Charlie Hebdo:
An Analysis of the Framing of the Paris Attacks in Comparison with 9/11.

By Laura Scholte
Student number: 4019563
Supervisor: S.J.Cook
Date: 3-01-2016

Contents

Introduction

On January 7th 2015, two masked men forced their entry into the office of French satirical newspaper Charlie Hebdo and shot eight staff members. The victims were a group of four cartoonists, the editor and sub-editor of the magazine, one journalist and one columnist. Four others who were in the building at the time were also killed; that week's guest-editor, an office caretaker, the editor's bodyguard and a local policeman outside. Eleven others were severely injured. The reason behind the attack was the portrayal of the prophet Muhammad in an earlier issue of the newspaper. The men who carried out the assault claimed to belong to Islamist Terrorist group Al-Qaeda in Jemen and were shot by the police after a hostage situation outside of Paris. The news of the shooting spread rapidly through social media and live TV broadcasts. *The Washington Post* named it "France's deadliest terrorist attack in modern memory (…)" (Witte and Faiola 2015) and U.S. President Obama's speech on counter-terrorism and justice was quoted in many following articles. For many days after the shooting, the hashtag #CharlieHebdo was trending worldwide on Twitter. Many expressed their sympathies for the victims by changing their profile pictures to "Je suis Charlie" (I am Charlie), after the name of the newspaper.

Numerous world leaders also expressed strong feelings of solidarity for the French. U.S. Secretary of State John F. Kerry talked about how this "act of terror" was unable to kill "the freedom of expression" (Ibid) that Charlie Hebdo represented, an opinion shared and followed by many others. The president of the French Council of the Muslim Faith, whilst worried about the growing Islamophobia in France, denounced the shooting as an "attack against democracy and freedom of the press" (Alami et al 2015).

The Charlie Hebdo attack follows in a trend of terrorist assaults by fundamentalist Islamists, which have been covered extensively in the American media since the attacks of September 11 2001. The Paris attacks did not receive the same kind of American media

attention, as they did not strike on U.S. ground and there were far less casualties. In order to analyze the media coverage of the Charlie Hebdo shooting however, it is crucial to recognize the event that marked a turn in American media reports on terrorism: the 9/11 attacks. More information on this subject will be provided later in this paper.

Despite the fact that the masses condemned the violence that the Charlie Hebdo attackers employed, the general public was not entirely unempathetic towards the Muslim community. An article in *The Washington Post* that focused on the American public opinion on Muhammad cartoons, stated that according to a poll taken in 2005-2006 many Americans "sympathized with Muslims' desire not to have the leader of their faith caricatured," (Blake 2015). Still trying to recover from the national trauma of the 9/11 attacks, it is quite striking that the public chooses a sympathetic position towards Muslim beliefs. Moreover, the results of this poll were used again in an article titled: "How do Americans feel about Muhammad cartoons?", on the 7th of January 2015 by *The Washington Post*. The fact that the editorial staff of this newspaper decided to re-use this information – even devoting an entire article to the public opinion– suggests that the reader's opinion towards Islam is a matter of importance.

This notion inspired the idea that this could be one crucial point in which the news coverage of the 9/11 attacks and the Charlie Hebdo shooting differentiated from each other. Whilst public awareness is an engaging topic on its own, other factors which have influenced the framing of both terror attacks must also be taken into account. This paper will, therefore, examine which factors influenced the differences in framing between the Charlie Hebdo attacks and the 9/11 attacks in American elite newspapers.

Before proceeding to the analysis however, it is necessary to present the method used to conduct this research. In order to execute this research, articles from different newspapers are required. All of the articles used in this paper are retrieved from online databases and will be included in the appendix. In regard to the news stories, an adjoining section is included

which is entirely dedicated to framing theory. The included information only scratches the surface of what is quite an elaborate subject, however, for this paper's purpose it should suffice. As far as the analysis is concerned, its purpose is to explore the different factors that distinguish different types of frames and their possible influences on the public. This paper will conclude the analysis with an short overview of the findings and provides suggestions for further research. As discussed above, the appendix will be at the end, enclosing all of the newspaper articles that were used.

