



uOttawa

L'Université canadienne  
Canada's university

The Right to Privacy in Media Discourse: American and Canadian Reporting on the Snowden  
Disclosures

Kiersten Smith  
Student number: 7873946  
API

University of Ottawa  
June 27th, 2016

## Abstract

How did the U.S. and Canadian news media cover privacy following the Snowden disclosures in 2013? What were the dominant frames used in portraying the disclosures and to what extent did the media mention privacy? Were there any prominent differences between Canadian and U.S. media coverage of the disclosures? Content analysis of four mainstream newspapers from both Canada and the United States revealed news coverage that largely circumvented difficult questions of privacy in the year following the Snowden disclosures. One American newspaper was found to be extremely negative in its portrayal of the disclosures, while both Canadian newspapers framed the disclosures more positively. The most dominant frame found in the study was found most frequently in both a Canadian and American newspaper under study, illustrating that understanding of the disclosures was similar in both countries to some degree. This study also draws comparisons between Canadian and American overlapping perspectives on corporations increasing collection of consumer data. The main finding of this study was that while most articles in the analysis called for a debate, the concept of privacy was largely circumvented in the media.

## Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	3
EDWARD SNOWDEN	5
PRIVACY	10
Privacy Definitions	10
Privacy & The Law	15
Privacy & U.S. Government Surveillance	17
Privacy & Democracy	18
THE IMPORTANCE OF MEDIA FRAMING	20
RESEARCH DESIGN	24
FINDINGS	30
Headline Findings	30
Full Article Findings	32
CONCLUSION	42

## Introduction

In June of 2013 an employee working for the NSA leaked thousands of classified documents for the world to see. Published with the help of three journalists, Laura Poitras, Glenn Greenwald and Ewan McCaskil, these documents revealed severe abuses by NSA surveillance practices both in the U.S. and abroad. The leaker, soon identified as Edward Snowden, claimed his actions as necessary for the public good in defence of civil liberties shared by all Americans as outlined in the Constitution. Edward Snowden's leaked documents and their accompanying news stories soon dominated the global mainstream media.

The impact of Snowden's leaks is undeniable. The leaks prompted the U.S. intelligence community to increase transparency about its activities, including by establishing a website, IC on the Record and prompted them to release previously classified documents to the public<sup>1</sup>. The leaks infuriated the largest U.S. technology companies; damaged U.S. relations abroad; provided the basis for litigation in U.S. Courts, British Tribunals, and the European Court of Human Rights; and forced the Obama administration to back down from its initial defence of the NSA and acknowledge the need for reforms<sup>2</sup>.

The political contentiousness and global scope of Snowden's revelations make trying to understand the impact of the affair important for United States international relations and the future of civil rights and liberties in an increasingly digital world. Edward Snowden wanted the public to know that their privacy was being forsaken in the name of surveillance by their own government. What he hoped to achieve with his disclosures was public outcry and a heightened sensitivity to what privacy means in today's world. This study seeks to answer the question, "Did he succeed?" and considers the status of "privacy" in the American and Canadian media

---

<sup>1</sup> Office of the Director of National Intelligence. IC on the Record. <https://icontherecord.tumblr.com/>

<sup>2</sup> Fidler, David P. *The Snowden Reader*. Indiana University Press, 2015, p.3

representations of the Snowden scandal. While other studies have been conducted concerning media frames in the wake of the Snowden disclosures, this growing literature is dominated by a focus on the “hero v. traitor” narrative of the person Edward Snowden as a leaker<sup>3</sup>. This study is unique and contributes to the academic literature in that it seeks to examine the Snowden scandal by focusing on one aspect of the controversy, namely privacy.

This study subjects to content analysis of a sample of 170 newspaper articles published in the immediate aftermath of the Snowden disclosures and throughout the year which followed. The sample was chosen to allow a cross country comparison between the United States and Canada and includes the newspapers *The Wall Street Journal*, *The New York Times*, *The Globe and Mail* and *The Toronto Star*. The main findings are as follows: the press largely ignored the question of privacy, the question Snowden most wanted publicized. The United States newspaper, *The Wall Street Journal*, was extremely more conservative leaning in its portrayal of Snowden and overwhelmingly supported the NSA and its surveillance practices in the name of preventing another terrorist attack, like 9/11. The Canadian newspapers tended to vilify Snowden the least, and showed more support overall towards the question of privacy. Lastly, the major frame package to emerge in the findings was that of “the balance between security and liberty” a metaphor dominating modern public discourse on privacy. What the findings show is that Snowden did not necessarily get the debate on privacy he was hoping to achieve. Snowden wanted a public debate concerning the unlawful infringement on civil liberties of the American people (and citizens worldwide) by the massive intrusion of NSA surveillance

---

<sup>3</sup> Di Salvo, Philip, and Gianluigi Negro. "Framing Edward Snowden: A comparative analysis of four newspapers in China, United Kingdom and United States." *Journalism* (2015); Qin, Jie. "Hero on Twitter, traitor on news How social media and legacy news frame Snowden." *The international journal of press/politics* 20, no. 2 (2015): 166-184; Diakopoulos, Nicholas, Dag Elgesem, Andrew Salway, Amy Zhang, and Knut Hofland. "Compare clouds: Visualizing text corpora to compare media frames." In *Proc. of IUI Workshop on Visual Text Analytics*. 2015; Chu, Wentao. "A comparative framing analysis of Edward Snowden's coverage in The New York Times and People's Daily." (2015).

practices. The findings of this content analysis highlight the fact that this debate was circumvented by the omission of privacy as a dominant narrative frame in the media. In the wake of the disclosures, the glaring omission of privacy was critical in guiding the audience away from the debate Snowden so desperately wanted. As a frame is not inextricably linked with any particular topic, it is possible to identify frames that define an identical situation in different ways. In the case of the Snowden revelations, shockingly few articles from the sample addressed the hard hitting questions of privacy in the modern world of surveillance, Snowden failed to galvanize the media in the short term.

### Edward Snowden

"Laura, at this stage, I can offer nothing more than my word. I am a senior government employee in the intelligence community. I hope you understand that contacting you is extremely high risk and you are willing to agree to the following precautions before I share more. This will not be a waste of your time. The following sounds complex but should only take minutes to complete for someone technical. I would like to confirm out of email that the keys we exchanged were not intercepted and replaced by your surveillance. Please confirm that no one has ever had a copy of your private key and that it uses a strong passphrase. Assume your adversary is capable of one trillion guesses per second. If the device you store the private key and enter your passphrase on has been hacked, it is trivial to decrypt our communications. Understand that the above steps are not bulletproof and are intended only to give us breathing room. In the end, if you publish the source material, I will likely be immediately implicated. This must not deter you from releasing the information I will provide.

Thank you, and be careful.  
Citizenfour."<sup>4</sup>

The above quote was made by Edward Snowden from one of his initial communications with journalist and film maker Laura Poitras. Eventually, this quote would be used in the opening scene of *Citizenfour*<sup>5</sup>. This quote appears in the beginning of this work because of its haunting nature, it is undeniably impactful. The sense of urgency found in the tone of Snowden's

---

<sup>4</sup> Poitras, Laura, and Dirk Wilutzky. *Citizenfour*. Piffel Medien, 2015.

<sup>5</sup> *Citizenfour* is the HBO documentary by journalist Laura Poitras which documents Snowden's journey to Hong Kong and the releasing his disclosures

message is unwavering. It insinuates a catastrophic emergency looming nearby, one that must be thwarted at all costs.

During his employment as a contractor on loan from private firm Booz Allen Hamilton to the NSA, Edward Snowden became increasingly concerned at the surveillance practices he bore witness to. After his concerns were ignored by his supervisors Snowden came to an important conclusion. His superiors were not going to hear his concerns, the NSA was arrogantly wielding its power outside the confines of the constitution and was subject to little effective oversight, why should they listen? It was at this moment Snowden came to the conclusion that the electronic surveillance being undertaken by the NSA violated U.S. and international law on a massive scale. Given the culture of divide and secrecy shrouding the NSA surveillance practices in darkness, these violations were hidden from public scrutiny. This tradition was enough to ripen Snowden's concerns into civil disobedience. When a person truly believes something massively illegal is being carried out by their own government how can they be expected to go to that same government for help? Snowden believed his only choice was to expose NSA activities to the public in order to spark a debate that brought the public back into the conversation and to forge the pathway which could have the potential to spark necessary reforms.

Snowden's security clearance with the United States government gave him access to an abundance of classified documents. He assembled his collection of documents and began the process of establishing a rapport with journalists he thought he could trust. Snowden first reached out to journalist Glenn Greenwald in December of 2012 who had written extensively and critically about the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and the erosion of civil liberties in the wake of 9/11<sup>6</sup>. Snowden also contacted journalist and documentary filmmaker Laura Poitras who was constantly facing run ins at U.S. airports while making a film about the government's

---

<sup>6</sup> Maass, Peter. "How Laura Poitras helped Snowden spill his secrets." *The New York Times* Aug 13 2013.

surveillance programs, clearly being targeted under surveillance herself. In April of 2013, Greenwald and Poitras met for the first time in New York, where Laura revealed the earth shattering scope and imperative of what Snowden intended to reveal:

“The truth is that the NSA has never in its history collected more than it does now. I know the location of most domestic interception points and that the largest telecommunication companies in the US are betraying the trust of their customers, which I can prove. We are building the greatest weapon for oppression in the history of man, yet its directors exempt themselves from accountability. NSA director Keith Alexander lied to Congress, which I can prove. Billions of US communications are being intercepted. In gathering evidence of wrongdoing, I focused on the wrongdoing of American people, but believe me when I say that the surveillance we live under is the highest privilege compared to how we treat the rest of the world. This I can also prove”<sup>7</sup>.

If what Snowden was claiming was true, he would expose the most massive intrusion of privacy in the history of the American people. In late May 2013, the journalists boarded a flight to Hong Kong where they would finally meet their anonymous source. Snowden had already given the documents to Laura and on the flight to Hong Kong, the impact of the trove of information which was about to be released hit Greenwald,

*“We couldn’t believe just how momentous this occasions was. When you read these documents, you get a sense of the breadth of them... you feel you are empowered for the first time because there’s this mammoth system that you try and undermine and subvert and shine a light on, but you usually can’t make any headway, because you don’t have any instruments to do it, and now the instruments were suddenly in our lap”<sup>8</sup>.*

Since 9/11 and the massive expansion of government power which came with it, there has been a pervading sense for most, that the government was getting away with too much and that something was wrong. But in the words of Greenwald, it is truly a “mammoth system”, one enshrined in a culture of secrecy and too far removed from the repercussions of the Church Committee to remember or care how upset Americans get when they realize they are being spied on. For the first time, the necessary tools to shine a light on this murky system were available

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

and in the hands of three extremely capable journalists. Soon, both journalists and Snowden had met face to face and began releasing the documents Snowden had gathered.

The first document leaked by Snowden and prepared for publication by journalist Glenn Greenwald was the most widely talked about revelation to hit the world from Snowden's disclosures<sup>9</sup>. It was published by *The Guardian* and titled, "NSA collecting phone records of millions of Verizon customers daily"<sup>10</sup>. The article was published June 6th, 2013 while the journalists and Snowden were still holed up in a hotel room in Hong Kong. The leak did not mention Snowden, the source of the information, or that there was more information to come. The story revealed a court order giving the National Security Agency (NSA) blanket access to millions of Verizon customers' records on a daily basis. When asked why this revelation was important in an interview with CNN, Glenn Greenwald explained that the Patriot Act enacted in the wake of 9/11 allowed the government very broad powers to get records about people with a lower level of suspicion than probable cause, the traditional standard. Under the Patriot Act, if the government had even any suspicion that you were involved in a crime or terrorism, they could get a lot of information about you. What this court order did that made it so striking, was that it wasn't directed at any individuals who the NSA believed or had suspicion of committing a crime or as being a part of a terrorist organization. It collected the phone records of every single Verizon customer, finding out every single call made internationally and locally, making it indiscriminate and sweeping<sup>11</sup>. This leak revealed a government program designed to collect information about all Americans, not just those suspected of wrongdoing. Suddenly, that

---

<sup>9</sup> For a complete list and timeline of the documents Snowden leaked, see:

<http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/multimedia/timeline-edward-snowden-revelations.html>

<sup>10</sup> Greenwald, Glenn. "NSA collecting phone records of millions of Verizon customers daily." *The Guardian* June 6, 2013.

<sup>11</sup> To see the interview of Greenwald on CNN see: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aNSiMPutgBU>

pervasive yet somehow intangible sense that the American government was abusing its post 9/11 powers was confirmed.

