

Prof. Susan Dente Ross, Washington State University

Email: suross@wsu.edu

You are not my friend: Media conflict in times of peace

Abstract

This study of U.S. newspaper coverage of the nation's border with Mexico during the administration of President George W. Bush contributes to a growing body of empirical research in which the concepts of peace journalism expounded by Johan Galtung are scrutinized *outside* the context of war. Peace journalism, as a practice and as a field of study, originates from a critique of mainstream media's preference for violent conflict, elitist visions of the world, and dichotomized, confrontational representations of reality (Shinar, in press). Much peace journalism research to date has critiqued perceived problems with mainstream media reporting – what some call 'war journalism' – through analysis of news of international conflict, global violence and war (see, e.g., Galtung, 1998; Kempf, 2001; Lynch & McGoldrick, 2005; Mandelzis, 2003; Ottosen & Nohrstedt, 2005; Ross, 2003). In this study, the authors seek to determine whether news coverage of putative allies and friends (here the U.S. neighbor to the south) during periods of *non-violent* interactions discursively positions the bilateral relationship as one of conflict or cooperation. Employing a close textual analysis, the authors examine how *New York Times* coverage of border issues with Mexico (particularly as related to trade/commerce, immigration, illegal drugs, and national security) frame the bilateral relationship. A primary object of this research is to explore new terrain for engagement of peace journalism practices and to reduce the discursive build-up for militarism and war.

You are not my friend: Media conflict in times of peace

Although more than one hundred and fifty years have passed since the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo formally established the modern-day boundary line between the United States of America and Mexico, the U.S.-Mexico border remains a crucial space in which U.S. and Mexican national identities are discursively produced, reproduced, contested, and renegotiated (Shome, 2003). While scholars generally agree that national identity is a fluid yet powerful social construct in which membership is dependent upon particular notions of shared history, culture, economy, polity, and territory (Smith, 1991), communication theorists focus specific attention on the role the mass media plays in the discursive construction of national identity. Media framing theorists, for example, argue that news media shape social assumptions by presenting events and topics in ways that privilege the perspectives of political elites and reinforce dominant social beliefs (Entman, 2003). Peace journalism scholars (e.g. Galtung, 1971; Goretti, 2007; Hackett, 2006; Ross, 2007; Villalobos, 2005) further argue that journalists who present news topics and events in ways that “portray ‘our’ side as moral and righteous, and ‘them’ as evil and aggressive” (Hackett, 2006, p. 3) reinforce polarized notions of national identity (Villalobos, 2005) and exacerbate political conflict (Hackett, 1989).

While peace journalism scholarship to date has focused primarily on news reporting during times of war, scholars have not yet explored how the news media discursively construct peace-time conflicts between putative allies such as the United States and Mexico. This study will therefore analyze *New York Times* coverage of the May, 2006, U.S. immigration policy debates to determine how news media coverage discursively situated the bilateral relationship between the United States and Mexico. We will first examine how the news media discursively constructed the U.S.-Mexico border region. Then, we will analyze how these discursive

constructions shaped U.S. national identity as well as U.S. understandings of Mexican national identity. Finally, we will note the implications of our findings and offer suggestions for further exploration.

Our 'Neighbor' to the South

The U.S.-Mexico border is much more than an imaginary political line between two adjoining geographical regions. It is, as Romero (2007) points out, “a dynamic site that encompasses modern global issues that range from migration to trade to international relations to national sovereignty” (p. 9). With more than one million crossings each day, the U.S.-Mexico border is the world’s most active border; it is also “the world’s longest contiguous international divide between a superpower and a developing nation” (Romero, 2007, p. 42). Most importantly, the U.S.-Mexico border has become a source of increasing tension as the governments of both nations attempt to manage the increased cross-border flow of people and products engendered by the 1994 implementation of the North American Free Trade Agreement (Cottam & Marenin, 1999). Since then, U.S. lawmakers have attempted to contain threats associated with “drug trafficking, possible terrorist infiltration, the smuggling of contraband...and illegal transborder crossings” (Cottam & Marenin, 2005, p. 5) by implementing a series of increasingly stringent border security measures (see Andreas, 1996; Cottam & Marenin, 2005; Palafox, 2000; Romero, 2008).

