lot of personalities and private lives.

Cable television is available in major cities, such as Sydney, offering viewers much of the same context as is available on cable television in the U.S. However, cable television is not yet as popular in Australia as it is in the U.S. So, the majority of people in major cities are tuning into the Australian Broadcasting Corporation, or ABC (similar to Britain's BBC, with no commercials and more informational shows), and three network channels. In outlying areas, ABC may be the only channel available.

Americans traveling in Australia will find their media outlets to not be dissimilar to what is found in the U.S. Newspapers, television news, and news web site will carry information on similar issues to what is discussed in the U.S. Organization of newspapers and the nightly news will be very familiar. What Americans will find in the Australian news is more coverage of sporting events (especially some, such as Aussie Rules Football and Cricket, which are not at all familiar to Americans) including more coverage of sports such as tennis and swimming that is not followed as closely in the U.S. Americans will also notice that the private lives of public figures is a very open topic in Australia and goings-on in the lives of "celebrities" is common knowledge. The one difference in coverage, particularly on the evening news or Australia's version of "America's Most Wanted" is the very formal way it is presented. There is much less hype displayed around this information; that seems to be saved for the tabloid newspapers.

In Australia, newspapers and television are the most common ways that the population gets their news. Web sites have been increasing in popularity for up-to-

the-minute information, and as the society in general is very technology-savvy, many people are moving towards getting their information “pushed” to them via mobile phones and web-enabled PDAs.

The Australian Press Council is an organization established in 1976 to protect the freedom of print media in Australia, and to make sure that those who work in the press perform their jobs responsibly. The Council, based in Sydney, is funded by the media and is made up of members of the media who monitor what is going on and listen to any complaints that are lodged with the Council.

Australian press members are safe within their own country. However, recently, several members of the Australian press went to Iraq, where they were not quite so lucky. On March 22, Paul Moran, a freelance photographer from the Australian Broadcasting Company, was killed by a car bomb in Northern Iraq (PBS website). A few days later, two independent journalists were captured near Basra and held by secret police (*The Australian*, April 3, 2003).

BACKGROUND ON *THE AUSTRALIAN*

The Australian is one of two nation-wide papers in Australia. It has been in circulation since 1964. *The Australian* was started by now-media mogul Rupert Murdoch, with the promise that the paper would provide, “the impartial information and the independent thinking that are essential to the further advance of our country” (www.theaustralian.news.com.au).

The goal of the newspaper, according to editor Michael Stutchbury, is to be “the nation’s foremost agenda-setting newspaper” (www.theaustralian.news.com.au). He goes on to say that he feels newspapers are “part of the social mortar which defines the nation’s shape, its moods and its ambitions...we will clearly make our own views known while providing a voice for those who disagree” (www.theaustralian.news.com.au). While the newspaper claims it will make its own feelings on issues known, the first edition of the paper make the staunch claim that, “this paper is tied to no party, to no state and has no chains of any kind. Its guide is faith in Australia and the country’s future” (www.theaustralian.news.com.au).

The paper has now grown to nine regional bureaus across Australia and has more international offices than any other Australian newspaper. It is said that *The Australian* inspires the work of the other Australian papers.

The Australian has a weekday circulation of 130,000 and the weekend edition has a circulation of 300,000.

BACKGROUND ON *NEW YORK TIMES*

The *New York Times* newspaper is owned and operated by The New York Times Company, which also owns *The International Herald* and *The Boston Globe*, along with other newspapers, television and radio stations, and media-related web sites.

The *New York Times* has been published since 1851 and has grown to become one of the world’s leading objective news sources. Adolph S. Ochs, who ran the

paper from 1896 until his death in 1935, is credited with much of the expansion of the paper from its start as four pages of news to include sections on book reviews and the highly acclaimed *New York Times Magazine*. He also established more news bureaus to provide readers with even more varied coverage.