The next revelation, released the next day on June 7th, 2013 revealed details in PowerPoint slides about the PRISM program. The PRISM program was revealed to allow the NSA direct access to the servers of some of the biggest U.S. tech companies, including Apple, Google and Microsoft. Later, it would be revealed that tech companies had worked closely with the NSA to help them circumvent encryption and other privacy controls, allowing them access to incalculable consumer data<sup>12</sup>. Government collecting innocuous data provided under the guise of consumerism is an egregious violation of individual privacy. The list went on and on with one common finding, the size and scope of the NSA surveillance programs were staggering. The NSA was collecting metadata concerning Americans domestically and casting a wide-net, encompassing everyone.

In his initial interview, Glenn Greenwald asked Snowden why he decided to do what he had set out to do, to which Snowden responded:

*“For me, it all comes down to the state power against the peoples’ ability to meaningfully oppose that power. And I’m sitting there every day getting paid to design methods to amplify that state power... And as I saw the promise of the Obama administration be betrayed and walked away from, and in fact, actually advance the things that had been promised to be sort of curtailed and reigned in and dialled back, and actually getting worse... As I saw that, that really hardened me to action”<sup>13</sup>*

Edward Snowden knew the system needed to change and that American’s civil liberties were in peril, with the NSA building “the greatest weapon for oppression in the history of man”. What exactly is at stake when the government can undertake domestic spying on an individual without probable cause or any specific justification? What are we losing when we are arbitrarily

---

<sup>12</sup> Greenwald, Glenn, and Ewen MacAskill. "NSA Prism program taps into user data of Apple, Google and others." *The Guardian*, June 7 2013; Washington Post. "NSA slides explain the PRISM data-collection program. June 6, 2013

<sup>13</sup> Poitras, *Citizenfour*

targeted and investigated for pre-emptive suspicions of wrongdoing? To answer these question an examination of the elusive, yet critically important concept of privacy is necessary.

### Privacy

The information leaked by Edward Snowden confirmed what many had suspected was underway. Since September 11th, 2001 the U.S. government had designed a series of both bureaucratic and physical structures to collect, share and retain vast amounts of data concerning its own citizens. The mantra of “connecting the dots” took hold, and increasingly little distinction was made between information that triggers suspicion and information that does not<sup>14</sup>. This section seeks to examine this violation by the NSA (and U.S. government) as a direct privacy violation of every individual citizen under surveillance. But what is privacy? Why do people care about it? Most importantly, how is privacy defined, measured and protected if it is violated?

### *Privacy Definitions*

Privacy is an elusive concept, hard to define and force into measurable parameters. In his work, “A Critical Contribution to Theoretical Foundations of Privacy Studies”, Thomas Allmer categorizes definitions of privacy found in the existing academic literature into three useful classifications or approaches to privacy studies. The first categorization is called a structuralistic approach to privacy. According to Allmer, structuralistic definitions of privacy understand privacy as a specific social structure, a moral or legal right, which is used to enable someone’s ability to limit or restrict others from access to persons or information, otherwise known as restricted access definitions of privacy<sup>15</sup>. The main assumptions in the structuralistic approach consider privacy as a moral or legal right which should be protected by the law and that

---

<sup>14</sup> Levinson-Waldman, Rachel. *What the Government Does with Americans' Data*. Technical report, Brennan Center for Justice at New York University School of Law, 2013

<sup>15</sup> Allmer, Thomas. "A critical contribution to theoretical foundations of privacy studies." *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society* 9, no. 2 (2011): 83-101

restrictions of privacy are violations of these laws. Warren and Brandeis (1890) are constantly cited in the privacy cannon for their seminal paper on privacy in the Harvard Law Review, “The Right to Privacy”. For the two authors privacy is a legal right and the aim of the law should protect privacy in order to guarantee the “right to an inviolate personality” and the “right to be let alone”<sup>16</sup>. Scanlon (1975) argued that law and conventions should offer zones and territories in order to be able to be free from intrusions<sup>17</sup>. Gavison (1980), Bok (1983), Schoeman (1992) and Parent (1983) all define privacy as protecting individuals from the overreaching control of others and that privacy is a limitation of others access to an individual, including access to personal information<sup>18</sup>. The structuralistic definitions of privacy understand privacy as a specific social structure, a moral or legal right, which is used to enable someone’s ability to limit or restrict others from access to persons or information. Structuralistic definitions suggest that the more access to persons or information is limited or restricted by a social structure such as the law, the more privacy people enjoy.

The second category of privacy definitions outlined by Allmer is the individualistic approach. In the individualistic approach privacy definitions focus on the individual and understand privacy as control over information about oneself or the “limited control” definition of privacy<sup>19</sup>. The assumptions of privacy in this category are that privacy is a personal interest and that privacy includes the freedom from external interference in one’s personal choices, decisions and plans<sup>20</sup>. Westin (1967) defined privacy as the “claim of individuals, groups, or institutions to determine for themselves when, how, and to what extent information about them is

---

<sup>16</sup> Warren, Samuel D., and Louis D. Brandeis. "The right to privacy." *Harvard law review* (1890): 193-220

<sup>17</sup> Scanlon, T. “Thomson on privacy”, *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 4 No. 4 (1975): 315-22

<sup>18</sup> Gavison, Ruth. "Privacy and the Limits of Law." *The Yale Law Journal* 89, no. 3 (1980): 421-47; Armstrong, Walter P., and Sissela Bok. "Secrets: On the Ethics of Concealment and Revelation." (1983): 946-948; Schoeman, Ferdinand David. *Privacy and social freedom*. Cambridge university press, 1992; Parent, William A. "A new definition of privacy for the law." *Law and Philosophy* 2, no. 3 (1983): 305-338.

<sup>19</sup> Allmer, A critical contribution to

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

communicated to others”<sup>21</sup>. Miller (1971), Shils (1966), Fried (1968), Clarke (1999) and Froomkin (2000) define privacy as the control we have over information about ourselves and that a violation of this privacy is characterized by the acquisition or transmission of information without the voluntary consent or initiative of those whose actions and words generate the information<sup>22</sup>. In summary, individualistic definitions of privacy assume that privacy is a personal interest, or/and privacy includes the freedom from external interference in one’s personal choices, decisions and plans. Individualistic definitions of privacy suggest that the more the individual has control over his/her information the more privacy he/she enjoys. Under this categorization, if a person is not able to control their information, but other people or organization’s may do so, privacy is restricted.

The last categorization of privacy definitions outlined by Allmer is integrative definitions of privacy. Integrative definitions of privacy combine individualistic and structuralistic notions into one concept, understanding privacy as a right worth protecting while also treating individual control as an essential aspect<sup>23</sup>. Tavani (2007) said, “differentiating normative (structuralistic) and descriptive (individualistic) aspects of privacy, enables us to distinguish between the condition of privacy and a right to privacy and between a loss of privacy (in a descriptive sense) and a violation or invasion of privacy (in a normative sense)”<sup>24</sup>. Reiman (1976), Moor (1997), Itrona (1997) and Spinello (2003) agree that a claim to privacy is to claim the right to limit access or control access to a personal or private domain and simultaneously that to claim privacy

---

<sup>21</sup> Westin, Alan F. "Privacy and freedom, atheneum." *New York* 7 (1967).

<sup>22</sup> Miller, Arthur Raphael. *The assault on privacy: computers, data banks, and dossiers*. University of Michigan Press, 1971; Shils, Edward. "Privacy: Its constitution and vicissitudes." *Law and Contemporary Problems* 31, no. 2 (1966): 281-306; Fried, Charles. "Privacy", *The Yale Law Journal*, 3, vol. 77 (1968): 475-93; Clarke, Roger. "Internet privacy concerns confirm the case for intervention." *Communications of the ACM* 42, no. 2 (1999): 60-67; Froomkin, A. Michael. "The death of privacy?." *Stanford Law Review* (2000): 1461-1543.

<sup>23</sup> Allmer, A critical contribution to

<sup>24</sup> Tavani, Herman T. "Philosophical theories of privacy: Implications for an adequate online privacy policy." *Metaphilosophy* 38, no. 1 (2007): 1-22.

is to claim the right to a personal domain of immunity against the judgments of others<sup>25</sup>. In summary, integrative definitions of privacy merge the control (structuralistic) and restricted access (individualistic) conceptions of privacy into an integrative theoretical foundation.

The categorizations offered by Allmer are useful in highlighting the plethora of contributions to the academic literature on privacy. Also, placing the numerous definitions into categories helps paint a mosaic of the overarching characteristics inherent to the definition of privacy itself. One frequently repeated condition of privacy in the definitions offered above, is the ability to control access to information about oneself.

There have been many critiques of the concept of privacy in general, some are; Gouldner (1976), Lyon (1994, 2001, 2007), Gilion (2001), Etzioni (1999), Bennett and Raab (2006), Ogura (2006) and Fuchs (2010)<sup>26</sup>. Some critics of privacy claim the elusive and non-uniform nature of the concept discredit it. Another critique of privacy is that privacy concepts advance the idea of possessive individualism in order to define the private individual embedded in a system of a competitive market society. Some also claim that the liberal understanding of privacy is that the sovereign individual should have freedom to seek his/her own interests without interference and that those interests are primarily interpreted as property interests and private ownership rights.

These criticisms have grounding in that historically privacy rights claimed by individuals often did involve property, either material or immaterial. And it is true that “privacy” has

---

<sup>25</sup> Reiman, Jeffrey H. "Privacy, intimacy, and personhood." *Philosophy & Public Affairs* (1976): 26-44; Moor, James H. "Towards a theory of privacy in the information age." *Computers and Society* 27, no. 3 (1997): 27-32; Introna, Lucas D. "Privacy and the computer: why we need privacy in the information society." *Metaphilosophy* 28, no. 3 (1997): 259-275; Spinello, Richard. *Cyberethics: Morality and law in cyberspace*. Jones & Bartlett Learning, 2010.

<sup>26</sup> Gouldner, Alvin W. *The dialectic of ideology and technology*. Vol. 976. London: Macmillan, 1976; Lyon, David. *The electronic eye: The rise of surveillance society*. U of Minnesota Press, 1994; Gilliom, John. *Overseers of the poor: Surveillance, resistance, and the limits of privacy*. University of Chicago Press, 2001; Etzioni, Amitai. *The limits of privacy*. Basic Books, 2008; Bennett, Colin J., and Charles D. Raab. "The governance of privacy: Policy instruments in global perspective. 2nd and updated ed." (2006); Ogura, Toshimaru. "Electronic government and surveillance-oriented society." *Theorizing surveillance* (2006): 270-295; Fuchs, Christian. "studivZ: social networking in the surveillance society." *Ethics and Information Technology* 12, no. 2 (2010): 171-185.

historically referenced the right to be alone in one's home<sup>27</sup>. However, these criticisms infer a selfish nature in staking a right to privacy exercised by an individual. Privacy is not a modern concept of liberal democracies contrary to the claim of Lyon (1994)<sup>28</sup>. It is a concept dating back countless years into human history and is inherent in human nature, something everyone is born with. Humanity and the desire for privacy are a package deal. To imply privacy is a tool selfishly utilized to claim property rights in today's commercialized world pigeonhole's the concept of privacy while implying it is a conscious and controllable choice.

Similarly, not all scholars are concerned about the erosion of privacy. Some argue that despite what people say, their actions demonstrate they do not want privacy at all. Although polls indicate that people care deeply about privacy, people routinely give out their personal information and willingly reveal intimate details about their lives on the internet<sup>29</sup>. This concept is extremely important in the world dominated by technology in which we live today and asks questions of privacy outside the scope of this study. A growing academic literature is developing around "privacy in public" which debates the paradox of people becoming increasingly transparent online but still wanting and valuing their privacy<sup>30</sup>. The importance of privacy is far reaching. To claim that privacy is essential for human well-being is not a novel idea and runs like a steady current through the philosophical literature on privacy, from DeCew's focus on the role of privacy in forming one's own lifestyle and personal identity, through Ruth Gavison's emphasis on the value that individual privacy holds for personal growth and development, to

---

<sup>27</sup> Shank, Russell. "Privacy: History, legal, social, and ethical aspects." *Library Trends* 35, no. 1 (1986): 7-18.

<sup>28</sup> Lyon, David. *The electronic eye: The rise of surveillance society*. U of Minnesota Press, 1994.

<sup>29</sup> Solove, Daniel J. "Understanding privacy." (2008).

<sup>30</sup> Reidenberg, Joel R. "Privacy in public." (2014); Nissenbaum, Helen. "Protecting privacy in an information age: The problem of privacy in public." *Law and philosophy* 17, no. 5 (1998): 559-596..