In early 2006, as the U.S. Senate began to debate the merits of immigration reform proposals, immigration activists began a campaign to agitate against restrictive immigration and border control policies and in favor of family reunification and social support for undocumented immigrants already living and working in the U.S. (Romero, 2008). Organizers designated May 1, 2006 as the day for a nationwide boycott and protest. Twenty-five days after hundreds of

thousands of immigrants participated in the resulting May Day demonstration marches in major metropolitan areas including Los Angeles, Chicago, and San Jose, California (Romero, 2008), the U.S. Senate voted to approve the controversial Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006 (Congressional Research Service, 2006). A wave of news media stories on immigration and border control also peaked in May, 2006.

The news media play a powerful role in the discursive construction of political ideologies, particularly those related to notions of national identity, by relying on “binary oppositions” (Hartley & Montgomery, 1985, p. 231) to differentiate between those who “belong” within the nation and those who do not. Negative images of Mexican nationals have predominated in North American mass media since the early days of radio, film, and television (Dowling & Husband 2005; Wilson, Gutierrez & Chao, 2003). U.S. news media continue to use negative racial stereotypes to represent Mexican immigrants today (Wilson, Gutierrez & Chao, 2003). In a study commissioned by the National Association of Hispanic Journalists in 2006, for example, researchers found that while less than one percent of U.S. network news stories focused on Latino/a issues, 18 percent of those stories described Latinos as the perpetrators of violent and/or nonviolent crime (National Association of Hispanic Journalists, 2006). The researchers also noted that broadcast news stories on immigration typically portrayed Latinos as undocumented immigrants and rarely included the viewpoints of Latinos (National Association of Hispanic Journalists, 2006). Similarly, Rodriguez (2007) studied news reports after the U.S. Census Bureau released statistics that showed Hispanics had surpassed Blacks as the second-largest ethnic group in the United States. She found that coverage in both daily mainstream and ethnic newspapers “emphasized competition and antagonism between African Americans and Hispanics” (Rodriguez, 2007, p. 585). These findings mirror the results of studies of press

coverage of minority immigration in Britain in which immigration was framed as a social problem or “crisis” (Husband & Chouhan, 1985, p. 275).

We can identify how the mass media have discursively constructed the U.S.-Mexico border through the application of critical discourse analysis. It is important to do so for three reasons: First, theorists need to understand how mass mediated peace-time representations of conflict may have a long-term influence foreign policy decisions:

While the news media cannot be considered a direct determinant of foreign policy, they affect its formation in several ways. For instance, news reports influence the perceptions of foreign countries which are held by policy-makers as well as by members of the mass public, whose attitudes place at least implicit constraints upon what is politically feasible. Media coverage can also help to place new issues on the policy agenda (Hackett, 1989, p. 809).

Second, in an era of increasing political tensions and economic pressures, researchers need to evaluate which media practices exacerbate political tension and which practices, if any, can mitigate conflict. Finally, journalists and news organizations need to understand how common journalistic practices may wreak more damage than might otherwise be expected in an industry that wears the principle of objectivity as a badge of honor.

In this study, we hope to fill a gap in peace journalism research by determining whether news coverage of putative allies and friends (here the U.S. and Mexico) during periods of *non-violent* interactions discursively positions the bilateral relationship as one of conflict or cooperation.

National Identity

In her seminal study of national identity and the “other,” Anna Triandafyllidou (1998) asserts that “[d]espite its long-prophesied demise the nation remains the most pertinent form of collective identity” (p. 593). National identity can be defined as a public image based on political membership, shared history, myths, and norms (Hutcheson, Domke, Billeaudeau, & Garland, 2004) that may include ethnic ties to a common public culture, shared history, links to a specified homeland, as well as legal and economic ties (Smith, 1991). American national identity, for example, is constructed around themes of democracy, freedom, liberty, equality, self-government, justice, opportunity, and innovation (Lazar & Lazar, 2004; Leuder, Marsland, & Nekvapil, 2004). Mexican national identity, on the other hand, is constructed around the notion of Mexico as a “revolutionary, democratic country, committed to social justice, strong in culture and achievements, tolerant of diversity, willing to grapple with its problems” (Cottam & Marenin, 1999, p. 216). However, the nation is tormented by, amongst other things, “the specter of the hovering giant of the U.S.” (Cottam & Marenin, 1999, p. 216).