Since the Charlie Hebdo shooting is a fairly recent event, academic research on the subject so far has been fairly limited. That said, the aim of this paper is to add a new perspective on something that has been written about extensively – the 9/11 attacks – by comparing it to more recent and yet to be researched event. To add new knowledge in the field of framing regarding the Charlie Hebdo attack, whilst providing an overview of factors that influenced the framing of said attack, is also desired.

Method

For this analysis, a selection of 22 articles has been made from the following three U.S. newspapers: *The Washington Post, USA Today* and *The New York Times*. These newspapers were picked because they are in the top ten of newspapers with the widest circulation in the United States (List of newspapers in the United States by circulation). *The New York Times* website had 41.282.199 unique visitors in December 2015, while *USA Today* online had 37.720.250 in September 2015. *The Washington Post* takes third place with 35.346. 760 unique visitors in October 2015. (Compete Inc) These newspapers have a national presence, which makes them best suited for this paper's analysis. That is, because the articles in these newspapers exercise great influence over the public's opinion, making them valuable topics for investigation.

Half of the mentioned articles are on the subject of the Charlie Hebdo attack. The other half are on 9/11 attacks. Furthermore, all of these stories were published on the day of the attack itself, or the day after. This measure ensures that the immediate reaction to both attacks are monitored, and excludes opinionated pieces or analyses from the group. This choice was based upon the assumption that more nuanced responses would lead to a more interesting analysis.

As for the method of examination, certain key phrases and points will be highlighted to categorize the different types of framing. For clarification, a table with examples of these points will be provided. The articles will be sorted into framing type, after which the Charlie Hebdo and 9/11 articles will be separated and examined individually. Each framing type will include the most prominent findings extracted from both attack articles. Each of those findings will then be considered and formed into an conclusion.

The American media response to 9/11

On September the 11th of 2001, 19 men hijacked 4 commercial airline planes that departed from the east coast of the United States. Two of them crashed into the twio towers of the World Trade Center in New York. A third airplane hit the Pentagon in Virginia, while the fourth plane never reached its destination and crashed in a field in Pennsylvania.
The death toll reached nearly 3,000 lives. It is the bloodiest terrorist attack on American soil to this day. (What happened on 11 September 2001?)

The American media, much like the public, was completely gripped by the terror attacks. On September 11 and most of September 12 the four major US television networks shared all of their video and satellite footage. In the rush to provide the public with as much information on the current situation as possible, commercials were cut short or removed to make place for news feeds. In this unusual, more chaotic state of news coverage, several mistakes were made as well. For example, CBS News reported, incorrectly, that a second hijacked plane was headed for the Pentagon. The print media, as well as the radio networks, turned to conveying the events as they unfolded. Newspapers did not provide extended information or analysis, but filled their pages with lots of images and bold headlines. *The USA Today*'s front page was covered by a picture of a plane striking one of the Twin Towers, the quote: 'Act of war' stretched across it. Weeks and even months after the attacks, *The New York Times f*eatured a memorial section called "Portraits of Grief" which offered short depictions of the people who lost their lives in the assault, often filled with touching details to remember them by (Zalizer & Allan, 2003 p. 6-7).

Moreover, *The New York Times* ran a series of articles that were headlined: "A day of terror" which were all published on September 12. All of the stories were covering different angles on the horrific events of the previous day. One article, for example, discussed how 21st century technology allows the public to be directly confronted with the unraveling horrors, as

there were live reports of the attack broadcasted on television. Essentially, *The New York*

Times published stories about television reports right after they were being broadcasted.

(James, 2001) This is quite certainly an unusual strategy for a newspaper, as providing an

analysis on other news channels is not one of the basic principles of print journalism. In the

article, the overwhelming effect of live footage is addressed, making everyone in and outside

of the U.S. "witnesses" of the disaster that struck the American East-Coast. Simultaneously,

the newspaper provides a small consolation; at least the information is out there. "On a day of

death, television was a lifeline to what was happening", writes journalist Caryn James for *The*

New York Times. (2001)

The need for detailed information on the current state of affairs was visible in many

stories that were published on September 11 and 12. *The Washington Post* published many

articles that featured numerous eye-witness accounts from anyone that seemed to be in reach

of the journalist running the piece: from office workers trapped in traffic, to students

desperately trying to contact their relatives (Achenbach, 2001), (O'neill, 2001). *USA Today*

ran lengthy cover stories which tried to answer the questions everyone in the nation wanted

answered: how many had perished in the attacks? (Puente, 2001) who is responsible for the

attacks? (Hampson, 2001) and how did the terrorists execute the attack? (Willing & Drinkard,

2001). The American print media was temporarily released from any boundaries it seemed,

whilst trying to bring as much news, as fast and as complete as possible, to the American

public.