Lucas Itrona's claim that privacy is a necessary condition for individuality<sup>31</sup>. Throughout the literature privacy has been cited more frequently than not as something of fundamental importance to humankind, and research supports this fact. While some critics question the validity of the concept of privacy, the overall consensus of Americans according to a 2015 Pew Research Center study is that Americans feel privacy is important in their daily lives in a number of essential ways<sup>32</sup>. The majority of Americans believe it is important - often "very important" - that they be able to maintain privacy and confidentiality in commonplace activities of their lives. Most strikingly, these views are especially pronounced when it comes to knowing what information is being collected about them and who is doing the collecting: 93% of adults say that being in control of *who* can get information about them is important and 74% feel this is "very important" while 90% say that controlling *what* information is collected about them is important, with 65% thinking it is "very important"<sup>33</sup>. This study also found that Americans have a pervasive sense that they are under surveillance when in public and very few feel they have a great deal of control over the data that is collected about them and how it is used. What this study shows, is that privacy remains an essential aspect to daily American life, regardless of how you chose to define it. This finding supports the academic literature on privacy in that control of information about oneself is seen as a crucial aspect to the concept of privacy. Privacy is proven to be important to the American people, so how is it protected?

### *Privacy and the Law*

---

<sup>31</sup> DeCew, Judith Wagner. *In pursuit of privacy: Law, ethics, and the rise of technology*. Cornell University Press, 1997; Gavison, Ruth. "Privacy and the Limits of Law." *The Yale Law Journal*, 89.3 (1980):421-471; Itrona, L.D. "Management, Information and Power: A Narrative for the Involved Manager." (1997).

<sup>32</sup> Pew Research Center. "Privacy Panel Survey #4, Jan. 27, 2015,- Feb. 16, 2015". Available at: <http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/05/20/americans-attitudes-about-privacy-security-and-surveillance/>

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*

The U.S. Constitution contains no express right to privacy. However, the Bill of Rights reflects the concern of James Madison and other framers for protecting specific aspects of privacy, such as the privacy of beliefs (1st Amendment), privacy of the home against demands that it be used to house soldiers (3rd Amendment), privacy of the person and possessions as against unreasonable searches (4th Amendment), and the 5th Amendment's privilege against self-incrimination, which provides protection for the privacy of personal information<sup>34</sup>. Although the U.S. Constitution does not explicitly mention the word "privacy," it safeguards the sanctity of the home and the confidentiality of communications from government intrusions. Beyond the United States, the vast majority of nations protect privacy in their constitutions. For example, Brazil proclaims that "the privacy, private life, honor and image of people are inviolable"; South Africa declares that "everyone has a right to privacy"; and South Korea announces that "the privacy of no citizen shall be infringed"<sup>35</sup>. Furthermore, privacy is recognized as a fundamental human right. According to the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948, "No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honor and reputation"<sup>36</sup>. In addition, thousands of laws protect privacy around the world including multinational privacy guidelines, directives and frameworks which have influenced the passage of privacy laws in a vast number of nations. What the abundance of these privacy laws demonstrates is that there appears to be a worldwide consensus about the importance of privacy and the need for its protection. Perhaps it is this consensus and unequivocal belief in the importance of privacy and simultaneously, its protection, that makes it so shocking when a democracy violates this basic human right of its citizens.

---

<sup>34</sup>Linder, Doug. "The right of privacy: Is it protected by the Constitution."(2011): Available at: <http://law2.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/conlaw/rightofprivacy.html>

<sup>35</sup> Solove, Understanding privacy

<sup>36</sup> UN General Assembly. "Universal declaration of human rights." *UN General Assembly* (1948).

*Privacy and U.S. government surveillance*

In 1975 the Church Committee was established to investigate abuses that had taken place by the American intelligence community. The committee opened a Pandora's box of wrongdoing, and one abuse after another came tumbling out as lawmakers and staff investigators shined a light into the hidden recesses of the American government. Historian Henry Steele Commager observed that the indifference of the intelligence agencies to constitutional restraint was "perhaps the most threatening of all the evidence that emerged from the findings of the Church Committee"<sup>37</sup>. Concealed from public scrutiny, and enshrined in a culture of secrecy, the intelligence community had abused its power to the detriment of American citizens. It is a sad and inevitable fact that those given immense power will eventually be tempted to use that power in an abusive way. The very nature of America's intelligence agencies pose a major challenge to the idea of government accountability in a democratic society<sup>38</sup>. How can privacy be protected when government agencies conduct their business in secret?

Several critical principles emerged in the wake of the Church Committee's findings, promising to reign back the intelligence communities power and subject it to increased oversight. First, surveillance and other forms of information gathering would take place under defined and transparent rules. Second, law enforcement and intelligence agencies would not collect information about Americans absent a factual predicate for suspicion - a predicate that must rise to the level of probable cause when intruding on communications. Third, agencies should tread lightly when their investigations might implicate First-Amendment protected freedoms. And fourth, investigative activity must be subject to oversight, with electronic surveillance of U.S.

---

<sup>37</sup> Commager, Henry Steele. "Intelligence: The Constitution Betrayed." *New York Review of Books*, September 30 (1976): 32-37.

<sup>38</sup>Ransom, Harry Howe, and Harry Howe Ransom. *The intelligence establishment*. No. 04; JK468. I6, R3. 1970; Johnson, Loch K. *A Season of Inquiry: the Senate intelligence investigation*. University Press of Kentucky, 2015.

persons communications requiring individualized court orders<sup>39</sup>. The American government was asking for its people to forgive its indiscretions, “trust us” they cooed.

To the detriment of individual privacy, the lessons learned in the 1970s and the reforms enacted to prevent intelligence abuses unravelled swiftly after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. The legal and policy changes enacted in the following years wrought two main changes: the government no longer needed a criminal predicate to gather information about Americans, and the information that was collected could be retained for long periods and often disseminated widely<sup>40</sup>. Under the Patriot Act of 2001, passed swiftly by President George W. Bush in a time of crisis, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC) could now order the release of “any tangible thing” and as revealed by Edward Snowden, the term “relevance” has been interpreted since 2006 to allow bulk collection of Americans’ phone records because some small number of them may at some point in the future be germane to an FBI investigation<sup>41</sup>.

### *Privacy and Democracy*

The effect of mass government surveillance invading the lives of American citizens has the power to destroy American democracy as we know it. As Loch K. Johnson put powerfully in 2008, “*The protection of freedom requires daily attentions; someone has to be continuously on guard. Outside the executive branch, only Congress has the authority to insist on access to intelligence documents and testimony; if elected representatives lapse into complacency, the secret agencies will again drift toward autonomy and the arrogance that isolation breeds*”<sup>42</sup>. As is obvious from the Snowden disclosures, the intelligence community once again strayed from

---

<sup>39</sup> Levinson-Waldman, What the Government does

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

<sup>42</sup> Johnson, Loch K. "Congressional supervision of America's secret agencies: The experience and legacy of the Church Committee." *Public Administration Review* 64, no. 1 (2004): 3-14.

the oversight imposed after the findings of the Church Committee to again violate the privacy of Americans. Johnson went on to say, *“It is imperative that responsible officials remain ever-vigilant in their protection of lawful political activities, ensuring that citizens do not become the target of secret intimidation by the intelligence community. The constitutional right to free expression must remain the linchpin of American democracy<sup>43</sup>”*. First, this quote demands we ask why government officials weren’t vigilant in ensuring the NSA was not abusing its power. Secondly, Johnson touches on an essential idea which is that sweeping government surveillance of everyday American citizens is a direct source of intimidation and threatens the constitutional right to freedom of expression. If people know they are being surveilled, their behavior changes. And if they are surveilled by a government who is conducting pre-emptive security and looking for any indication of wrongdoing, people’s freedom of expression plummets into peril. James Rachels and Thomas Scanlon demonstrate this with the following example:

Consider what happens when two close friends are joined by a casual acquaintance. The character of the group changes; and one of the changes is that conversation about intimate matters is now out of order. Then suppose these friends could never be alone; suppose there were always third parties. They could carry on as close friends do, sharing confidences, freely expressing their feelings about things, but this would mean violating their sense of how it is appropriate to behave around casual acquaintances or strangers. Or they could avoid doing or saying anything which they think inappropriate to do or say around a third party. But this would mean that they could no longer behave with one another in the way that friends do and further that, eventually, they would no longer be close friends. The lesson from the above example is that if we cannot control who has access to us, sometimes including and sometimes excluding various people, then we cannot control the patterns of behavior we need to adopt and this is one

---

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

reason why privacy is an aspect of liberty<sup>44</sup>. Put another way, the collection and retention of non-criminal information about Americans for law enforcement and national security purposes poses profound challenges to our democracies and our liberties<sup>45</sup>. Distinct authors agree that surveillance might create conformist actions. People will keep their records clean and will avoid controversial or deviant behaviour, whatever their private views and intentions might really be<sup>46</sup>. When asked by Glenn Greenwald to motivations behind his actions, Edward Snowden said the following:

I remember what the internet was like before it was being watched and there's never been anything in the history of man that's like it. I mean, you could have children from one part of the world having an equal discussion where, you know, they were sort of granted the same respects for their ideas and conversation with experts in a field from another part of the world... And it was free and unrestrained. And we've seen the chilling of that and the cooling of that and the changing of that model, toward something in which people self-police their own views, and they literally make jokes about ending up on "the list"<sup>47</sup>

We are all well aware of the fear constant surveillance can have on a society, the frightening thing is that we are truly getting closer and closer to this Orwellian world. What this analysis of privacy has shown is despite the complex nature of the concept and its criticisms, privacy is without a doubt considered important not just to Americans, but also to people and nations around the world. Edward Snowden leaked documents in order to prove the U.S. government had again abused its power in violating the privacy of its citizens. What impact did his disclosures have on this seemingly immovable mammoth system of government surveillance? Did his message permeate the popular media?

---

<sup>44</sup>Rachels, James. "Why privacy is important." *Philosophy & Public Affairs*(1975): 323-333.

<sup>45</sup> Levinson-Waldman, What the government does

<sup>46</sup> Burnham, David. *The Rise of the Computer State: The Threat to Our Freedoms, Our Ethics and Our Democratic Process*. Open Road Media, 2015.

<sup>47</sup> Poitras, *Citizenfour*

## The Importance of Media Framing

There is no denying Edward Snowden's actions were controversial. Most research done on media framing of the Snowden disclosures to date has focused on Edward Snowden's portrayal as either a hero or traitor, whistleblower or dissident<sup>48</sup>. These studies focus on the characterization of Snowden and examine the reaction to his actions by how he himself was framed. This is not what Snowden aimed to achieve with his disclosures and studies focusing on him as a person devalue his actions. Snowden repeatedly states in *Citizenfour* that he does not want the story to be about him, he comes forward as the leaker only to strengthen the leaks reliability.

"These are public issues, these are not my issues, you know, these are everybody's issues... And if nobody else is gonna do it, I will, and hopefully when I'm gone, whatever you do to me, there will be somebody else who will do the same thing.. You can stomp one person, but there's gonna be seven more of us"<sup>49</sup>

It is clear from any examination of the Snowden scandal that above all, Edward Snowden wanted the public to know the American government was violating their right to privacy and that he hoped that they would care. Unfortunately, popular media are the lense through which the reader ultimately views an issue presented by the news and analysis of media framing illuminates the influence of the media on the human consciousness. Despite numerous definitions, research on framing is characterized by theoretical and empirical vagueness, due in large part to the lack of a commonly shared theoretical model underlying framing research<sup>50</sup>. One of the most commonly cited media framing communications scholars is Robert Entman, who suggested that

---

<sup>48</sup> Wu, Amy, Will WK Ma, and Wendy WL Chan. "'Whistleblower or Leaker?'" Examining the Portrayal and Characterization of Edward Snowden in USA, UK, and HK Posts." In *New Media, Knowledge Practices and Multiliteracies*, pp. 53-66. Springer Singapore, 2015; Caster, Cole N. "Edward Snowden, Hero or Traitor? An Analysis of News Media Framing." PhD diss., California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, 2016.

<sup>49</sup> Poitras, *Citizenfour*

<sup>50</sup> Scheufele, Dietram A. "Framing as a theory of media effects." *Journal of communication* 49, no. 1 (1999): 103-122; Van Gorp, Baldwin. "The constructionist approach to framing: Bringing culture back in." *Journal of communication* 57, no. 1 (2007): 60-78.

frames in the news can be examined and identified by “the presence or absence of certain keywords, stock phrases, stereotyped images, sources of information and sentences that provide thematically reinforcing clusters of facts and judgements”<sup>51</sup>. This idea of grouping frames together based on perceived commonalities is popular in framing research. Some political communication scholars argue simply that repetitive news framing leads to a higher and more constant level of accessibility, which in turn leads to the increased applicability of a framed message<sup>52</sup>. This view suggests that frames can become more pervasive and durable with frequency. There are many critics of framing research, and as noted by Claes H. De Vreese, the challenge in framing research often occurs when these general definitions are translated and operationalized into empirical studies<sup>53</sup>.