National identity is constructed through a continual process of personal identification and re-identification, with institutions such as schools, churches, and the mass media creating and reinforcing labels that signify membership (Altheide, 2004; Deutsch, 1966). De Cillia, Reisigl, and Wodak (1999) summarize this relationship succinctly:

“[N]ational identities – conceived as specific forms of social identities – are *discursively*, by means of language and other semiotic systems, *produced, reproduced, transformed,* and *destroyed*. The idea of a specific national community becomes reality in the realm of convictions and beliefs through reifying, figurative discourses continually launched by

politicians, intellectuals, and media people and disseminated through... mass communication” (p. 153, emphasis in original).

These discursive transformations are ongoing, ensuring that national identity is never static but is constantly in a state of flux, continually undergoing a process of revision, reinvention and reimagination (Anderson, 1991; Brookes, 1999). As a result, nations are “imagined” and must continually reconstruct their identities in a public manner. This is accomplished, as Brookes (1999) asserts, are “through strategies of exclusion and inclusion in the face of perceived threats from without and within” (p. 249). The notion of a threat from outside is something that can be used by those who can machinate national identity to force through a political agenda. The psychological identification of a nation’s populace with the nation is crucial to the maintenance of the nation-state, a necessary factor in order for the citizenry to defend the nation when it comes under threat (Bloom, 1990; Rivenburgh, 2000), and something that can be exploited by political leaders (using the mass media) to advance a specific agenda through the reinforcement of national identity (Cottam & Cottam, 2001). If citizens make a strong psychological identification with the nation, political leaders are better able to mobilize the public toward a goal in times of crisis by deploying communicative strategies that emphasize positive themes of national identity at the expense of those not consider to be of “us” (Cottam & Cottam, 2001).

Importantly, national identity is a representation of commonalities (be they physical, psychological, or otherwise) among a specific group of people(s) in contrast to those who are not part of the collective. Simply put, if national identity defines “us” then it must also define “them” and create boundaries between “us” and “them” (Connor, 1993; Kuzio, 2001; Schlesinger, 1991). Indeed, the very question of a national identity is contingent on difference; the understanding of national identity mandates the existence of a contrasting “other” (Neumann, 1993).

Triandafyllidou (1998) argues that “national identity implies difference. Its existence presupposes the existence of ‘others’ ...render[ing] both commonality and difference meaningful” (p. 599). Though customs, modes of dress, and social norms help to define who is “in” and who is “out,” national identity has meaning only when it is juxtaposed against another nation and is thus inextricably tied to othering, as those that are “others” are disregarded as members of the community or citizenry. The othering process serves a strategic, hegemonizing purpose to the benefit of ruling elites who maintain control over the terms of ingroup and outgroup membership (James, 1996; Neumann, 1993).

The mass media play a strategic role in the construction of national identity that serves the goals of social elites and advances a specific, explicit political agenda. Altheide (2004) suggests that this is accomplished through “depictions of fear, patriotism, consumption, and victimization [that contribute] to the emergence of a national identity and collective action... fostered by elite decision-makers’ propaganda” (p. 290). Li and Brewer (2004) suggest that the “core essence of American identity is defined in terms of cultural homogeneity” (p. 736), which might possibly be exploited by political leaders who see advantages in mobilizing nationalistic sentiments in the name of patriotism. The media and elites are thus powerful forces in the identity construction process, as they articulate the collective identity of citizens and juxtapose it against notions of threat or menace associated with outsiders. Furthermore, as Hutcheson, Domke, Billeaudeau, and Garland (2004) point out, “[i]n times of national crisis, political leaders and news media both assume a more overt role in the construction and articulation of national identity” (p. 47). If we assume that identity is a site of contestation and struggle, then media are at the very heart of such a struggle, wielding great power and influence to shape

assumptions and beliefs regarding *who we are, how we define ourselves, who we are not, and who are not “us”*.

Creating Reality

Significant scholarship has been conducted on how the mass media serve as ideological tools that serve the interests of the elite while maintaining the oppression of the disenfranchised and acting as agents of social control by discouraging change. Scholars have maintained that the mass media maintain the status quo and naturalize dominant discourses to the benefit of elites and the detriment of the disenfranchised, serving to legitimate the actions of social elites and dim the voices of the oppressed, weakening any challenges to the prevailing ideology (Altheide, 2002; Paletz & Entman, 1981; Wolfsfeld, 1997, 2004). Media institutions and texts thus can be said to serve the “vested interests of the prevalent power structure and its privileged beneficiaries” (Thompson, 1990, p. 7) by constructing a sense of potentially distorted reality for citizens (Gamson, Croteau, Hoynes, & Sasson, 1992; Parenti, 1993; Tuchman, 1978).