Throughout the years that followed, the impact of the 9/11 attacks remained visible.

Not only through the memorials that were evicted, or the commemorative news pieces that

appeared each passing year, but also in the form of a notable change in the agenda setting.

In the years between 2002 and 2005, the number of minutes devoted to coverage of armed

conflict increased by 69%. Reports on foreign policy rose 102 %, while coverage of terrorism

rose by 135%. The division between hard and soft news remained unchanged (How 9-11 Changed the Evening News). Naturally, these results do only account for the changes made at ABC, NBC and CBS News, which are, evidently the three commercial network television networks that have dominated US television for a long time. These numbers do, however, illustrate the 9/11 attacks noticeably influenced the American media during the following years. This paper argues that the coverage of the Charlie Hebdo attack is part of this post 9/11 journalism and is therefore expected to show similarities in style and framing of the 9/11 attacks, as well as differences.

Framing theory

Frames in communication

James N. Druckman has shown two different uses of the terms frame and framing. He differentiates between "frames in communication," which provide the reader with a perspective on the content of an article by choice in vocabulary, pictures, or presentation, and "frames in thought." The former concerns how a message is communicated to the audience. "A general definition of framing seems to reduce to 'the way the story is written or produced,' including the orienting headlines, the specific words choices, the rhetorical devices employed, the narrative form, and so on," (Cappella and Jamieson, 1997). A variety of different types of frames can be applied within the communication context. For example a political campaign where the politician emphasizes welfare issues, an "human interest frame" is used," (Druckman 2001). In a report on a tsunami in Japan which focuses on the lives that are lost and how the citizens deal with the situation, a human-impact frame is applied.

Frames in thought

As mentioned earlier, a second definition exists as frames in thought. They refer to "an individual's (cognitive) understanding of a given situation," (Ibid 2001). Frames in thought are not communicated through media content but exist in the mind of an individual. They shape how individuals perceive reality. To return to an earlier example, someone who evaluates political candidates based on their standpoints on economic issues is "said to be in an economic frame of mind" (Ibid 2001) A notion on decision making by Tversky and Kahneman further illustrates this concept:

> We use the term 'decision frame' to refer to the decision-maker's conception
> of the acts, outcomes, and contingencies associated with a particular choice.
> The frame that a decision-maker adopts is controlled partly by the formulation
> of the problem and partly by the norms, habits, and personal characteristics of

the decision-maker." (1998)

Essentially, it is argued that the choice of frame depends on how an issue is communicated and personal discourse.

Common frames

Years of research has identified a handful of frames that commonly occur in news stories. Multiple frames can occur in the same news story, however, this is not always the case. Many related studies also focus on the public opinion. Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) distinguish five important frames: conflict-, human interest-, economic consequences-, morality- and responsibility frame.

The conflict frame "emphasizes conflict between individuals, groups or institutions as means of capturing audience interest." (2000) It has been the subject of discussion for many years and according to Neuman et al. (1992) it serves as the most common frame in U.S. new coverage. Furthermore, Cappella and Jamieson (1997) found that this type of framing led to increased political cynicism and a loss of trust in political leadership.

The human interest frame is also fairly common. It "refers to an effort to personalize the news, dramatize or 'emotionalize' the news in order to capture and retain audience interest." (Semetko and Valkenburg 2000) This is often a product of the competitive news market where journalists and editors need to come up with certain angles to make a story interesting to the public. For this reason, it has also been named the "human impact frame," (Neuman et al 1992).

As mentioned earlier, the economic consequences frame "reports an event, problem, or issue in terms of the consequences it will have economically on an individual, group, institution, region, or country." (Semetko and Valkenburg 2000) Economic consequences are considered a significant topic by the general public and is also a common frame in U.S. news stories (Ibid 2000).