Despite the shortcomings of media framing analysis, this method was considered as appropriate for examining privacy in the wake of the Snowden disclosures for several reasons. The theoretical grounding chosen with respect to media framing for this analysis is the social constructivist approach outlined by Denis McQuail<sup>54</sup>. In the social constructivist approach to media framing, “Media discourse is part of the process by which individuals construct meaning, and public opinion is part of the process by which journalists develop and crystallize meaning in public discourse”<sup>55</sup>. The social constructivist approach to framing can be understood as a loop, individuals construct the public opinion which journalists then develop into public discourse, or

---

<sup>51</sup> Entman, Robert M. "Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm." *Journal of communication* 43, no. 4 (1993): 51-58.

<sup>52</sup> Cappella, Joseph N., and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. *Spiral of cynicism: The press and the public good*. Oxford University Press, 1997; Iyengar, Shanto. *Is anyone responsible?: How television frames political issues*. University of Chicago Press, 1994; Price, Vincent, and David Tewksbury. "News values and public opinion: A theoretical account of media priming and framing." *Progress in communication sciences* (1997): 173-212.

<sup>53</sup> De Vreese, Claes H. "New avenues for framing research." *American Behavioral Scientist* 56, no. 3 (2012): 365-375.

<sup>54</sup> McQuail, Denis. *Mass communication theory: An introduction* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (1994): 327

<sup>55</sup> Gamson, William A., and Andre Modigliani. "Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach." *American journal of sociology* (1989): 1-37.

that which becomes public opinion. Within the realm of political communication, it is useful for framing to be defined and operationalized on the basis of this social constructivism. Mass media actively set the frames and reference that readers or viewers use to interpret and discuss public events<sup>56</sup>. And in the case of the disclosures leaked by Edward Snowden, the mass media was pivotal in perpetuating dominant frames.

The constructivist approach to framing has particular applicability in the Snowden case for another reason. Within a constructivist view, the potency of frames to influence the public lies in the fact that they are closely linked with familiar cultural frames. Cultural resonances contribute to the fact that devices are often perceived as familiar, situating journalists and members of their audience in a dynamic social process where social reality is produced, reproduced, and transformed<sup>57</sup>. The dominant negative frames identified in the content analysis in this study resonated so profoundly due to the perceived familiarity of the cultural events in which they were placed, most poignantly, the terrorist attacks of 9/11. The analysis will show the use of this frame by journalists to construct a reality surrounding the Snowden scandal that constantly referred to 9/11, situating it in a culturally familiar frame associated with fear, thus framing the scandal negatively.

Another important aspect of framing as a construction of social reality for this experiment is not necessarily what frames have the power to call attention to but just as importantly what they have the power to omit. Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky called their studies of how people manage risk and uncertainty, Prospect Theory, which investigated and highlighted

---

<sup>56</sup> Tuchman, Gaye. "Making news: A study in the construction of reality." (1978).

<sup>57</sup> Van Gorp, The constructionist approach to framing

anomalies and contradictions in human behavior<sup>58</sup>. One unlikely finding of Kahneman and Tversky's experiments demonstrated that frames select and call attention to particular aspects of the reality described, which follows logically that frames simultaneously direct attention away from other aspects. Most frames are defined by what they omit as well as include, and the omissions of potential problem definitions, explanations, evaluations and recommendations may be as critical as the inclusions guiding the audience<sup>59</sup>. McCombs, Shaw and Weaver suggest that not only are agenda setting and framing effects related, but that framing is in fact, an extension of agenda setting<sup>60</sup>. They use the term "second-level-agenda-setting" to describe the impact of the salience of characteristics of media coverage on audiences' interpretation of news stories. Therefore, if the importance of privacy was not found as a dominant frame in this analysis, it can be considered to have been largely left off the agenda. While the effects of media framing are largely debated and criticized in the literature, it is undeniable that media framing has some measure of power in shaping the discourse surrounding an event.

### Research Design

This content analysis focuses on four mainstream daily newspapers, two from the U.S. and two from Canada. The four newspapers selected for analysis were: *The Globe and Mail*, *The Toronto Star*, *The Wall Street Journal* and *The New York Times*. The selection criteria for these newspapers was based on highest circulation, *The Globe and Mail* having the highest circulation

---

<sup>58</sup>Tversky, Amos, and Daniel Kahneman. "The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice." In *Environmental Impact Assessment, Technology Assessment, and Risk Analysis*, pp. 107-129. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1985.

<sup>59</sup>Entman, 'Framing: Toward Clarification of

<sup>60</sup>McCombs, Maxwell E., Donald Lewis Shaw, and David Hugh Weaver. *Communication and democracy: Exploring the intellectual frontiers in agenda-setting theory*. Psychology Press, 1997..

in Canada followed by the *Toronto Star*<sup>61</sup> and *The New York Times* having the highest circulation in the U.S. followed by *The Wall Street Journal*<sup>62</sup>. The justification for choosing largest circulation as a selection criteria was readership. Newspapers maintaining the highest readership among a population must presumably hold themselves to high professional and recognized standards while simultaneously proving themselves as reliable sources of information, reaching large audiences with information they can trust.

This analysis focuses on the period between June 8th, 2013 and June 30th, 2014 inclusively. While the first leak provided by Edward Snowden was published anonymously on June 5th 2013, Snowden's identity was not revealed to the public until 4 days later on June 9th, 2013 when he came forward as the leaker of the NSA documents in a video by Laura Poitras and Glenn Greenwald given to *The Guardian*<sup>63</sup>. June 8th, 2013 was chosen as the start date for analysis in order to encompass all articles published regarding the controversy from the time Snowden went public. June 30th, 2014 was chosen as the end date for articles included in the analysis in order to fully encompass a one year period following the disclosures. The approximate one year timeline was chosen to focus on the time period immediately following the disclosures as it can be understood as the "controversy period" in which the most fervent responses to Snowden's actions were produced in the media. The end date of June 30th, 2014 was chosen instead of the precise one year mark of June 8th, 2014 in an attempt to capture any "anniversary" articles which may have appeared in print surrounding the one year mark of the day Snowden came forward to the public. The one year timeline was also chosen with regards to

---

<sup>61</sup> Newspapers Canada, "2013 Daily Circulation Newspaper Report" Accessed June 12, 2016 at <http://www.newspaperscanada.ca/sites/default/files/2013%20Daily%20Newspapers%20Circulation%20Report%20FINAL.pdf>

<sup>62</sup> Lulofs, Neal. "Top 25 U.S. Newspapers for March 2013", Alliance for Audited Media, Accessed June 12 2016 at <http://auditedmedia.ca/news/blog/top-25-us-newspapers-for-march-2013.aspx>

<sup>63</sup> Poitras, Laura, and Glenn Greenwald. "NSA whistleblower Edward Snowden: "I don't want to live in a society that does these sort of things"—video." *The Guardian*, June 9 (2013).

keeping the article sample size manageable, as one coder was undertaking the analysis for this project. One shortcoming of this study is that the duration of the framing effects were not studied over the course of the one year period under examination. Framing scholars have recently begun to include duration of framing effects in their studies, assessing whether frames carry a temporal characteristic<sup>64</sup>.

The unit of analysis for this study are newspaper items and includes both news and feature stories written both in house as well as those supplied by wire services and syndicates. The article types included in this analysis are columns or commentaries and opinions or editorials. The data gathering was performed using the Factiva database through the University of Ottawa library. The exact search terms chosen for the study were “Snowden and Privacy” applied to both headlines and text. The justification for the keyword search was to focus on the status of “privacy” in the American and Canadian media representations of the Snowden scandal. Intentions were to capture any instances of Snowden and privacy mentioned in the same article in the one year period following the disclosures. Keywords were pre-tested to ensure the resulting articles were relevant to the study. The search results returned 184 articles for the time period June 8th, 2013 through June 30th, 2014. After reviewing the 184 articles captured, 14 articles were omitted from the analysis. All results omitted were returned from *The New York Times* search results and consisted of the article type “Letters” which were not included in the content analysis as a category to be analyzed in an attempt to include only professional journalistic accounts of the scandal. Out of 184 initial results, 170 articles were included in the final sample for analysis. Forty one articles were returned for *The Wall Street Journal* constituting 24% of the total sample; eleven articles from the *Toronto Star* at 6% of the sample; 42 *Globe and Mail* articles at 25% of the sample and 76 *New York Times* articles constituting the

---

<sup>64</sup> De Vreese, New avenues for framing

largest portion of the sample at 45%. Table 1 below summarizes the corpus by newspaper and newspaper item type. The majority of item types were columns constituting 43% of the overall sample. The other three categories were relatively evenly spread with commentaries at 20%, opinions at 19% and editorials at 18% of the overall sample. However, it is interesting to note that the Canadian newspapers only had 4 or 13% of the total editorials, perhaps suggesting they saw themselves somehow removed from the controversy.

*Table 1: Summary of sample by newspaper and newspaper item type, for the period June 8th, 2013 through June 30th, 2014*

Newspaper	Commentary	Column	Editorial	Opinion	Total
The Wall Street Journal	13	14	14	0	41 (24%)
The New York Times	11	31	13	21	76 (45%)
The Globe and Mail	10	28	3	1	42 (25%)
The Toronto Star	0	0	1	10	11 (6%)
Total	34 (20%)	73 (43%)	31 (18%)	32 (19%)	170 (100%)

Two techniques of content analysis were used in interpreting the sample. The first technique was to focus on article headlines. Headlines are indicative of newspaper editors framing techniques and are important in how an article will be cognitively perceived and processed by a reader.<sup>65</sup> The second technique used in the analysis was to identify and gather dominant frames in the narrative, which would later be grouped into frame packages for analysis. While headlines are a valuable source of information regarding media frames, full text analysis

<sup>65</sup> Lagerwerf, Luuk, Carly Timmerman, and Anique Bosschaert. "Incongruity in news headings: Readers' choices and resulting cognitions". *Journalism Practice* (2015): 1-23; Lindemann, Bernard. "Cheap thrills we live by- some notes on the poetics of tabloid headlines". *Journal of Literary Semantics* 19, no. 1 (1990): 46-59.

was also necessary to gain a deeper perspective on how privacy was framed following the Snowden disclosures.

In the first stage of the content analysis of the sample for this study, each article headline was coded according to the following scale: Tone of the headline - positive (1), negative (2), ambiguous (3) and neutral/balanced (4). A positive tone (1) was defined as the unambiguous support for and understanding of the activities and events involving Snowden and his actions. The categories are complex in that something marked as “positive” for showing understanding of Snowden’s actions, would simultaneously be identified as “positive” for condemning the sweeping surveillance practices of the NSA (hence showing understanding of the leaks). Included in the positive category were any headlines which mentioned the importance of privacy, importance of Snowden, surveillance practices by the NSA as being abusive, or the untruthfulness/deception by the government in question (both the U.S. and Canadian government were discussed in search results).

A negative tone (2) was defined as the opposite of a positive ranking, including; alarm or condemnation of Snowden or support or sympathy for the surveillance practices of the NSA. The category of ambiguous (3) was afforded to articles whose headlines could not be grouped easily into either category mentioned above. Ambiguous headlines frequently neither mentioned Snowden, the disclosures or the NSA. Lastly, a ranking of neutral/balanced (4) was given to headlines that offered no obvious opinion on the Snowden disclosures, privacy or the NSA. Articles assigned the ranking of neutral were factual and straightforward in nature demonstrating no clear bias. Table 2 summarized the criteria of the ranking system below:

*Table 2: Coding scheme applied to Headlines and Full Text*

Positive (1)	Negative (2)	Ambiguous (3)	Neutral/Balanced (4)
--------------	--------------	---------------	----------------------

-Unambiguous support for and understanding of Snowden and his actions	-Alarm towards or condemnation of Snowden	- Articles who can't be grouped easily into category 1 or 2	- No obvious opinion/bias given
-Condemnation of NSA surveillance practices	-Support or sympathy for the surveillance practices of the NSA	- Did not discuss Snowden	- Strictly factual in nature

Stage two of the analysis involved gathering dominant frames in the narrative of each newspaper item. Each of the 170 articles included in this study were read at least twice for this analysis. During the first reading a coding sheet was filled out where questions were answered regarding certain aspects of the article<sup>66</sup>. The questions answered on the coding sheet helped to determine the frames found in each article. An initial tally of all frames found from the sample totalled 78 frames<sup>67</sup>. Each article was then read again and a tally system was used to discern which articles mentioned which of the 78 frames, and how often. The unique article code was used as the tally mark in order to identify which newspaper the tally came from. Soon, a clear pattern emerged of the most reoccurring frames found in the news articles. The most reoccurring frames were chosen by frequency of appearance, according to the tally system. Finally, frames which were closely related were grouped into “frame packages”.