Ochs felt it was imperative that his reporters cover issues in an honest and fair manner, and that all sides of an issue be covered equally. This has continued as a theme for all *New York Times* employees to adhere to through the years. The *New York Times* has continued to be run as a family-owned business, even when The New York Times Company began to sell shares on the New York Stock Exchange in 1967. The current chairman of the board of directors, Arthur Sulzberger, Jr., is the great-grandson of Adolph S. Ochs.

The *New York Times* is distributed nation-wide with three different editions: the New York edition, the Northeast edition, and the national edition. Circulation figures from 2000 indicate 1.1 million copies distributed for the weekday editions, and 1.7 million copies of the Sunday edition (www.nytc.com).

MEDIA ANALYSIS

I learned a great deal about my chosen subject area by reading all of the articles in the *New York Times* and *The Australian*. In addition to the articles solidifying my position on the situation, I learned some history, realized how complex and complicated it all is, and got but a glimpse of how the “conflict” could impact the

world. There were so many interesting things in the articles that I read that I could have commented on, but there is not time or space to go into all of these details.

I thought that the best way to present the analysis of the articles I chose was to discuss specific things of each the *New York Times* and *The Australian*, then do a comparison of similar and dissimilar reporting between the two papers. The following three sections contain this information.

New York Times Coverage Summary

Overall, I found the *New York Times* to be an unbiased source, though there were a couple of places where the writer's personal bias was hinted at. Near the end of the article "France and Russia ready to veto Iraq war" (March 6, 2003) the author quoted Russian Parliament deputy speaker, Vladimir P. Lukin, as saying, "if someone tries to wage war on their own account, without other states, without an international mandate, it means all the world is confusion and a wild jungle." This is a very powerful statement and leads the reader to think about the impact of what the "coalition" is trying to do.

In "Powell attacks validity of weapons inspector's work" (March 6, 2003) the author includes opinions from Powell and Blix. This is a very interesting article, comparing the views of these two characters at the forefront of the situation. The reporter leaves the reader to sort out in their own mind whether Powell is right and Iraq should see military force, or if Blix is right and additional time should be given to the weapons inspectors to find all of the information they are seeking.

The article “U.S. seeks 9 votes from UN Council to confront Iraq” (February 21, 2003) contains an interesting quote from a “diplomat” who said, “People hate Saddam Hussein. But people hate war more than they hate Saddam Hussein.” What a statement! This was buried as the very last paragraph of the article. It was a comment that I felt could have had more play, something that would have helped a lot of people understand the anti-war sentiment in a different light.

I found it very interesting that photographs of the U.N. Security Council members were included with the article “US and allies ask UN to declare Iraq won’t disarm” (February 25, 2003). Putting faces to the names that we had been reading and hearing so much about made the information much more personal. It gave the comments coming from the gentlemen more weight. I often feel that it is difficult to take seriously information I get from unknown sources. By providing their pictures, the *New York Times* helped the reader get to know these people a little bit better, and made them more real.

A great deal of information about Iraq was presented in “Iraq will stop destroying arms if US attacks” (March 3, 2003) that I had not come across before. I found the information given by General Amir al-Saadi very interesting, and I felt the reporter offered the information in an unbiased manner. In particular, the details given about what is actually involved in weapons destruction give the reader some perspective on why some of this work has taken so long. The author did not present the information in a “justification” manner, which helped the readers take it as unbiased and process the information in their own way.

One article where I felt the author could have done some questioning of the information is “President seems to prepare nation for imminent war” (March 7, 2003). This article covered Bush’s “prime time news conference” from the previous evening. In particular, I saw a change in Bush’s reasoning for pursuing an invasion from Iraq’s lack of disarmament to telling the American public that Iraq is a direct threat to us, a threat equal to the tragedy of September 11. I also found it interesting that the reporter mentioned Bush could be “pre-empting” the report due from Blix the day after the news conference. I found Bush’s comments about forcing other countries to “show their cards” as being a statement of alienation, not cooperation. Overall, I found this article full of issues that should be questioned. Perhaps the author was leaving that to the editorial page.