One that is less common, but still prominent, is the morality frame. It views certain issues or events in a moral light or a religious context. However, Neuman et al (1992) find that because of the "professional norm of objectivity", journalists often refrain from directly referring to morals that can be traced back to his or her personal values. The journalist could, however, choose to quote a certain group which embodies the same values as him or her, or have someone else raise the question (Ibid 1992).

Finally, the responsibility frame "(…) presents an issue or problem in such a way as to attribute responsibility for its cause or solution to either the government or to an individual or group,"(Semetko and Valkenburg 2000). So far, this has not been measured in any research or experiment but the US government have been responsible for creating ideas, which influence the public on who is responsible for problems like poverty (Ibid 2000). This can be a powerful tool, since, according to Iyengar (1991) the news encourages viewers to find solutions for social problems on an individual level, rather than blaming the government or putting the issues in a "historical social context," (Semetko and Valkenburg 2000).

Framing effects

Frames in thought and frames in communication are not separate concepts in the sense that the former are often shaped by the latter. (Druckman 2001) This effect is what can be described as a "framing effect." (Ibid 2001). The first is what Leving, Schneider and Gaeth (1998) refer to as the "valence framing effect."

This effect, also known as the equivalency framing effect (Druckman 2001), focuses on how "the same critical information in either a positive or a negative light," (Leving, Schneider and Gaeth 150). In this case, the information stays the same but is phrased in two different manners, which leads to different evaluations of the same situation. There are three manipulations which involve valence framing. Most widely used is "risky choice framing." (Ibid 1998) This term was first introduced in 1981 and refers to the manner in which different

levels of risks are described (Ibid). How this manipulation influences the public can be illustrated with the following example: A study by Meyerowitz and Chaiken (1987) showed that "women who were told that not performing a breast selfexamination decreases the chance of finding a treatable tumor were more likely to engage in examinations than women who were told that performing an examination increases the chance of finding a treatable tumor," (Druckman 2001)

The second and third type of manipulation are called "attribute framing" and "goal framing." The former manipulates through the specific characteristics that are used in the message. For example, Levin, Schneider and Gaeth (1998) found that the public responded more positively to beef which was labelled 75% lean, than the alternative label 25% fat. (Ibid) In goal framing a consequence or an implied goal of certain behavior is framed. In other words, the audience is persuaded to think about the presented consequences in a positive or negative light.

> (…) the issue may be framed to focus attention on its potential to provide or gain (positive frame) or on its potential to prevent or avoid a loss (negative frame). Both frames should enhance the evaluation of the issue, but the question here is which type of goal is the more powerful enhancer. (Ibid 1998)

Whereas the valence framing effect focuses itself on either putting a message in a positive or negative light, the emphasis framing effect refers to the way the public might be influenced by the terms used in the message. (Druckman 2001) Essentially, Druckman argues that putting emphasis on "potentially relevant considerations" can cause individuals to construct their opinions based on that focus. (Ibid) For example: a political candidate can frame a campaign in war terms, causing voters to evaluate the candidate based on their defense policies. This could then lead to voters preferring the candidate with a veteran past (Ibid). Also known as "issue framing", it is defined in the *Handbook of Journalism Studies* as:

" (...) concerned with increasing or decreasing the salience of an issue or consideration when formulating an opinion," (Entman, Matthes and Pellicano 182).

These definitions of framing and their attributes are the eyes through which the news articles must be perceived ; the most useful of which will be the conflict-, human impact- and the responsibility frame. Only after taking all of this information on framing into account, is it possible to recognize different features when examining the articles. It is not, however, a matter of identifying frames only. The results can be viewed in the next section, where an analysis will be provided.