Frames

The media have a number of tools at their disposal that enable them to shape reader assumptions and beliefs. Among the tools in this arsenal are the ability to structure stories to emphasize conflict or dramatic narrative (Jamieson & Waldman, 2003; Tuchman, 1978) and the privileging of government or “official” sources at the expense of alternative sources (Paletz & Entman, 1981; Tuchman, 1978; Wolfsfeld, 1997). Such devices enable journalists to frame a story in a manner that determines the relevance of information and establish a context for comprehension among readers (Gamson et al, 1992; Gamson, 1989; Gitlin, 1980; Tuchman, 1978). In short, the use of frames allows the media to attach meaning to events and enable citizens to comprehend events. It is no coincidence, Jamieson and Waldman (2003) argue, that

news “stories” are so called, as “by arranging information into structures with antagonists, central conflicts, and narrative progression, journalists deliver the world to citizens in comprehensible form” (p. 1). Gitlin (1980) says media frames

...largely unspoken and unacknowledged, organize the world both for journalists who report it and, in some important degree, for us who rely on their reports. Media frames are persistent patterns of cognition, interpretation, and presentation, of selection, emphasis, and exclusion, by which symbol-handlers routinely organize discourse, whether verbal or visual. Frames enable journalists to process large amounts of information, to assign it to cognitive categories, and to package it for efficient relay to their audiences (p. 7).

By framing stories in such a manner, journalists are able to shape and reinforce cultural assumptions, attitudes, and beliefs (Gamson et al, 1992; Lynch & McGoldrick, 2005; Paletz & Entman, 1991). This has resulted in a tendency to resort to narratives of conflict, where reporting is reduced to a simplistic binary of good and bad, black and white, ignoring the complex shades of grey that may surround a delicate and complicated issue. As a result of such dualistic portrayals and reportage, the media thus reinforce socially constructed cultural divides between the ingroup and the outgroup, between the elites and the oppressed (Entman, 2004; Lazar & Lazar, 2004; Wolfsfeld, 2004).

Media & Identity

The media play a key role in identity construction as they shape our understandings of who we are, and, crucially, who we aren't, and who is not of us. The media cover foreign issues from an ethnocentric position which immediately presupposes the outsider as not part of “us” (Steuter, 1990; Suleiman, 1998, 1999), increasing the likelihood for nationalistic, even jingoistic

reportage. As a result, outside and/or minority voices get excluded (Hackett, 1991). If we consider culture as a social process that creates a sense of belonging and difference, of inclusions and exclusions (Connor, 1978; Smith, 1991; Triandafyllidou, 1998) then we can better understand the role of the media in shaping and manipulating culture, and thus we can begin to encapsulate a notion of culture as weapon (Bruner, 2005, p. 317), used as a tool of elites to silence the “other,” enabling identification of the other as inferior and different (Lazar & Lazar, 2004; Leuder, Marsland, & Nekvapil, 2004), thus maximizing security within the ingroup (Bloom, 1990; Schafer, 1999), and increasing the likelihood of conflict with the outgroup (Merskin, 2004; Triandafyllidou, 1998). For example, this has been demonstrated in the way media have helped to construct an “evil Arab” stereotype, resulting in Arabs becoming “America’s bogeyman” (Shaheen, 1995, p. 191), inextricably linked to violence and danger (Hamada, 2001; Shaheen, 1995; Suleiman, 1988, 1999). Media, in sum, employ a discourse of war, and has come to be known as war journalism (Lynch & McGoldrick, 2005), serving as “agents of capitalist domination and dependency” (Blankson & Murphy, 2007, p. 4).

Peace Journalism

Journalists, like all members of society, are subject to the influences of the culture they inhabit, with their stories reflecting, intentionally or otherwise, their own values and assumptions (Lynch, 2007, 2007a; Tuchman, 1978). As members of society, journalists individually interpret and apply societal frames onto media content. The socially formed attitudes and behaviors of journalists affect media content by creating media ideologies. In this sense, the frame of certain issues in the media highly depends upon journalists’ or reporters’ values and opinions.