One way to unpack or understand frames which emerge surrounding an issue highlighted in the media is to use a method which suggests each frame that a journalist has applied in a text can be represented as a part of a “frame package”, or a cluster of logical organized devices which function as an identity kit for a frame<sup>68</sup>. Found within this identity kit are three main components: 1. The *manifest framing devices*, such as word choice, metaphors, descriptions and arguments, 2. The *manifest or latent reasoning devices* which are explicit and implicit statements

<sup>66</sup> See appendix for full article bibliography and coding sheet used in full text analysis

<sup>67</sup> See appendix for a complete list of the frames found in this analysis

<sup>68</sup> Gamson, William A., and Kathryn E. Lasch. "The political culture of social welfare policy." *Evaluating the welfare state: Social and political perspectives* 95 (1983): 397-415.

that deal with justifications, causes, and consequences in a temporal order and 3. *An implicit cultural phenomenon* that displays the package as a whole. In the framing analysis conducted in this study, the Snowden leaks acted as the implicit cultural phenomenon which displayed the frame package as a whole, frames were then identified as similar and grouped into “frame packages” on the basis of similar manifest framing devices (word choice, metaphors and descriptions) as well as by similar manifest reasoning devices (justifications, causes and consequences). One shortcoming to this study and a challenge when applying media framing to an empirical study in general, is that a specific criteria for eligibility into a “frame package” is defined too broadly, for example, numerically how many frames does it take to constitute a frame package?

After frames were grouped into frame packages, positive and negative dominant frames for both the U.S. and Canadian newspapers were identified and the findings of the study emerged.

## Findings

### *Headline Findings*

Positive article headlines included anything showing support or understanding of the Snowden disclosures, or condemnation of NSA surveillance practices. The *Toronto Star* returned the most interesting findings of the headline analysis returning a 100% score of positive headlines. Out of a total of 11 articles, all eleven headlines were positive in nature, showing support or understanding for Snowden. *The Globe and Mail* came in second for positive article headlines with 69% designated positive, or 29 of 42 articles. *The New York Times* came in third with a score of 54% positive headlines and *The Wall Street Journal* came in last with only 22% of article headlines being coded as positive. What these findings demonstrate is that the

Canadian newspapers were more likely to frame the headlines regarding the Snowden disclosures in a positive or understanding way.

*The Wall Street Journal* was the most likely to frame the Snowden in a negative way, which was defined as article headlines which showed alarm or incomprehension towards Snowden or the disclosures or fervent support for the NSA and its surveillance practices. Regarding headlines, *The Wall Street Journal* had the most negative at 46% or 19 of 41 articles. *The Globe and Mail* came in second at 10% of article headlines coded negatively, this is surprising due to *The Globe and Mail* also coming in second for positive headlines. *The New York Times* came in third for negative toned headlines at 6%. This finding can be attributed to the coding schema and the fact that *The New York Times* had a disproportionately large number of headlines in the sample coded as “ambiguous” (24%) where *The Globe and Mail* only had 7% coded as “ambiguous”. The larger number of “ambiguous” articles for *The New York Times* detracted from article headlines being coded as “positive” or “negative”. A summary of the headline findings is illustrated in table 2 below:

*Table 2: Headline Findings by newspaper and tone type*

Newspaper	Positive (1)	Negative (2)	Ambiguous (3)	Neutral (4)	Article Total
The New York Times	41 (54%)	5 (6%)	18 (24%)	12 (16%)	76
The Wall Street Journal	9 (22%)	19 (46%)	8 (20%)	5 (12%)	41
The Toronto Star	11 (100%)	0	0	0	11
The Globe and Mail	29 (69%)	4 (10%)	3 (7%)	6 (14%)	42
Totals	90 (53%)	28 (16%)	29 (17%)	23 (14%)	170

The headline findings of this analysis show that overall the Canadian newspaper headlines from the sample were overwhelmingly positive concerning the Snowden disclosures and *The Toronto Star* was more positive than *The Globe and Mail*. The U.S. headlines were second to the Canadian newspapers in terms of positive headlines, *The New York Times* coming in third overall and *The Wall Street Journal* in last place for positive headlines with only (22%). Preliminarily, these headline findings illustrate that to some degree, Canada and the U.S. hold different viewpoints concerning Snowden's actions, Canada representing the scandal in a more positive light and the U.S. representing Snowden in a more negative light.

#### *Full Article Findings*

Data was coded by one researcher and was cross checked for accuracy and consistency by Professor Vucetic at the University of Ottawa. Prior to full text coding, a total familiarization with the "Snowden disclosures" was necessary. This was facilitated through the reading of news articles and academic literature, familiarization with statements made by Snowden and watching several documentaries on Snowden, including *Citizen 4*. The study was conducted using simple content analysis undertaken by one researcher and the shortcomings of such a superficial examination are noted here. If more time and resources were dedicated to this study the results would presumably be more reliable and hopefully this study will be expanded on in the future.

The first major finding of the full article analysis is that Canada's coverage of the Snowden Scandal was overwhelmingly positive, while the U.S. coverage of the scandal was more mixed, which is in line with the headline findings.

*The Toronto Star* was the most positive of the Canadian newspapers, presumably due to its historically left of center political position. However, the sub sample for this analysis was too

small, with only 11 articles from the *Toronto Star* constituting 6% of the overall sample. Luckily, this point has been proven empirically by other research. A 2001 NewsWatch study found dramatic differences between the policy prescriptions in editorials, and columns in the main news sections of Canada's most influential newspapers, including the *Toronto Star* and *The Globe and Mail*. When comparing coverage of three issues, the study concluded the *Toronto Star* was dominated by left-wing opinions of the sampled opinion pieces and editorials and was found to continually place emphasis on issues of diversity, democracy and the public good<sup>69</sup>. The findings of this study are in line with the findings of the 2001 NewsWatch study in that the *Toronto Star* overwhelmingly framed the Snowden controversy in a positive light, in both headline and full text article analysis, showing support and understanding for Snowden and his actions and condemnation of NSA surveillance practices in reference to democracy and the public good.

The 2001 NewsWatch study also found that *The Globe and Mail* was categorized as more right-wing in its editorial and opinion pieces. The findings of this study support the NewsWatch study in that *The Globe and Mail* was less likely to frame the Snowden controversy in a positive light when compared to the *Toronto Star*, at 71% v. 100%. Despite its tendency towards right-wing opinions, however, *The Globe and Mail* was overwhelmingly supportive of the Snowden disclosures when compared to the U.S. newspapers, demonstrating overall that Canadian support for Snowden was more salient in the media than U.S. support.

In the U.S. context, *The Wall Street Journal* is considered the most mainstream conservative newspaper and *The New York Times* is seen as the most mainstream liberal

---

<sup>69</sup> Hackett, Robert A., and Scott Uzelman. "Tracing corporate influences on press content: A summary of recent NewsWatch Canada research." *Journalism Studies* 4, no. 3 (2003): 331-346.

newspaper, according to the majority of public opinion<sup>70</sup>. The findings of this study are in line with those of the political leaning of the papers, *The New York Times* having 68% positive articles regarding Snowden and *The Wall Street Journal* showing only 5% positive articles towards Snowden. Out of the 41 articles collected from *The Wall Street Journal* an overwhelming majority of 33 or 80% of the sample framed Snowden and his disclosures in a negative light. Despite its liberal leaning, *The New York Times* was the paper most likely to frame Snowden in an ambiguous light, neither taking a positive or negative stance. Out of the four newspapers included in this analysis, *The Wall Street Journal* was by far the most likely to frame the Snowden disclosures in a negative way. Table 3 below shows a summary of full article findings by newspaper type:

*Table 3: Full Article Findings by Newspaper*

Newspaper	Positive (1)	Negative (2)	Ambiguous (3)	Neutral (4)	Article Total
The New York Times	52 (68%)	8 (11%)	15 (20%)	1 (1%)	76
The Wall Street Journal	2 (5%)	33 (80%)	4 (10%)	2 (5%)	41
The Toronto Star	11 (100%)	0	0	0	11
The Globe and Mail	30 (71%)	5 (12%)	5 (12%)	2 (5%)	42
Totals	90	46	24	5	170

The only negative dominant frame package to emerge in this study was from *The Wall Street Journal*. The frame implied strongly that restricting NSA programs would be harmful to

<sup>70</sup> Quora. "Among large US Newspaper which are considered conservative and which are considered liberal" (2014). Accessed at: <https://www.quora.com/Among-large-US-Newspapers-which-are-considered-conservative-and-which-are-considered-liberal>

national security and would degrade the United States ability to prevent terrorist attacks. More specifically this frame states that the NSA surveillance program is necessary to prevent another 9/11 and demanded that risks of abuse must be measured in proportion to the damages they might prevent. A majority, or 54% of articles from *The Wall Street Journal* framed the Snowden disclosures in this way.

This has been a common trope of the post 9/11 world we live in, the idea that mass surveillance is justified because it could prevent another 9/11 attack. Four articles from the *Wall Street Journal* went so far as to say that if we would have had this technology prior to 2001, the terrorist attacks of 9/11 would never have occurred<sup>71</sup>. This notion is startlingly pervasive, as shown by its frequency in this study. The justifications by the American government and the NSA that possible threats to national security are judged to be of such importance as to warrant the suspension of civil liberties in an expression of socially repressive measures is weak. The threat of terrorism has now long been used a source of justification for this level of social repression and it is simply the weapon of fear which the American government has used to cow the American people into submission.

One argument in favor of retaining all information gathered by the NSA, regardless of its apparent law enforcement value, is that seemingly innocuous information may prove meaningful when connected with other “dots” of information. But a recent study commissioned by the Department of Defence concluded that, “there is no credible approach that has been documented to accurately anticipate terrorist threats”<sup>72</sup>. A National Academics of Science report echoed this finding, determining that terrorist identification via data mining (or by “any other methodology”)

---

<sup>71</sup> Crovitz, Gordon L. “Information Age: Making the case for the NSA - At Last.” *The Wall Street Journal*, September 23, 2013; Feinstein, Dianne. “The NSA’s Watchfulness Protects America.” *The Wall Street Journal*, October 14, 2013; Crovitz, Gordon L. “Information Age: White Hats vs. Black Hats.” *The Wall Street Journal*, August 5, 2013; Coats, Dan. “To My Congressional Colleagues: Stop the NSA Grandstanding.” *The Wall Street Journal*, June 18, 2013.

<sup>72</sup> The MITRE Corporation. “Rare Events” (2009). Available at <http://www.fas.org/irp/agency/dod/jason/rare.pdf>

was “neither feasible as an objective nor desirable as a goal of technology development efforts”<sup>73</sup>. Statistically speaking, there have been relatively few attempted or successful terrorist attacks, which means there are no reliable signatures for pattern modeling, it simply does not occur with enough frequency to enable the creation of valid predictive models. Modeling from massive amounts of individuals data does not predict terrorist attacks because there are no discernable patterns and startlingly too many people wrongfully suspected. Therefore, the most cited and widely understood justification for the necessity of mass surveillance is a moot point. Furthermore, an overabundance of innocuous information can increase the risk of drawing false connections. With increasing quantities of innocuous information about innocent Americans, government will have more opportunities to reach inaccurate conclusions<sup>74</sup>. If you want to see something and look hard enough, you will find it, whether it exists or not. Allowing pre-emptive security through massive surveillance of individual citizens in the name of fighting terrorism is a clever guise the American government employs to violate privacy rights and civil liberties. Therefore, the most dominant negative frame package to emerge from this study implied surveillance is excusable in violating privacy because it could help prevent another 9/11, which has proven to ring false.

The most dominant positive frame to emerge from this study was the dominant frame found in both *The New York Times* and *The Toronto Star*, making it the most reoccurring frame found throughout the study. The frame suggests that Edward Snowden brought forth a necessary debate for the citizenry on the balance between security and privacy or safety and liberty. An impressive 38% of *The New York Times* articles mentioned this frame while 45% of *The Toronto*

---

<sup>73</sup> National Research Council (US). Committee on Technical, Privacy Dimensions of Information for Terrorism Prevention, and Other National Goals. *Protecting individual privacy in the struggle against terrorists: a framework for program assessment*. The National Academies, 2008.

<sup>74</sup> Burnham, David. *The Rise of the Computer State: The Threat to Our Freedoms, Our Ethics and Our Democratic Process*. Open Road Media, 2015.

*Star* articles mentioned the frame. The fact that the most dominant frame for the U.S. newspapers was also the second most dominant frame in the Canadian newspapers studied in this analysis shows that Canada and the U.S. were to some degree on the same page concerning Snowden and his leaks, in regards to a debate being necessary and brought to the people.