Analysis of the framing of Charlie Hebdo

Responsibility frame

The responsibility frame occurs in an substantial number of the articles in all three newspapers. In these new stories, nations or individuals are not blamed explicitly but there are still a few aspects consistent with this type of framing. The naming of bin Laden and/or nations and groups associated with him is one of them. That bin Laden's name appears regularly is not unsurprising, as he is known to have ordered acts of terror before. Still, it is important to take into account that these articles were published a day, or two days after the attacks. Essentially, they were written before any real evidence had been collected, but even in this early stage, there seemed a desperate need to find an enemy to blame. There are other aspects present which point towards the responsibility frame, yet are not standard for this type of framing. The victimizing of the American nation, for example. This provides a contrast with the Charlie Hebdo articles, where this emphasis is not expressed. In addition, political leaders and army men are quoted stating their trust in the aid of European countries in their fight against terrorism. Therefore, the responsibility frame stretches not only as far as the blame for the attack, but also U.S. expectation of European support. In order to create an overview of the findings, the following table categorizes the aspects and where they are found in the text.

The Washington Post

Responsibility feature	Quote from the text
Blaming/ searching for common enemy	"(…) that bin Laden, the Saudi dissident now based in Afghanistan, masterminded the suicide attacks." (Drozdiak, 2001)
European support	"Italy's Renato Ruggiero said there was unanimous agreement on both sides of the Atlantic that 'an attack on U.S. territory is an attack on the values that belong to all of us.'" (Drozdiak, 2001)
European support	"Referring to the American role in the two world wars in Europe, the president of the EU's executive commission, Romano Prodi, said that 'just as in the darkest hours of European history when American stood close with us, today we stand close by America. (…)'" (Drozdiak, 2001)
European support	"Attack on U.S. Is Attack on All NATO Agrees" (Drozdiak, 2001)
Blaming/ searching for common enemy	"But war with whom? To retaliate, the United States must first figure out who committed these acts of terrorism." (Mufson, 2001.)
Blaming/ searching for common enemy	"(…) pointed to bin Laden, Iraq or some other similar group." (Mufson, 2001)
America as a victim	"While acknowledging that the scale of the tragedy fully warranted retaliatory blows by the United States (…)" (Drozdiak, 2001.)

The New York Times

Responsibility feature	Quote from the text
America as a victim	"(…) but in general it is Americans at home and abroad who have been the targets of the largest and most destructive attacks." (Kahn, 2001.)
Blaming/ searching for common enemy	"'They are ideologically or religious motivated, unlike the nationalist causes of the 80's, and most involve friends or associates of bin Laden.'"(Kahn, 2001.)
Blaming/ searching for common enemy	"(…) terrorists seeking to punish the United States for its support of Israel began killing civilans." (Kahn, 2001.)

The responsibility frame is however, not present in any of the Charlie Hebdo articles. While both selections of articles focus on the news coverage of a terrorist attack, there is a considerable time gap that needs to be addressed. The Charlie Hebdo shooting occurred 14 years after the 9/11 attacks. This means that over the years the media's dominant perspective could easily have changed. One could argue then, that the conflict between western and eastern ideologies has become more central in news coverage, which is why the responsibility frame is not employed in these recent articles on terrorism. For future reference, this factor will be referred to as the *time gap*. The effect of the time gap can be spotted in various ways. In the Charlie Hebo articles the voices of the Muslim community are featured, whereas in the 9/11 articles no such views are presented. In fact, it would be fair to say that while in the 9/11 articles the United States is presented as a victim above else, there are a substantial number of the Charlie Hebdo articles which focus on the controversy the attacks have caused.

'People are exploiting this one way or another,' said Fateh Kimouche, 38, the founder of Al Kanz, a prominent French Muslim blog. 'The terrorists didn't distinguish what faith their victims were from. I just found out that one of the cops killed, his name was Ahmed. Even Muslims aren't safe,' (Alami, Waters & Bryant 2015).