Based on the foundational work of Johan Galtung (1971, 1998), scholars have begun to articulate an alternate vision for journalism in the form of peace journalism. Initially conceived

as a mechanism for changing the way the media contribute to and prolong warfare, peace journalism has grown as a broader attempt to frame stories in ways that encourage conflict analysis, driven by a contextualized, nuanced understanding of the event under scrutiny (emphasizing the *cause* of the conflict rather than the conflict itself), and divorced of the nationalistic, zero-sum reportage of mainstream media. This is itself a contentious notion and peace journalism has caused much fragment and ferment in the field, dividing those who believe that the self-reflexive, contextualized practices that drive the field make peace journalism synonymous with good journalism (Kempf, 2007; Lynch, 2007a; Ross, 2007), and those who believe that peace journalism obfuscates a key convention of journalistic practice: objectivity and the reportage of events in a neutral manner (Hanitzsch, 2007, 2007a; Loyn, 2007, 2007a). Peace journalists reject the assertion that by taking a pro-peace stance they become “bad” journalists, cherishing the values of fairness, accuracy, and balance, but underpinning this with an understanding that such norms are socially constructed phenomena (Tuchman, 1978), and serve to exacerbate the problems of nationalistic, jingoistic reporting, such as the tendency to report in binary terms, of reporting and quoting two sides of an argument with opposing views, the assumption being that such dichotomous coverage balances the scales and makes matters “equal,” rather than recognizing that there are a multiplicity of sides and viewpoints of disparate levels of equality (Kempf, 2003, 2007; Lynch, 2007, 2007a).

Peace journalism, then, can be seen as a more sophisticated model of traditional, (i.e. “good”) journalism. As has been expressed elsewhere, peace journalism “does not seek to distort the facts, manipulate the truth, or cover only the morally upright and peace loving perspectives” (Ross, 2007, p. 80). Peace journalism seeks to emphasize the power that journalists wield, imparting the understanding that every time a story is reported, a reality is constructed, impacting

readers' perceptions of the world and their identity. The choices that journalists make – what stories to report (and what to ignore), what sources to use, who to quote, how to structure the story – have dramatic consequences for readers' understandings of the world around them.

We seek here to add to the body of peace journalism research by applying the principles of critical discourse analysis to examine whether news coverage of putative allies and friends (the U.S. and Mexico) during periods of *non-violent* interactions discursively positions the bilateral relationship as one of conflict or cooperation. We will look first at how the news media discursively constructs the U.S.-Mexico border region and second at how such discursive constructions shape U.S. national identity and U.S. perceptions of Mexican national identity. For this reason, we begin by asking the question,

RQ1: How do the news media discursively construct the U.S.-Mexico border?

It is not enough, however, to simply identify how news media describe the border and border conflict. The linkages between specific discursive practices and social conflict must also be clarified. Therefore, two additional research questions are warranted:

RQ2: How do these discursive constructions shape U.S. national identity?

RQ3: How do these discursive constructions shape (U.S. notions of) Mexican national identity?

Method

This study analyzes news media coverage of the May, 2006 U.S. immigration debates in the *New York Times* from May 1 to May 31, 2006. We selected the *New York Times* because as Hogan (2006) points out, it is “the de facto newspaper of public record in its domestic market” (Hogan, 2006, p. 65). As such, it is the newspaper to which other media outlets, both inside and outside the United States, would turn for information, particularly during national political

debates (Page, 1996). We conducted a search of the LexisNexis Academic database to identify the articles published in the *New York Times* between January 1, 2000 and January 1, 2008 that included the terms ‘U.S. and Mexic***’ and ‘border.’ The greatest number of stories (613) appeared in the *New York Times* between January 1, 2006 and December 31, 2006, with 99 of those stories appearing during the month of May, when the U.S. Congress was engaged in a debate over legislative changes intended to overhaul U.S. immigration and border security policies. After an initial reading, we eliminated 27 of the 99 articles. Seven of these were summaries of stories that appeared elsewhere in the newspaper and five were duplicate articles. We also eliminated two obituaries; three tourism stories; five movie, book or music reviews; one home décor story; one Guatemalan archaeology piece; one story covering an F.B.I corruption investigation; one feature story about a couple in the Pacific Northwest, and another about White House Press Secretary Tony Snow. After a second reading, we eliminated 15 additional stories; 12 of these were editorials and letters to the editor that used the same language to describe the U.S./Mexico border region as was present in news stories about the border. We also discarded an additional two music reviews and 10 stories about immigration and immigrant experiences in which the border or border crossings were tangential. Finally, we eliminated four more feature biography stories and two humorous articles highlighting quotations from late night comedy shows. After we appended two error correction stories to their respective originals, we were left with 39 news articles that focused specific attention on the U.S.-Mexico Border.