On the surface, the fact that the need for a debate was mentioned so frequently throughout newspaper reporting on the Snowden disclosures, it would seem Snowden achieved his goal of causing a tidal wave of public awareness concerning privacy. What this analysis found, however, was that although there was such a fervent call for debate, hardly any articles proffered hard hitting questions about privacy. Out of the 170 articles included in this study, only 8 articles came close in asking hard hitting questions about the meaning of privacy Snowden had wanted to bring forth with his disclosures. For example, one *Globe and Mail* article asked, “Does this promise of increased security from these kinds of surveillance programs justify giving governments virtually unchecked authority to both watch and know us?”<sup>75</sup>. Another *New York Times* article said, “Preventing terrorist attacks is a critical and complex job... but a free society must have another kind of security as well: the security of its citizens from the fear that their conversations and activities are being watched, monitored, questioned, interrogated, or scrutinized. Without this security, individual liberty, self-government, economic growth, and basic ideals of citizenship are all jeopardized”<sup>76</sup>. One *Globe and Mail* article said, “What’s the answer? There is no easy one, but let’s at least keep our eyes on the right target, which is not states spying on states. It’s the massive erosion of privacy - your privacy”<sup>77</sup>. Surprisingly, one *Wall Street Journal* article stated poignantly, “is is excessive? It certainly appears to be. Does

---

<sup>75</sup> Southey, Tabatha. “Pundits demand Snowden leak dating secrets.” *Globe and Mail*, June, 14th 2013.

<sup>76</sup> The editorial board. “Bad Times for Big Brother.” *The New York Times*, December, 22 2013.

<sup>77</sup> Garton Ash, Timothy. “Government spying? Worry about yourself; of course states are surveiling each other. With data spilling across borders, the vital issue is the monitoring of innocent individuals.” *Globe and Mail*, November, 1 2013.

that matter? Yes. Among other reasons: The end of the expectation that citizens' communications are and will remain private will probably change us as a people, and a country"<sup>78</sup>. Finally, one *Toronto Star* article said, "Osama bin Laden's assault on U.S. soil was minor by comparison. That the American war on the privacy and liberty of its own citizens should have been prompted by a mere terrorist attack is the sorriest part of the tragic American overreaction. Bin Laden removed a chip of a brick in a wall. The U.S. has destroyed the building"<sup>79</sup>. While empowering and moving, unfortunately these types of statements made up a dishearteningly small portion of the overall sample of articles. The statements and questions above addressed the hard hitting issues of privacy in today's world, they are the questions we as a people should be debating. Unfortunately, this study revealed the discourse surrounding Snowden and privacy in mainstream news articles in both Canada and the U.S. agreed that we need a debate, but offered none.

A disturbing layer added to the dominant frame calling for a debate by the populace under surveillance, is that this needed debate is labelled as a debate about the balance of security v. privacy or safety v. liberty. This study finds that an extremely large proportion of the articles framed the need for a debate in terms of a debate between the balance of these two, and therefore competing, ideals. It is crucial to look at where this metaphor is derived from, and what weight it carries. Why do the American people, and people around the world, find it necessary to find a balance between their security and privacy?

The context in which the "balance" metaphor has arisen in responses to Snowden's disclosures refers to government's need to protect official secrets as central to the maintenance of "security". This utterance is so commonly cited as fact that it has come to take on an air of true

---

<sup>78</sup> Noonan, Peggy. "What we lose if we give up privacy." *The Wall Street Journal*, August, 17th 2013.

<sup>79</sup> Mallick, Heather. "U.S. snoopers knows you are guilty." *The Toronto Star*, June 12, 2013.

validity, even necessity. More dangerously, it implies that both security and liberty (synonymous with privacy in this sense) are things which can be empirically measured, as if by detracting from one you can incrementally add to the other. This perception implies that security and liberty are competing considerations.

What's worse is this recurring "balance" metaphor is something the public has misattributed as coming from the founding fathers. In December 2013, six months after the Snowden disclosures began, Senator Ron Wyden accredited the balance metaphor to, "what's always been a constitutional teeter-totter" to "the founding fathers, it really comes back to that. They always said, our system works when you have liberty and security in balance"<sup>80</sup>. As it turns out, no founding fathers ever said anything of the sort. By constantly repeating a common and widely accepted metaphor, its origins often become lost and it eventually turns into a truism. People so commonly have come to accept the "balance of security v. liberty" metaphor, that it is practically archetypal to U.S. history. In reality, the balance of security v. privacy was mentioned nowhere in the founding documents, and strikingly Americans were able to handle two major wars in the first half of the twentieth century without it, namely WWI and WWII, both handled without discussing or attempting to balance security and liberty<sup>81</sup>. It wasn't until the 1940's the term "security" came to mean protecting state secrets, or, as the Oxford English Dictionary's earliest record of this usage put it, "the Army term for what normal people call secrecy"<sup>82</sup>.

Credit for the invention of the privacy v. security metaphor has been attributed to Harry S. Truman who began a presidential commission on secrecy in order to "seek the wisest balance that can be struck between security and freedom". The balance trope emerged in a specific policy

---

<sup>80</sup> "Senator Ron Wyden on balancing the 'teeter-totter' of security and liberty." *PBS Newshour*, December 13, 2013. Accessed at: [http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/government\\_programs-july-dec13-nsa2\\_12-13/](http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/government_programs-july-dec13-nsa2_12-13/)

<sup>81</sup> Ganguly, Sumit. *The Snowden Reader*. "Security and Liberty: The Imaginary Balance." Edited by David P. Fidler. Indiana University Press, 2015.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*

context and cultural setting of the nuclear age, the Red Scare, wiretapping by the FBI and the Cold War. A classification system soon emerged known today as the security clearance system, a system which allows few who have undergone the proper “clearances” access to high-level secrets. By 1951, Truman faced a rising public backlash against indiscriminate investigations and reckless allegations of disloyalty. Editorials hit at Truman’s framing of the issue as one of balance. *The Washington Post* argued “security and freedom are not in conflict, they are, on the contrary, complementary” and editorials maintained that the government was responsible for ensuring both security and liberty<sup>83</sup>.

The language of balance was introduced to describe the relationship between the small group of the population holding a security clearance and the remainder of the American public, which now had no legitimate recourse to the growing system of hidden knowledge their government was creating and using<sup>84</sup>. This is what the balance metaphor still describes today and is useful in explaining what Snowden was trying to highlight with his disclosures. Snowden has justified his actions as an attempt to redress what he sees as a widening imbalance of power between the cleared and the uncleared. Those who obtain security clearances must sacrifice certain rights, but those without security clearances also sacrifice theirs; they live in a country divided by those who know and cannot speak, and those who can speak but do not know. Leaks have become the prime driver of reform in the intelligence establishment, not because illegal or improper acts were necessarily committed, but because the public has been left in the dark about what is legal and proper under the applicable rules<sup>85</sup>. Snowden is charged with disclosing classified information to “unauthorized persons”, referring not only to the international

---

<sup>83</sup> Ibid.

<sup>84</sup> Ibid.

<sup>85</sup> Waldron, Jeremy. "Security and liberty: The image of balance." *Journal of Political Philosophy* 11, no. 2 (2003): 191-210.

community but also to the 308 million Americans without a security clearance. The legal pursuit and manhunt of leakers are all an attempt to police a crumbling boundary between the suitable and unsuitable sectors of the American polity.

Following the terrorist attacks of September 11th, 2001 it became a widely accepted and even called for view that some adjustment had to be made between liberty and security after it became evident that terrorists could take advantage of traditional liberties in order to commit murder on a mass scale. Now that it has been proven that mass surveillance cannot effectively prevent terrorist attacks, why are citizens still forced to chose a balance between security v. privacy? They should be allowed to have both.

The last dominant frame package to emerge from full article analysis in this study was found predominantly in *The Globe and Mail* and was that private accumulation of intimate personal information is worrying. An impressive 12 out of 42, or 29% of *The Globe and Mail* articles mentioned this point in some sense. This finding presumably shows that Canadians consider control over information about themselves just as important as Americans do<sup>86</sup>. The fact that privacy was presented in this frame as being abused by corporations collection of intimate personal information frames privacy in a positive light with regards to the disclosures. The increasingly global collection of personal data for commercial purposes was already worrying, before the PRISM program revealed these corporations working in tandem with government. If private companies have information about internet users they can't prosecute, however when the government has the information, they can. Suddenly seemingly harmless information provided by oneself shopping online turns into metadata painting a portrait of our daily lives and who we are. There is the argument that people who have done nothing wrong and have nothing to hide have no need to care if the government knows they bought something online last week. But, this

---

<sup>86</sup> See the Pew research center study mentioned on page 15

one data point adds to an aggregate creating a picture of every individual known as metadata. All of the information you fill out online adds to this metadata about you, including purchases, subscriptions and internet searches. Linking debit or credit cards to something like a bus pass also adds that data to the aggregate, creating content or a story about you. This story should be harmless, but what if you have something to hide? More importantly, what if you have nothing to hide but a crime is committed and the metadata about you suggests you could have been there at the time, even if you were not. Security expert Joseph Applebaum explains, "Just because you were on the corner and all those data points point to it, it doesn't mean you committed the crime. So it's important to note that if someone has a perception of you having done a thing, it will follow you for the rest of your life"<sup>87</sup>. Lastly, the disclosures also revealed that the NSA can keep this data about you for an indeterminate amount of time. This finding shows that Canadians, like Americans, are also worried about who has access to information about them and what could be done with this information, showing support in this sense for the concept of privacy.

### Conclusion

In June of 2013 Edward Snowden leaked thousands of classified documents that revealed severe abuses by NSA surveillance practices both in the U.S. and abroad. Snowden, claimed his actions as necessary for the public good in defence of civil liberties shared by all Americans. Edward Snowden wanted the public to know that their privacy was being forsaken in the name of surveillance by their own government. What he hoped to achieve with his disclosures was public outcry and a heightened sensitivity to what privacy means in today's world. This study sought to answer the question, "Did he succeed?" and considered the status of "privacy" in the American and Canadian media representations of the Snowden scandal.

---

<sup>87</sup> Poitras, *Citizenfour*

The findings of the content analysis executed in this study found that the press largely ignored the hard hitting questions of privacy and Snowden failed to galvanize the media in the short term. *The Wall Street Journal*, was extremely more conservative leaning in its portrayal of Snowden and overwhelmingly supported the NSA and its surveillance practices in the name of preventing another terrorist attack like 9/11. The most dominant frame found in the analysis, occurring most frequently in *The New York Times* and the *Toronto Star*, was that there was need for a debate and Snowden brought that debate to the table. However, those who called for a debate largely ignored any hard hitting questions of privacy in their articles. Also, the debate which was called for was one between finding a balance between security v. privacy which is arguably the wrong debate, people should not have to chose as if security and privacy are competing interests. Lastly, the dominant frame found in *The Globe and Mail* revealed that Canadians, like Americans, find control over personal information important and private companies accumulation of this data troublesome.

The findings of this content analysis highlight the fact that the debate Snowden wanted was circumvented by the omission of privacy as a dominant narrative frame in the media. In the wake of the disclosures, the glaring omission of privacy was critical in guiding the audience away from the debate Snowden so desperately wanted.

In conclusion this study contributes to the growing literature on Edward Snowden by highlighting the gap between the promised “security v. liberty” debate and what actually occurred, which was largely silence on privacy rights.