This was taken from *The Washington Post* and written on January 7 2015, the day of the attack. The headline of the article reads: "Muslims on edge after Paris terrorist attack on satirical magazine." It is quite striking that the same day of the assault an article appears that focuses on the controversy of it. This provides a stark contrast with the 9/11 articles, which display a thirst for revenge. None of the selected pieces discuss or analyze the motives of the guilty party. It seems as if the articles on Charlie Hebdo were written with much more caution; no emotional exclamations of outrage or finger pointing at the Muslim community to take the blame. The Council of American-Islamic Relations however, reports a "backlash against American Muslims" after the Paris attacks of November 13, 2015. These attacks took place later that year of course, but from their report, it becomes clear that Islamophobia is still on the rise in United States and that the situation is not likely to change any time soon ("CAIR Reports", 2015). It could very well be that the exercised caution is a phenomenon which is limited to the media. Yet, the people use the media to try to reach out to individuals of other beliefs. An example, is this article which centers around the use of social media by extremists. It addresses the difficulties of blocking extremist propaganda and filtering out potentially violent jihadists from the rest. The article ends with a tweet from an US-based Arabic-language blogger who writes: "No to terrorism, yes to dialogue." This message shows a clear need for understanding from the non-Muslim communities in the world. Negative stereotypes and the rise of the Islamic State are hard to battle as whatever positive deeds Muslim individuals do, rarely make hard news items. As long as fundamentalist Islamism is constantly

in the news, the public starts to associate Islam in general with evil acts. Furthermore, it is of the upmost importance not to forget that since the 9/11 attack, the Global War on Terror was extensively covered in the American media. Examples are the invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan, the torture reports from Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib prison, and the provocative cartoon depiction of the prophet Muhammad in a Danish newspaper Jyllands-Posten. As Dr. Akil N. Awan writes in his paper:

> The ideological conflict underlying the global "war on terror" is almost entirely
>
> predicated on issues of legitimacy, in which each side must convince
>
> supporters, neutral audiences and even enemy publics of the justness of its cause
>
> the morality of its strategy, the legality of its methods, and the ethical nature of its
>
> vision for the future. (2012)

The ban on Islamic face garments in France and the Netherlands is one example of such a conflict in which two different ideologies clash. One the one hand there is a group which calls on the right of the freedom of expression of religion, on the other hand there is a group which feels a security risk is present when a person cannot be identified. Restriction of personal freedom and oppression of the female sex are also prominent arguments in favor of the ban. Even if both sides present valid arguments, there is still a chance that the differences in culture and ideologies are irreconcilable. The question then remains if a better understanding of Muslim beliefs will lead to actual change, even if the negative stereotypes are exterminated.

To return to Charlie Hebdo: the cartoons that depicted the prophet Muhammad in a provocative manner and the outrage they caused are also symbolic of a Western versus Eastern values battle. In many Western countries the media's response was dominated by comments about freedom of speech and the protection of democracy. On the other hand, the right of Muslims to have their faith respected is also an issue which was, even though less

prominently, featured in articles in those same countries. Looking at the articles on the Charlie Hebdo attack, it has become evident that the media is on its way to showing the other side of the coin.

Human impact frame

This is the dominant type of framing when it comes to the 9/11 attack articles. The logical explanation for this is that the attacks deeply shocked audiences all over the world, including the American public. Reporting on the impact of the incident can been seen as a way of coping with the loss and destruction inflicted upon the American nation. Two key phrases stood out, of which the most prominent is the notion of terror brought home. In a certain sense, this expresses the immunity America has thought to have against terror attacks. This then turns out to be an illusion. In addition, largely present is the comparison between another catastrophic historical incident: Pearl Harbor. The attack on Pearl Harbor is an event that is deeply ingrained in the cultural memory of the United States. Drawing the comparison between 9/11 and Pearl Harbor may help in this way, for people to have a reference point in history which allows them to express how they experienced the gravity of the attacks. In addition, it is a powerful phrase, easily copied by the media, "the second Pearl Harbor", because the losses and damage inflicted during the WWII attack is widely known.

Another feature of the human impact frame is that of personalizing the events. This happens in the form of quoting eye-witnesses and by revealing personal information and background information of the victims of the airplane hijackings.