There were three articles where I found spelling or grammatical errors. This may sound odd, but I enjoyed finding these; they made me feel a little bit better about errors in my own work that I do not catch. In the second-to-last paragraph of the page A1 portion of “US seeks 9 votes from UN Council to confront Iraq” (February 21, 2003), the word “still” is spelled “stll” – interesting because adding the “i” may have pushed that last line over and made the information not fit in the space. In the March 6 article “France and Russia ready to veto Iraq war” there are two errors in the last paragraph of the article; first, “inevitable” is spelled “inevitabl” and, second, in the final quote there is a misuse of the quotation marks, which makes the information difficult to read. Finally, in “Bush and two allies set to go to war to depose Hussein” (March 17, 2003) there is a spacing error where the second column flows over into

the third column. The use of a dash and spaces between two words is where the break takes place; the first line of the third column is distracting because the space after the dash flowed over, so it looks like the text is a new paragraph, not a break between a dash and a word.

The Australian Coverage Summary

The Australian has a number of internationally based reporters, including some based in New York, Washington, D.C., and Los Angeles. Until the war began, they did have one reporter stationed in Baghdad. The articles in *The Australian* that I analyzed were mostly written around how events would directly affect Australian citizens, as one would expect. While the editor of *The Australian* has said that their views will be reflected in their articles, for the most part I found unbiased reporting.

The times that *The Australian* showed any evidence of expressing anything other than unbiased reporting were done in a very subtle manner. In the article “We will free Middle East: Bush” (February 29, 2003), in two places the reporter leaves topics open for possible “non-supportive” interpretation by the reader.

Approximately two-thirds of the way through the article the author writes of Bush comparing Iraq with Germany and Japan in terms of U.S. post-war involvement, then ends the paragraph by saying, “The U.S. ran Japan for seven years.” This leaves the reader thinking the same thing could happen in Iraq and therefore the war should not be supported.

In the article “Bush pushes for UN vote” (March 13, 2003), the reporter discusses a recent poll of British citizens and that only 19 percent of those polled support Blair and action in Iraq. The reporter says that Blair is “bleeding politically,” opening up questions of whether or not to support the war in the reader’s mind.

Another article from March 13 (“Howard to lobby UN members”), the author discusses the deployment of Australian troops to the Middle East. It leads the reader to question the reasoning behind this. Is Australia supporting the U.S. and British push to invade Iraq because of their connection to the Commonwealth (i.e., are they “obligated” to join in?) or is it for “brownie points” with the U.S.? As Howard was chosen to talk to countries, especially Pakistan, is it because he represents the Commonwealth and could offer the possibility of Pakistan’s reinstatement into the Commonwealth? Another thing that came to mind while reading this article was the use of the phrase “borderless world.” I had to ask myself how this could possibly be accomplished when the U.S. alienates some countries and kills citizens of other countries.

A final example of *The Australian* expressing their opinions about the war, is the article “Downer to urge UN vote for action” (March 1, 2003) where, in the last paragraph, the reporter says Australia has deployed 2,000 troops to the Middle East and comments that the cost will be “hundreds of millions of dollars.” In a world economy where there are so many people unemployed and companies not being successful, this seems to be a lot of money to spend – especially on a war that people

do not approve of. It also makes an American question whether Bush's request for \$90 billion for the war is severely under what the actual cost will be.

There were two articles where I found fairly blatant "anti-American" comments. In "US to ditch diplomacy" (March 15, 2003) the author says Bush has had an "embarrassing backdown" on the resolution he, Powell, and Blair have been discussing for weeks. They had decided to go ahead and try for a vote; however, France and Russia have stated they will definitely use their vetoes, so Bush has had to retract his plans. This can lead readers to question the sensibility of going ahead with force against Iraq and Australia's role in the "conflict."