Data Analysis

As the purpose of this study was to explore how the news media discursively constructed the U.S.-Mexico border and how these discursive constructions shape U.S. national identity as well as Mexican national identity, we used a discourse analysis approach to examine textual and

structural features in the *New York Times* articles (Van Dijk, 1985). A discourse analysis approach enables researchers to “shed light upon such issues as the shared cultural basis of common understanding (and hence of cultural presuppositions)...[and] the socio-cultural functions of various media discourses” (Van Dijk, 1985, p. 8) in a way that illuminates the relationships between mass-mediated social texts and the socio-cultural contexts in which they are embedded. Discourse analysis has been used by scholars in a number of disciplinary fields to reveal how such topics as the events of September 11, 2001 (Achugar, 2004), political debates (Hess-Luttich, 2007), and British national identity (Rosie, MacInnes, Petersoo, Condor, & Kennedy, 2004) have been depicted in mass media discourses. Antaki, Billig, Edwards and Potter (2003) caution, however, that any discourse analysis must be conducted in a thorough and rigorous manner, as simplistic text summarization, taking sides, or lack of substantiation may severely limit the theoretical value of any analysis. For this reason, we have endeavored to be objective, to fully analyze each text, and to fully support each analytical claim.

The process of analysis proceeded as follows: First, the selected texts were read to identify portions of text that described the border. Then, the relevant portions of text were re-read and analyzed to reveal key discursive features and themes. These themes were noted, then the text was read several more times to uncover finer themes, perspectives, implications, presuppositions, lexical style, and other discursive and structural patterns relevant to the research questions. The results of this analysis are presented in the following section. Practical implications and limitations of the study are presented in the final segment.

Results

Discussion

As Gandy (1998) wrote, “The reason for understanding the world is to change it” (1998, p. 1).

References

- Achugar, M. (2004). The events and actors of 11 September 2001 as seen from Uruguay: Analysis of daily newspaper editorials. *Discourse & Society, 15*, 291-320.
- Altheide, D. L. (2002). *Creating fear: News and the construction of crisis*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Altheide, D. L. (2004). Consuming terror. *Symbolic Interaction, 27*(3), 289-308.
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. New York: Verso.
- Andreas, P. (1996). U.S.-Mexico: Open markets, closed border. *Foreign Policy, 103*, 51-69.
- Antaki, C., Billig, M., Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (2003) Discourse analysis; Means of doing analysis. Retrieved April 29, 2008 from <http://www.usq.edu.au/users/patrick/PAPERS/Discourse%20analysis%20means%20doing%20analysis.pdf>
- Blankson, I. A., & Murphy P. D. (2007). *Negotiating democracy: Media transformations in emerging democracies*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Bloom, W. (1990). *Personal identity, national identity and international relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brookes, T. (1999). Newspapers and national identity: The BSE/CJD crisis and the British press. *Media, Culture, & Society, 21*(2), 247-264.
- Bruner, M. L. (2005). Rhetorical theory and critique of national identity construction. *National Identities, 7*(3), 309-327.
- Congressional Research Service. (2007, May 11). U.S. Immigration Policy on Permanent Admissions. Retrieved June 11, 2008 from <http://openocrs.com/document/RL32235>
- Connor, W. (1978). A nation is a nation, is a state, is an ethnic group is a... *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 1*(4), 377-400.
- Connor, W. (1993). Beyond reason: The nature of the ethnonational bond. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 16*(3), 373-389.
- Cottam, M., & Cottam, R. (2001). *Nationalism and politics: The political behavior of nation states*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Cottam, M. L., & Marenin, O. (1999). International cooperation in the war on drugs: Mexico and the United States. *Policing and Society, 9*, 209-240.
- Cottam, M. L., & Marenin, O. (2005). The management of border security in NAFTA: Imagery, nationalism, and the war on drugs. *International Criminal Justice Review, 15*, 5-37.
- De Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (1999). The discursive construction of national identities. *Discourse and Society, 10*(2), 148-173.
- Deutsch, K. (1966). *Nationalism and social communication: An inquiry into the foundations of nationality* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Dowling, J. & Husband, C. (2005). *Representing 'race': Racisms, ethnicities, and media*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Entman, R. M. (2003). Cascading activation: Contesting the White House's frame after 9/11. *Political Communication*, 20(4), 415 – 432.
- Entman, R. M. (2004). *Projections of power: Framing news, public opinion, and U.S. foreign policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Galtung, J. (1971). A structural theory of imperialism. *Journal of Peace Research*, 8(2), 81-117.
- Galtung, J. (1998). Peace journalism: What, why, who, how, when, where. Paper presented in the workshop, "What are journalists for?" *TRANSCEND*, Taplow Court, UK, September 3–6.
- Gamson, W. A. (1989). News as framing. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 32(2), 157-161.
- Gamson, W. A., Croteau, D., Hoynes, W., & Sasson, T. (1992). Media and social construction of reality. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 18, 373-393.
- Gandy, O. H. (1998). *Communication and race: A structural perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gitlin, T. (1980). *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making and unmaking of the New Left*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Goretti, L. N. (2007). Peace journalism applied: An assessment of media coverage of the conflict in Northern Uganda. *conflict & communication online*, 6(2).
- Hackett, R. A. (1989). Coups, earthquakes and hostages? Foreign news on Canadian television. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 22, 809-825.
- Hackett, R. A. (1991). *News and dissent: The press and the politics of peace in Canada*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Hackett, R. A. (2006). Is peace journalism possible? Three frameworks for assessing structure and agency in news media. *conflict & communication online*, 5(2).
- Hamada, B. I. (2001). The Arab image in the minds of western image-makers. *The Journal of International Communication*, 7(1), 7-35.
- Hanitzsch, T. (2007). Situating peace journalism studies: A critical appraisal. *conflict & communication online*, 6(2).
- Hanitzsch, T. (2007a). It should be fair to criticize even noble ideas – A counterplea. *conflict & communication online*, 6(2).
- Hartley, J., & Montgomery, M. (1985). Representations and relations: Ideology and power in press and TV news. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse and communication: New approaches to the analyses of mass media discourse and communication* (pp. 233-269). New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hess-Lüttich, E. W. B. (2007). (Pseudo-) Argumentation in TV-debates. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 1360-1370.
- Hogan, J. (2006). Letters to the editor in the "war on terror": A cross-national study. *Mass Communication & Society*, 9, 63-83.
- Husband, C. & Chouhan, J. M. (1985). Radio and ethnic minorities in Britain. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse and communication: New approaches to the analyses of mass media discourse and communication* (pp. 270-294). New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hutcheson, J., Domke, D., Billeaudeau, A., & Garland, P. (2004). U.S. national identity, political elites, and a patriotic press following September 11. *Political Communication*, 21, 27-50.
- James, P. (1996). *Nation formation: Towards a theory of abstract community*. London: Sage.