USA Today

Human impact feature	Quote from the text
Pearl Harbor	"Americans talked of 'a second Pearl Harbor' and 'an act of war', (…)" (Hampson, 2001)
Pearl Harbor	"'I heard someone compare this to Pearl Harbor. This is worse.'" (Parker, 2001)
Pearl Harbor	"(…) an unknown number of killed and wounded shook the nation as perhaps nothing had since the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor (…)" (Willing and Drinkard, 2001.)
Terror brought home	"'We essentially have been attacked at home… We are changed forevermore.'" (Willing and Drinkard, 2001)
Terror brought home	"'What's next? The schools? The churches? How can they take our planes and crash them into our buildings?'" (Parker, 2001.)
Personalized information	"The pilot of American Airlines Flight 11, which crashed into the World Trade Center, was identified as John Ogonowski, 52, or Dracut, Mass. (…) John Ogonowski leaves a wife and three daughters. (Puente, 2001)
Personalized information	"'I met a woman whose husband works on the 99th floor (of a World Trade Center tower) and she was just devasted (…) she can't cross the bridge to get there and all the cell phones are out because the antennas are on tp the trade center.'" (Willing and Drinkard, 2001)

Personalized information	"Elgen Long, 74, of Reno, Nev., a retired airline pilot and World War II veteran, worried that something like paranoia would grip the nation." (Hampson, 2001)

The New York Times

Human impact feature	Quote from the text
Personalized information	"Each call brought relief; each hour of silence, dread." (Kifner and Waldman, 2001)

The Washington Post

Human impact feature	Quote from the text
Personalized information	"Boris Ozersky, 47, computer networks analyst, was on the 70th floor of one of the buildings when he felt something like an explosion rock it." (O'Neill, 2001)
Pearl Harbor	"Others compared it to Pearl Harbor as hundreds of people poured off the Brooklyn Bridge on the Brooklyn side, covered in dust and debris."(O'Neill, 2001)

The human impact frame covers only a few of the selected Charlie Hebdo articles, but is still worth mentioning. The reason that this type of framing occurs less often in the Charlie Hebdo news coverage than in the 9/11 articles, is most likely because the scale of the attacks are different – in the Charlie Hebdo shooting only 12 people were killed, while the terrorist

attack of 2001 claimed nearly 3.000 lives. Furthermore, the Charlie Hebdo shooting took place in France. American media and audiences are likely to get less emotionally involved. The factor that causes the framing to differ, will be referred to as *proximity*. Proximity does of course not only adhere to the physical distance between the US and France, but also the emotional distance. Had it been 12 American citizens that were killed in an Paris attack, the incident would be likely to attract a more emotional response.

Conflict frame

Remarkably enough, the conflict frame was largely absent in most of the 9/11 articles. Only two stood out as being centered around the conflict between terrorism and democracy, or western and eastern values. Because of US military involvement with Israel and other Middle-Eastern countries, Islamist terrorist group Al-Qaeda had already declared a holy war against the States prior to the suicide attacks. Thus, it could be expected from the media to highlight this conflict in their stories. This was not the case, however.

The majority of these Charlie Hebdo articles, however, are conflict-centered. Many of them mention a "holy war" or "jihad", democracy, freedom of speech, the Muslim community and islamophobia. Instead of making the attack out for nothing but a meaningless act of violence, most stories elaborate on the discussion about intercultural morals and values. During 2001 people needed to hear the actual events through news articles, now they are able to follow the news on live streams and other video material. This factor will therefore will be referred to as *technological progress*. Technological progress is unavoidable; the internet has rapidly become the main source of news worldwide. News has never been more available which means a new "modern" form of journalism has to emerge in order to separate itself from the numerous amateur newsfeeds out there. In order for their articles to stand out, they need to deliver something more than just the events. Thus, most articles are focused on the conflict between Islam and Western values. Here are a few headlines to illustrate this idea:

"Paris attack heightens European tensions with Muslims", "Obama pledges U.S. help on probe of Paris attack", and " In the wake of attack on Paris newspaper, extremists take to Twitter to celebrate."

Conclusion

Essentially, in the 9/11 articles and the Charlie Hebdo articles, the same three frames were employed. Both incidents being terrorist attacks, this wasn't a surprising outcome. The framing of the articles was, however, heavily influenced by a number of factors which provided a contrast between the 9/11 and the Charlie Hebdo stories. A combination of rising tensions between the West and the East, technological enhancement and emotional distance of the readers divide them. It might be assume that every story is made to fit the time-frame of a certain era. The world has seen drastic measures taken and changes being made in the war against terror since 2001. Moreover, journalism itself has evolved greatly in the past 14 years. For one, there are more free-lancers, as permanent positions at newspapers became scarce with the rapid decline of paper circulations and the rise of the internet. People are less willing to pay for news, as illegal downloads spread like wildfire on the world wide web. In addition to this, with the introduction of the smartphone, many amateur journalists publish their own footage of events on social media.