Interestingly, this article also included a quote from *Babil*, the state-run newspaper owned by Hussein's son, Odai. The quote tells readers that the coalition has lost the war before it starts; in particular, the use of "along with well-intentioned powers in the world" tries to influence readers against the U.S., Britain, and Australia.

On March 19, the day the U.S. began dropping bombs on Baghdad, the article "Limited active support for US" says that the U.S.'s attempts to get support for military action against Iraq is seen as "horsetrading." This is not a positive image. It makes the reader wonder what secret agreements have been made for support and what kinds of pay-offs there have been.

Coverage Comparison

It was interesting to compare the coverage and style of the *New York Times* and *The Australian*. One thing I found myself questioning while reading all of the

articles was where the information came from. While there were many instances where sources were quoted and the reader was told the context in which the information was given (i.e., Bush at a press conference, or John Howard in a television interview), there were many more instances when the specifics of the quote were not given. In these situations, was the reporter able to have an interview with the person? Knowing that some of these people are very high-ranking officials, it is difficult to believe this is the case. Being aware of the situation in which the information was provided would help give context and support to the veracity of the information.

There were also a number of times when essentially “unnamed” sources were used for quotes and information. Why were the names of these sources not given? Would the source have been in trouble if their name were used? Was the information true? How did the reporter know if the source was reliable and if the information could be verified and used in their article? The ability to use a source’s name lends credibility to the information.

One interesting trend through the articles in both newspapers is the role that Turkey might play in military action against Iraq. Different articles on different days in different papers would discuss the agreement Turkey has with the U.S., or might have with the U.S., or does not have with the U.S. It was a very complicated situation and it seemed that different sources provided different perspective on the status of an agreement and what any outstanding issues might be.

An interesting specific that was provided in both a *New York Times* and *The Australian* articles was the duration of phone calls – one between Bush and Putin and one between Bush and Howard. The *New York Times* article (“ ‘ In principle’ Iraq agrees to destroy missiles,” February 28, 2003) mentions that Bush spoke with Putin for 17 minutes. *The Australian* article (“Howard to lobby UN members,” March 13, 2003) says that Bush spoke with Howard for more than 20 minutes. I found this very curious. Why mention these specific times? Are these long conversations or short conversations?

The article in *The Australian* “Bush scorns Iraqi missiles offer” (March 1, 2003) goes into a lot of detail about the work of Blix and his frustration around the progress of the inspections. I did not find any article in the *New York Times* that discussed this. I wondered if this was because the U.S. would not want the public to feel more strongly that the U.N. should allow more time for this work to be done.

The phrase “coalition of the willing” appeared in an article in *The Australian* on March 6 (“US may withdraw resolution”). This was the first instance of the full phrase that I had seen in this newspaper. It was used in a direct quote from Ari Fleischer, in a statement that was noted as a contradiction from a statement he had made a week before. The way that Fleischer used the phrase seemed to alienate any country that was not supporting the U.S. and the urge to invade Iraq. I did not find this same quote in any of the articles in the *New York Times* and considered this might be due to the contradiction in Fleischer’s comments and because the comment was so alienating.

The article “Bush pushes for UN vote” (March 13, 2003) in *The Australian* brought up a thought to me that none of the *New York Times* articles did. Something in the way the information was put together made me consider that Iraq was being asked to destroy all “weapons of mass destruction” and yet no other country had this request made of them. It seems to me that as a sign of good will, all countries should be destroying these types of weapons, to help make an even playing field. The “do as I say, not as I do” mentality is never a good one to try to force on others.