## Bibliography

- Allmer, Thomas. "A critical contribution to theoretical foundations of privacy studies." *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society* 9, no. 2 (2011): 83-101.
- Armstrong, Walter P., and Sissela Bok. "Secrets: On the Ethics of Concealment and Revelation." (1983): 946-948.
- Bennett, Colin J., and Charles D. Raab. "The governance of privacy: Policy instruments in global perspective." The Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2nd and updated ed." 2006.
- Burnham, David. *The Rise of the Computer State: The Threat to Our Freedoms, Our Ethics and Our Democratic Process*. Open Road Media, 2015.
- Cappella, Joseph N., and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. *Spiral of cynicism: The press and the public good*. Oxford University Press, 1997
- Caster, Cole N. "Edward Snowden, Hero or Traitor? An Analysis of News Media Framing." PhD diss., California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, 2016.
- Chu, Wentao. "A comparative framing analysis of Edward Snowden's coverage in The New York Times and People's Daily." (2015).
- Clarke, Roger. "Internet privacy concerns confirm the case for intervention." *Communications of the ACM* 42, no. 2 (1999): 60-67.
- Coats, Dan. "To My Congressional Colleagues: Stop the NSA Grandstanding." *The Wall Street Journal*, June 18, 2013.
- Commager, Henry Steele. "Intelligence: The Constitution Betrayed." *New York Review of Books*, September 30 (1976): 32-37.
- Crovitz, Gordon L. "Information Age: Making the case for the NSA - At Last." *The Wall Street Journal*, September 23, 2013.
- Crovitz, Gordon L. "Information Age: White Hats vs. Black Hats." *The Wall Street Journal*, August 5, 2013.
- DeCew, Judith Wagner. *In pursuit of privacy: Law, ethics, and the rise of technology*. Cornell University Press, 1997
- De Vreese, Claes H. "New avenues for framing research." *American Behavioral Scientist* 56, no. 3 (2012): 365-375

- Diakopoulos, Nicholas, Dag Elgesem, Andrew Salway, Amy Zhang, and Knut Hofland. "Compare clouds: Visualizing text corpora to compare media frames." In *Proc. of IUI Workshop on Visual Text Analytics*. 2015
- Di Salvo, Philip, and Gianluigi Negro. "Framing Edward Snowden: A comparative analysis of four newspapers in China, United Kingdom and United States." *Journalism* (2015)
- Entman, Robert M. "Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm." *Journal of communication* 43, no. 4 (1993): 51-58.
- Etzioni, Amitai. *The limits of privacy*. Basic Books, 2008.
- Feinstein, Dianne. "The NSA's Watchfulness Protects America." *The Wall Street Journal*, October 14, 2013.
- Fidler, David P. *The Snowden Reader*. Indiana University Press, 2015.
- Fried, Charles. "Privacy", *The Yale Law Journal*, 3, vol. 77 (1968): 475-93
- Froomkin, A. Michael. "The death of privacy?." *Stanford Law Review* (2000): 1461-1543.
- Fuchs, Christian. "studiVZ: social networking in the surveillance society." *Ethics and Information Technology* 12, no. 2 (2010): 171-185.
- Gamson, William A., and Andre Modigliani. "Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach." *American journal of sociology* (1989): 1-37.
- Gamson, William A., and Kathryn E. Lasch. "The political culture of social welfare policy." *Evaluating the welfare state: Social and political perspectives* 95 (1983): 397-415
- Ganguly, Sumit. *The Snowden Reader*. "Security and Liberty: The Imaginary Balance." Edited by David P. Fidler. Indiana University Press, 2015.
- Garton Ash, Timothy. "Government spying? Worry about yourself; of course states are surveiling each other. With data spilling across borders, the vital issue is the monitoring of innocent individuals." *Globe and Mail*, November, 1 2013.
- Gavison, Ruth. "Privacy and the Limits of Law." *The Yale Law Journal* 89, no. 3 (1980): 421-47
- Gilliom, John. *Overseers of the poor: Surveillance, resistance, and the limits of privacy*. University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. *The dialectic of ideology and technology*. Vol. 976. London: Macmillan, 1976.
- Greenwald, Glenn, and Ewen MacAskill. "NSA Prism program taps into user data of Apple, Google and others." *The Guardian*, June 7 2013

- Greenwald, Glenn. "NSA collecting phone records of millions of Verizon customers daily." *The Guardian*, June 06 2013.
- Hackett, Robert A., and Scott Uzelman. "Tracing corporate influences on press content: A summary of recent NewsWatch Canada research." *Journalism Studies* 4, no. 3 (2003): 331-346.
- Introna, Lucas D. "Privacy and the computer: why we need privacy in the information society." *Metaphilosophy* 28, no. 3 (1997): 259-275.
- Itrona, Lucas D. "Management, Information and Power: A Narrative for the Involved Manager." (1997).
- Iyengar, Shanto. *Is anyone responsible?: How television frames political issues*. University of Chicago Press, 1994
- Johnson, Loch K. *A Season of Inquiry: the Senate intelligence investigation*. University Press of Kentucky, 2015.
- Johnson, Loch K. "Congressional supervision of America's secret agencies: The experience and legacy of the Church Committee." *Public Administration Review* 64, no. 1 (2004): 3-14.
- Lagerwerf, Luuk, Carly Timmerman, and Anique Bosschaert. "Incongruity in news headings: Readers' choices and resulting cognitions".
- Levinson-Waldman, Rachel. *What the Government Does with Americans Data*. Technical report, Brennan Center for Justice at New York University School of Law, 2013.
- Lindemann, Bernard. "Cheap thrills we live by- some notes on the poetics of tabloid headlines". *Journal of Literary Semantics* 19, no. 1 (1990): 46-59.
- Linder, Doug. "The right of privacy: Is it protected by the Constitution."(2011): Available at: <http://law2.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/conlaw/rightofprivacy.html>
- Lulofs, Neal. "Top 25 U.S. Newspapers for March 2013", Alliance for Audited Media, Accessed June 12, 2016 at <http://auditedmedia.ca/news/blog/top-25-us-newspapers-for-march-2013.aspx>
- Lyon, David. *The electronic eye: The rise of surveillance society*. U of Minnesota Press, 1994.
- Maass, Peter. "How Laura Poitras helped Snowden spill his secrets." *The New York Times* Aug, 13 2013.
- Mallick, Heather. "U.S. snoopers knows you are guilty." *The Toronto Star*, June 12, 2013

- McCombs, Maxwell E., Donald Lewis Shaw, and David Hugh Weaver. *Communication and democracy: Exploring the intellectual frontiers in agenda-setting theory*. Psychology Press, 1997.
- McQuail, Denis. *Mass communication theory: An introduction* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (1994): 327.
- Miller, Arthur Raphael. *The assault on privacy: computers, data banks, and dossiers*. University of Michigan Press, 1971
- Moor, James H. "Towards a theory of privacy II', in the information age." *Computers and Society* 27, no. 3 (1997): 27-32.
- National Research Council (US). Committee on Technical, Privacy Dimensions of Information for Terrorism Prevention, and Other National Goals. *Protecting individual privacy in the struggle against terrorists: a framework for program assessment*. The National Academies, 2008.
- Newspapers Canada, "2013 Daily Circulation Newspaper Report" Accessed June 12, 2016 at <http://www.newspaperscanada.ca/sites/default/files/2013%20Daily%20Newspapers%20Circulation%20Report%20FINAL.pdf>
- Nissenbaum, Helen. "Protecting privacy in an information age: The problem of privacy in public." *Law and philosophy* 17, no. 5 (1998): 559-596.
- Noonan, Peggy. "What we lose if we give up privacy." *The Wall Street Journal*, August, 17th 2013.
- Office of the Director of National Intelligence. IC on the Record.  
<https://icontherecord.tumblr.com/>
- Ogura, Toshimaru. "Electronic government and surveillance-oriented society." *Theorizing surveillance* (2006): 270-295.
- Parent, William A. "A new definition of privacy for the law." *Law and Philosophy* 2, no. 3 (1983): 305-338.
- Pew Research Center. "Privacy Panel Survey #4, Jan. 27, 2015,- Feb. 16, 2015". Available at: <http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/05/20/americans-attitudes-about-privacy-security-and-surveillance/>
- Poitras, Laura, and Dirk Wilutzky. *Citizenfour*. Piffel Medien, 2015.

- Poitras, Laura, and Glenn Greenwald. "NSA whistleblower Edward Snowden: "I don't want to live in a society that does these sort of things"—video." *The Guardian*, June 9 (2013).
- Price, Vincent, and David Tewksbury. "News values and public opinion: A theoretical account of media priming and framing." *Progress in communication sciences* (1997): 173-212.
- Qin, Jie. "Hero on Twitter, traitor on news How social media and legacy news frame Snowden." *The international journal of press/politics* 20, no. 2 (2015): 166-184
- Quora. "Among large US Newspaper which are considered conservative and which are considered liberal" (2014). Accessed at: <https://www.quora.com/Among-large-US-Newspapers-which-are-considered-conservative-and-which-are-considered-liberal>
- Rachels, James. "Why privacy is important." *Philosophy & Public Affairs*(1975): 323-333.
- Ransom, Harry Howe, and Harry Howe Ransom. *The intelligence establishment*. No. 04; JK468. I6, R3. 1970.
- Reidenberg, Joel R. "Privacy in public." (2014).
- Reiman, Jeffrey H. "Privacy, intimacy, and personhood." *Philosophy & Public Affairs* (1976): 26-44.
- Scanlon, T. "Thomson on privacy", *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 4 No. 4 (1975): 315-22
- Scheufele, Dietram A. "Framing as a theory of media effects." *Journal of communication* 49, no. 1 (1999): 103-122.
- Schoeman, Ferdinand David. *Privacy and social freedom*. Cambridge university press, 1992.
- "Senator Ron Wyden on balancing the 'teeter-totter' of security and liberty." *PBS Newshour*, December 13, 2013. Accessed at: [http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/government\\_programs-july-dec13-nsa2\\_12-13/](http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/government_programs-july-dec13-nsa2_12-13/)
- Shank, Russell. "Privacy: History, legal, social, and ethical aspects." *Library Trends* 35, no. 1 (1986): 7-18.
- Shils, Edward. "Privacy: Its constitution and vicissitudes." *Law and Contemporary Problems* 31, no. 2 (1966): 281-306.
- Solove, Daniel J. "Understanding privacy." (2008).
- Southey, Tabatha. "Pundits demand Snowden leak dating secrets." *Globe and Mail*, June, 14th 2013.
- Spinello, Richard. *Cyberethics: Morality and law in cyberspace*. Jones & Bartlett Learning, 2010.

- Tavani, Herman T. "Philosophical theories of privacy: Implications for an adequate online privacy policy." *Metaphilosophy* 38, no. 1 (2007): 1-22.
- The editorial board. "Bad Times for Big Brother." *The New York Times*, December, 22 2013.
- The MITRE Corporation. "Rare Events" (2009). Available at <http://www.fas.org/irp/agency/dod/jason/rare.pdf>
- Tuchman, Gaye. "Making news: A study in the construction of reality." (1978).
- Tversky, Amos, and Daniel Kahneman. "The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice." In *Environmental Impact Assessment, Technology Assessment, and Risk Analysis*, pp. 107-129. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1985.
- UN General Assembly. "Universal declaration of human rights." *UN General Assembly* (1948).
- Van Gorp, Baldwin. "The constructionist approach to framing: Bringing culture back in." *Journal of communication* 57, no. 1 (2007): 60-78.
- Waldron, Jeremy. "Security and liberty: The image of balance." *Journal of Political Philosophy* 11, no. 2 (2003): 191-210.
- Warren, Samuel D., and Louis D. Brandeis. "The right to privacy." *Harvard law review* (1890): 193-220.
- Washington Post. "NSA slides explain the PRISM data-collection program. June 6, 2013
- Watzlawick, Paul, Janet H. Beavin, and Don D. Jackson. "Pragmatics of human communication." *New York* (1967).
- Westin, Alan F. "Privacy and freedom, atheneum." *New York* 7 (1967).
- Wu, Amy, Will WK Ma, and Wendy WL Chan. "'Whistleblower or Leaker?'" Examining the Portrayal and Characterization of Edward Snowden in USA, UK, and HK Posts." In *New Media, Knowledge Practices and Multiliteracies*, pp. 53-66. Springer Singapore, 2015

## Appendix

### 1. Coding sheet used in full text analysis:

Newspaper:

Date:

Verbatim Headline:

Author:

- What Phase of the controversy was this item about?

1 beginning 2 middle 3 end

- Tone of the headline

1 negative 2 neutral/balanced 3 positive 4 ambiguous

- Tone of the full transcript

1 negative 2 neutral/balanced 3 positive 4 ambiguous

- In the full transcript how many frames do you identify? List them.

- Which of these frames as diagnostic? (problem)

- Which of these frames are prognostic? (solution)

- Who in the full transcript, if anyone, is identified as the person(s), group(s) or institutions(s) PRIMARILY responsible for the problem?

- Who, if anyone, is identified as NEXT MOST problematic?

- Does the newspaper item portray the problem as violating values or norms that are:

1 personal 2 political 3 institutional 4 legal 5 moral 6 other (specify)

- What motivation and/or qualities are attributed to the actors MOST blamed for the problem? Specify.

- In the full transcript, who, if anyone, is identified as the person(s), group(s) or institution(s) PRIMARILY responsible for the solution?

- Who, if anyone is identified as NEXT MOST likely to solve the problem?

- Judging by the full transcript, what is the nature of the solution:

1 personal 2 political 3 institutional 4 legal 5 moral 6 other (specify)

What is the article about?

How is privacy framed in the article?