What this paper did not account for, was the change in staff at both newspapers or any other specific event which could have occurred and inspired a different direction within the newspaper. Moreover, the conclusion drawn here is based on limited research. This analysis only accounted for three newspapers, and articles that were published on two days out of the whole year. For a more elaborate and detailed conclusion, the scope of the research should be widened significantly.

Further research could be conducted on the framing of non-US newspapers on this subject to view it from a foreign perspective. In addition, it would make for an interesting analysis to see how the stories on Charlie Hebdo are framed, six months, or a year after the day of the shooting. A wide comparison could be made between the coverage of the 9/11

attacks and Charlie Hebdo and the role that time plays in the framing between the two is

likely to become more apparent.

References

Achenbach, J. (2001, September 11) Nation's Captital in State of Shock. *The Washington Post.* Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/

Alami,A. & Waters, A. & Bryant, E. (2015, January 7) Muslims on edge after Paris terrorist attack on satirical magazine. *The Washington Post.* Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/

Awan, Akil N. (2012) 'Jihadi ideology in the new-media environment', Contextualising Jihadi Thought. Deol, J. & Kazmi, Z. (eds.). London: C. Hurst & Co.

Blake, A. (2015, January 7) How do Americans feel about Muhammad cartoons? *The Washington Post.* Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/

Cappella, Joseph N & Jamieson & Hall,K. (1997) "Spiral of Cynicism: The Press and the Public Good." New York: Oxford University Press. Web

CAIR Reports Unprecedented Backlash Against American Muslims After Paris Attacks (2015, November 24). Retrieved from http://www.cair.com/press-center/press-releases/13277-cair-reports-unprecedented-backlash-against-american-muslims-after-paris-attacks.html

Compete Inc. (2016) Retrieved from https://siteanalytics.compete.com/

Druckman, James N. (2001) "The implications of framing effects for citizen competence.*" Political Behavior* 23.3. p. 225-256. Web.

Entman, Robert M. & Matthes,J. & Pellicano, L. (2009) "Nature, sources, and effects of news framing." *The handbook of journalism studies*. P. 175-190. Web.

Hampson, Rick. (2001, September 12) Minute by minute, fear envelops the country as jetliners strike U.S. landmarks, America's sense of security is shattered. *USA Today.* Retrieved from http://www.usatoday.com/

How 9-11 Changed the Evening News. (2006, September 11). Retrieved from http://www.journalism.org/2006/09/11/how-9-11-changed-the-evening-news/

James, Caryn. (2001, September 12) A day of terror: Critic's notebook; Live Images Makes Viewers Witnesses to Horror. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/

Levin, Irwin P. & Schneider, S. & Gaeth, G.(1998) "All frames are not created equal: A typology and critical analysis of framing effects." Organizational behavior and human decision processes 76.2. p. 149-188. Web.

List of newspapers in the United States by circulation. (2015, December 6). Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_newspapers_in_the_United_States_by_circulation

O'neill, Helen. (2001, September 11) 'Like a War Zone' in N.Y.; Workday Plunged Into a Nightmare at World Trade Center. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/

Puente, Maria. (2001, September 12) Reaching a final death toll could take weeks. Officials say survivors may be few. *USA Today.* Retrieved from http://www.usatoday.com/

Tversky & Amos & Kahneman, D. (1981) "The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice." *Science* 211.4481. 1981 p. .453-458. Web.

What happened on 11 September 2001? (2011, September 9). Retrieved from http://www.bbc.co.uk/newsround/14854813

Willing, R & Drinkard, J. (2001, September 12) U.S. under attack ; U.S. premise: Attacks will be renewed. *USA Today.* Retrieved from http://www.usatoday.com/

Witte,G. & Faiola, A. (2015, January 7) Charlie Hebdo suspect said to surrender; two others at large after Paris terror attack. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/

Zelizer, B., & Allan, S. (2003). *Journalism after September 11*. London: Routledge.

Appendix