There were two articles, one in each paper, which I felt complemented each other and could be used to help some people understand the situation better. “France and Germany call for long inspections” (February 25, 2003) in the *New York Times* and “Howard joins attack on Paris” (March 15, 2003) in *The Australian* both address the issue of France not supporting the U.S./British stance on the situation in Iraq. The *New York Times* article goes into much detail about the historical experiences of France and Germany and the wars they have experienced in their own countries. These experiences have shown these countries the terrors of war, and they did not want to see that inflicted on the innocent citizens of Iraq. The article in *The Australian* reminded me that, like the U.S., Australia is a very young country, and that they have never had a war or terrorist attack on their own soil. While Australians have participated in other conflicts (such as the two world wars) they have not had their own society attacked. I felt that if Australia could better understand the perspectives of France and Germany, that they might form a different opinion on the

attack on Iraq. This would not have stopped the war, I am sure, but it could have influenced other people and spread some overall understanding.

I did anticipate more coverage in the *New York Times* as it is a U.S.-based paper and the U.S. was the nation leading the charge to invade Iraq. As Australia sent troops into Iraq as part of coalition forces, I did expect them to follow the U.N. weapons inspectors more closely than just through AP and APF reports.

Before the war, *The Australian* had a section on its web site called “Countdown to War.” As soon as the U.S. began dropping bombs on Baghdad, this section was renamed “War on Iraq.” This section continues to have active reporting of what’s going on in Iraq.

Prior to the war, the *New York Times* had a lot of coverage of the build-up to war, the U.N. weapons inspectors and worldwide reactions. During the active part of the war, the paper had an entire section dedicated to what was happening in Iraq called “A Nation at War.” Now that the active fighting seems to be over, that section has been discontinued and the majority of the coverage is contained in the A section, under the subheading of “After Effects.”

IN CONCLUSION...

While this assignment involved complex research and analysis, now that it’s complete, I realize how much this course has taught me. Reviewing these articles made me think about the work that is done behind the scenes that even the reporters do not have exposure to, what are the spin-doctors creating versus what is actually

happening; how are the different governments “marketing” the war to their countries; is the coverage we are getting biased or unbiased.

Through the exercises of this project I not only learned more about the topic I select, I also became aware of the fact that I will no longer just accept the news that is provided over various outlets as pure fact, but gather my news through multiple sources and see where it is consistent and where there are discrepancies, and then do more research to determine what might actually be going on.

I know that many people feel that the *New York Times* is a liberal newspaper, but I felt that their coverage of the U.N. weapons inspectors and how it impacted the push towards war was fair and unbiased; however I wonder if because I have a liberal view this has somehow clouded my views. *The Australian* self-claims unbiased reporting, and I felt that they were true to this, with a few instances of anti-war undertones. This finding somewhat surprises me as Rupert Murdoch owns the paper and he also owns the very conservative Fox News Network.

I also appreciated the opportunity to reconnect with Australia. When I traveled there before I did not necessarily think about their press system, even though I participated in it as a consumer. I definitely learned more about that, and appreciated being able to relate some personal experiences with my research for this project.

And in conclusion, I hope that the world has learned something from the past few weeks and that this is something we don’t go through again any time soon.

REFERENCES

- Australia: APA Insight Guides*. (1997). Houghton Mifflin, Boston.
- Australian Press Council web site. (2003) <http://www.presscouncil.org.au>.
- Berlitz Pocket Guides: Australia*. (1996). Berlitz, New York.
- Fodor's Exploring Australia*. (1996). Fodor's Travel Publishing, Inc., New York.
- Lonely Planet World Guide: Destination Australia. (2003).
<http://www.lonelyplanet.com/destinations/australasia/australia/history.htm>.
- Online NewsHour. (2003). *BBC Cameraman Killed in Iraq*.
http://www.pbs.org/newshour/media/media_watch/jan-jun03/bbc_4-2.html
- Sydney: Eyewitness Travel Guides*. (1996). DK Publishing, New York.
- The Australian: About This Paper. (2003).
<http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/aboutus>
- The New York Times Company: Our Company. (2003).
<http://www.nytc.com/company.html>.

APPENDIX A – ARTICLES FROM THE *NEW YORK TIMES*

APPENDIX B – ARTICLES FROM *THE AUSTRALIAN*