- Jamieson, K. H., & Waldman, P. (2003). *The press effect: Politicians, journalists, and the stories that shape the political world*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kempf, W. (2001). News media and conflict escalation - a comparative study of the Gulf War coverage in American and European media. In: S.A. Nohrstedt and R. Ottosen (eds.). *Journalism and the New World Order. Vol. I. Gulf War, National News Discourses and Globalization*. Göteborg: Nordicom.
- Kempf, W. (2003). *Constructive conflict coverage*. Berlin: Regener.
- Kempf, W. (2007). Peace journalism: A tightrope walk between advocacy and constructive conflict coverage. *conflict & communication online*, 6(2).
- Kuzio, T. (2001). Identity and nation-building in Ukraine: Defining the “Other.” *Ethnicities*, 1(3), 343-365.
- Lazar, A., & Lazar, M. M. (2004). The discourse of the New World Order: “Out-casting” the double face of threat. *Discourse & Society*, 15(2-3), 223-242.
- Leuder, I., Marsland, V., & Nekvapil, J. (2004). On membership categorization: “Us,” “them,” and “doing violence” in political discourse. *Discourse & Society*, 15(2-3), 243-266.
- Li, Q., & Brewer, M. B. (2004). What does it mean to be an American? Patriotism, nationalism, and American identity after 9/11. *Political Psychology*, 25(5), 727-739.
- Loyn, D. (2007). Good journalism or peace journalism? *conflict & communication online*, 6(2).
- Loyn, D. (2007a). Good journalism or peace journalism? –Counterplea. *conflict & communication online*, 6(2).
- Lynch, J. (2007). Peace journalism and its discontents. *conflict & communication online*, 6(2).
- Lynch, J. (2007a). A reply to the replies – a counterplea. *conflict & communication online*, 6(2).
- Lynch, J., & McGoldrick, A. (2005). *Peace journalism*. London: Hawthorn Press.
- Mandelzisz, L. (2003). The changing image of the enemy in the news discourse of Israeli newspapers 1993-1994. *Conflict & Communication Online*, 2(1), 2-12.
- Merskin, D. (2004). The construction of Arabs as enemies: Post-September 11 discourse of George W. Bush. *Mass Communication & Society*, 7(2), 157-175.
- National Association of Hispanic Journalists. (2006, October). Network brownout report: The portrayal of Latinos and Latino issues on network television news, 2005. Retrieved June 13, 2008 from <http://www.nahj.org/resources/2006Brownout.pdf>
- National Immigration Law Center (n.d.). Senate approves sweeping but flawed immigration reform bill: The Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006. Retrieved June 9, 2008 from <http://www.nilc.org/immlawpolicy/CIR/cir017.htm>
- Neumann, I. B. (1993). Russia as central Europe’s constituting “other.” *East European Politics and Society*, 7(2), 349–69.
- Ottosen, R. & Nohrstedt, S.A. (2005). Introduction. In Ottosen, Rune and Nohrstedt, Stig A (eds.), *Global War – Local Views. Media Images of the Iraq War*. Gothenburg: Nordicom.
- Page, I’ve ordered the book to get the correct citation. It should be ready for pickup on Thursday.
- Palafox, J. (2000). Opening up borderland studies: A review of U.S.-Mexico border militarization discourse. *Social Justice*, 27(3), 56-72.
- Paletz, D., & Entman, R. M. (1981). *Media, power, politics*. New York: Free Press.
- Parenti, M. (1993). *Inventing reality: The politics of news media* (2nd ed.). New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- Rivenburgh, N. K. (2000). Social identity and news portrayals of citizens involved in international affairs. *Media Psychology*, 2, 303–329.

- Rodriguez, I. (2007). Telling stories of Latino population growth in the United States: Narratives of inter-ethnic conflict in the mainstream, Latino and African-American press. *Journalism*, 8, 573-590.
- Romero, F. (2008). *Hyperborder: The contemporary U.S.-Mexico border and its future*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Rosie, M., MacInnes, J., Petersoo, P., Condor, S. & Kennedy, J. (2004). Nation speaking unto nation? Newspapers and national identity in the devolved UK. *The Sociological Review*, 52(4), 437-458.
- Ross, S. D. (2003). Framing of the Palestinian/Israeli conflict in thirteen months of *New York Times* editorials surrounding the attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, *conflict & communication*, 2:2.
- Ross, S. D. (2007). Peace journalism: Constructive media in a global community. *Global Media Journal, Mediterranean Edition* 2:2. CHECK THIS CITATION - APA
- Schafer, M. (1999). Cooperative and conflictual policy preferences: The effect of identity, security, and the image of the other. *Political Psychology*, 20(4), 829-844.
- Schlesinger, P. (1991). Media, the political order, and national identity. *Media, Culture, and Society*, 13, 297-308.
- Shaheen, J. G. (1995). TV Arabs. In P. Rothenburg (Ed.), *Race, class, and gender in the United States* (pp. 197-199). New York: St. Martin's.
- Shinar, D. (2008, in press). Why not more peace journalism? The coverage of the 2006 Lebanon war in Canadian and Israeli media. *Peace & Policy*, 13.
- Shome, R. (2003). Space matters: The power and practice of space. *Communication Theory*, 13, 39-56.
- Smith, A. (1991). *National identity*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Steuter, E. (1990). Understanding the media/terrorism relationship: An analysis of ideology and the news in *Time* magazine. *Political Communication and Persuasion*, 7, 257-278.
- Suleiman, M. W. (1988). *The Arabs in the mind of America*. Battleboro, VT: Amana.
- Suleiman, M. W. (1999). Islam, Muslims, and Arabs in America: The other of the other of the other... *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*, 19, 33-48.
- Thompson, J. B. (1990). *Ideology and modern culture: Critical social theory in the era of mass communication*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Triandafyllidou, A. (1998). National identity and the "other." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 21(4), 593-612.
- Tuchman, G. (1978). *Making news: A study in the construction of reality*. New York: Free Press.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1985). Introduction: Discourse analysis in (mass) communication research. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse and communication: New approaches to the analyses of mass media discourse and communication* (pp. 1 – 9). New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Villalobos, S. G. (2005). Pro-conflict and pro-cooperation coverage: The San Juan River conflict. *conflict and communication online*, 6(2).
- Wolfsfeld, G. (1997). *Media and political conflict: News from the Middle East*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wolfsfeld, G. (2004). *Media and the path to peace*. New York: Cambridge University Press.