## 2. Full article bibliography and article coding scheme:

Newspaper	Date	Verbatim Headline	Author	Code
The Wall Street Journal	5/22/2014	Honey, I shrunk the NSA	Editorial	W1
The Wall Street Journal	5/15/2014	The Paranoid Style	Michael B. Mukasey	W2
The Wall Street Journal	5/13/2014	European Regulators Take Aim at U.S. Tech Companies	Will Marshall	W3
The Wall Street Journal	4/19/2014	Phone-Hacking on Trial	Holman W. Jenkins, Jr.	W4
The Wall Street Journal	4/18/2014	The Vlad and Ed Snow	Editorial	W5
The Wall Street Journal	3/8/2014	Russian Spies and the Metadata Debate	Holman W. Jenkins, Jr.	W6
The Wall Street Journal	2/11/2014	Crippling the Intelligence We Used to Get bin Laden	Mike Pompeo and David B. Rivkin Jr.	W7
The Wall Street Journal	2/8/2014	Russia Hacks Americans	Editorial	W8
The Wall Street Journal	1/30/2014	A Press Corps Full of Snowdenistas	Edward Lucas	W9
The Wall Street Journal	1/24/2014	Congress's NSA Fail	Kimberley A. Strassel	W10
The Wall Street Journal	1/21/2014	The Presiden's NSA Illusions	Michael B. Mukasey	W11
The Wall Street Journal	1/16/2014	The Surveillance Moment	Editorial	W12
The Wall Street Journal	12/24/2013	The Air of Unreality in NSA Reform	Michael B. Mukasey	W13
The Wall Street Journal	12/23/2013	Information Age: From Metal Detectors to Metadata	L. Gordon Crovitz	W14
The Wall Street Journal	12/19/2013	How Obama Can Save the NSA	Karl Rove	W15
The Wall Street Journal	12/18/2013	The Judge and the NSA	Editorial	W16
The Wall Street Journal	12/17/2013	Disarming Surveillance	Editorial	W17
The Wall Street Journal	11/25/2013	Information Age: Snowden and His Fellow Fantasies	L. Gordon Crovitz	W18
The Wall Street Journal	11/20/2013	Digging the NSA Out of the Snowden Storm	Mike Pompeo and David B. Rivkin Jr.	W19

The Wall Street Journal	11/2/2013	How to Live With Spying	Holman W. Jenkins, Jr.	W20
The Wall Street Journal	10/31/2013	American Intelligence and the High Noon Scenario	Michael Hayden	W21
The Wall Street Journal	10/28/2013	Birds, Bees and Spies	Editorial	W22
The Wall Street Journal	10/24/2013	The French Collection	Editorial	W23
The Wall Street Journal	10/14/2013	The NSA's Watchfulness Protects America	Dianne Feinstein	W24
The Wall Street Journal	9/23/2013	Information Age: Making the Case for the NSA - At Last	L. Gordon Crovitz	W25
The Wall Street Journal	9/4/2013	Boss Talk: Data-Security Expert: There is No More Privacy	Paul Sonne	W26
The Wall Street Journal	8/29/2013	The NSA Dossier	Editorial	W27
The Wall Street Journal	8/26/2013	Information Age: More Surveillance, Please	L. Gordon Crovitz	W28
The Wall Street Journal	8/19/2013	Not "The Lives of Others"	Editorial	W29
The Wall Street Journal	8/17/2013	Declarations: What We Lose if We Give Up Privacy	Peggy Noonan	W30
The Wall Street Journal	8/12/2013	Obama's Security Retreat	Editorial	W31
The Wall Street Journal	8/8/2013	World Wide		W32
The Wall Street Journal	8/5/2013	Information Age: White Hats vs. Black Hats	L. Gordon Crovitz	W33
The Wall Street Journal	8/2/2013	Big Transparency for the NSA	Timothy Edgar	W34
The Wall Street Journal	6/20/2013	The Millenials Sour on Obama	Karl Rove	W35
The Wall Street Journal	6/18/2013	To My Congressional Colleagues: Stop the NSA Grandstanding	Dan Coats	W36
The Wall Street Journal	6/15/2013	Declaration: Privacy isn't All We're Losing	Peggy Noonan	W37
The Wall Street Journal	6/14/2013	Surveillance and Its Discontents	Editorial	W38
The Wall Street Journal	6/11/2013	Snowden's "Conscience"	Editorial	W39

Journal				
The Wall Street Journal	6/10/2013	Leaking Secrets Empowers Terrorists	Michael B. Mukasey	W40
The Wall Street Journal	6/10/2013	Big Brother' and Big data	Editorial	W41
The New York Times	10 June 2013	Lawmakers Mostly Defend Surveillance	Brian Knowlton	NY1
The New York Times	June 11 2013	The Solitary Leaker	David Brooks	NY2
The New York Times	11 June 2013	A New Kind of Leaker for an Internet Age	David Carr	NY3
<b>The New York Times</b>	<b>11 June 2013</b>	<b>Trying to Balance Privacy and Security</b>	<b>Letters to editor</b>	<b>NY4</b>
The New York Times	12 June 2013	Blowing A Whistle	Thomas L. Friedman	NY5
<b>The New York Times</b>	<b>13 June 2013</b>	<b>Privacy, Trust and the Eyes on Our Data</b>	<b>Letters to editor</b>	<b>NY6</b>
The New York Times	15 June 2013	This Isn't How to Stop Hacking	Joe Nocera	NY7
The New York Times	17 June 2013	Living With the Surveillance State	Bill Keller	NY8
The New York Times	23 June 2013	Where Did Our 'Inalienable Rights' Go?	Max Frankel	NY9
<b>The New York Times</b>	<b>25 June 2013</b>	<b>Surveillance and Rights in a Democracy</b>	<b>Letters to editor</b>	<b>NY10</b>
The New York Times	28 June 2013	The Criminal N.S.A.	Jennifer Stisa Granick and Christopher Jon Sprigman	NY11
The New York Times	28 June 2013	The Service of Snowden	Roger Cohen	NY12
The New York Times	29 June 2013	After Leaks, Obama Leads Wilde Effort on Damage Control	Peter Baker	NY13
The New York Times	30 June 2013	Germans Loved Obama. Now We Don't Trust Him.	Malte Spitz	NY14
The New York Times	30 June 2013	The Better Not to See You With, My Dear	Jenna Wortham	NY15
The New York Times	1 July 2013	Journalism, Even When It's Tilted	David Carr	NY16
The New York	1 July 2013	E.U. Reaction to Data Sharing	Kevin J. O'Brien	NY17

Times		Revelations Grew Slowly		
The New York Times	12 July 2013	Terms and Conditions May Apply	Jeannette Catsoulis	NY18
The New York Times	25 July 2013	If You Can't Hide From Big Brother, Adapt	David Brin	NY19
The New York Times	10 August 2013	Balancing Act Put to the Test	Mark Mazzetti and Scott Shane	NY20
The New York Times	10 August 2013	Obama's Remarks at a News Conference		NY21
The New York Times	10 August 2013	2 E-Mail Services Close and Destroy Data Rather Than Reveal Files	Somini Sengupta and Nicole Perlroth	NY22
The New York Times	13 August 2013	Obama's Defense of Surveillance	Letters to the editor	NY23
The New York Times	14 August	Obama, Snowden And Putin	Thomas L. Friedman	NY24
The New York Times	29 August 2013	Between Paranoia and Naivete	Jochen Bittner	NY25
The New York Times	31 August 2013	Saying 'No' to Our Right to Know	Celestine Bohlen	NY26
The New York Times	1 September 2013	Magazine Desk, Reply All/Letters - How Laura Poitras Helped Snowden Spill His Secrets		NY27
The New York Times	4 September 2013	Invitation fo a Dialogue: Spying Excesses	Letter to the editor	NY28
The New York Times	8 September 2013	Sunday Dialogue: Our Intelligence Network	Letter to the editor	NY29
The New York Times	9 September 2013	A Journalist-Agitator Facing Prison Over a Link	David Carr	NY30
The New York Times	18 September 2013	Steps Toward a Less Secret Court	the editorial Board	NY31
The New York Times	22 September 2013	Close the N.S.A.'s Back Doors	the editorial Board	NY32
The New York Times	24 September 2013	Debating the Changing Economics of Editorial Content	Stuart Elliott; Vindu Goel and Tanzina Vega	NY33
The New York Times	24 September 2013	Senators Call for Surveillance Inquiry	Charlie Savage	NY34
The New York Times	4 October 2013	Britain: Online Surveillance Challenged	Steven Erlanger	NY35
The New York Times	15 October	A World Without Privacy	Joe Nocera	NY36

Times				
The New York Times	15 October 2013	Europe, Lost on the Digital Planet	Sylvie Kauffmann	NY37
The New York Times	23 October 2013	New Leaks, New Repercussions	the editorial Board	NY38
The New York Times	26 October 2013	In Spy Uproar, 'Everyone Does it' Just Won't Do	David E. Sanger; Rick Gladstone and Andrew W. Lehren	NY39
The New York Times	26 October 2013	N.S.A. Snooping and the Damage Done	the editorial Board	NY40
The New York Times	27 October 2013	The Information-Gathering Paradox	Somini Sengupta	NY41
The New York Times	28 October 2013	British Tabloids on Trial, Along with Ex-Editors	Steven Erlanger and Stephen Castle	NY42
The New York Times	8 November 2013	The Struggle for Balanced Surveillance	Alan Cowell	NY43
The New York Times	9 November 2013	Why Do Brits Accept Surveillance?	Jonathan Freedland	NY44
The New York Times	9 November 2013	Britain Needs a First Amendment	Kenan Malik	NY45
The New York Times	13 November 2013	2 U.S. Allies Diverge on Spy Program	Katrin Bennhold	NY46
The New York Times	15 November 2013	British Press Freedom Under Threat	the editorial Board	NY47
The New York Times	18 November 2013	The Transparent Chinese	Murong Xuecun	NY48
The New York Times	18 November 2013	Give Snowden Asylum in Germany	Malte Spitz and Hans-Christian Strobele	NY49
The New York Times	9 December 2013	Where Freedom of the Press is Muffled	David Carr	NY50
The New York Times	15 December 2013	Surveillance: Cozy or Chilling?	Noam Cohen	NY51
The New York Times	16 December 2013	Internet's Sad Legacy: No More Secrets	Nick Bilton	NY52
The New York Times	18 December 2013	Spying Run Amok	Maureen Dowd	NY53
The New York Times	18 December 2013	A Blow Against Big Brother	Ryan Goodman	NY54
<b>The New York Times</b>	<b>18 December 2013</b>	<b>A Judge's Ruling on N.S.A. Data Collection</b>	<b>letter to the editor</b>	<b>NY55</b>

The New York Times	20 December 2013	A Legacy in the Balance on Surveillance Policies	Peter Baker; Jeremy W. Peters	NY56
The New York Times	20 December 2013	Cutting Back the N.S.A.'s Data Sweep	Letter to the editor	NY57
The New York Times	22 December 2013	Virtual Reality, Real Spies	Margaret Atwood	NY58
The New York Times	22 December 2013	Bad Times for Big Brother	the editorial Board	NY59
The New York Times	27 December 2013	Should New Limits Be Put on N.S.A. Surveillance?	Letter to the editor	NY60
The New York Times	2 January 2014	Edward Snowden, Whistle Blower	the editorial Board	NY61
The New York Times	6 January 2014	Judgements on Edward Snowden and the N.S.A.	Letter to the editor	NY62
The New York Times	8 January 2014	What happened to Transparency?	the editorial Board	NY63
The New York Times	18 January 2014	A Crucial Event in Obama's Vow on Phone Data	Peter Baker	NY64
The New York Times	18 January 2014	Obama's Speech on N.S.A. Phone Surveillance	transcript	NY65
The New York Times	18 January 2014	The President on Mass Surveillance	the editorial Board	NY66
The New York Times	19 January 2014	With Plan to Overhaul Spying, the Divisiveness is in the Details	Peter Baker and Jeremy W. Peters	NY67
The New York Times	24 January 2014	End the Phone Data Sweeps	the editorial Board	NY68
The New York Times	26 January 2014	Distrust in America, War in Syria and Protests in Ukraine	Serge Schmemann	NY69
The New York Times	2 February 2014	When No One is Just a Face in the Crowd	Natasha Singer	NY70
The New York Times	5 February 2014	Tales From Within the N.S.A.'s Monumental Haystack	Michiko Kakutani	NY71
The New York Times	24 February 2014	A Second Front in the Privacy Wars	the editorial Board	NY72
The New York Times	25 February 2014	The Wild West of Privacy	Joe Nocera	NY73
The New York Times	3 March 2014	Shadow of Spying by N.S.A. Lingers at a Conference	Nicole Perlroth	NY74
The New York Times	4 March 2014	Has Privacy Become a Luxury Good?	Julia Angwin	NY75

The New York Times	9 March 2014	Stop Glorifying Hackers	Diane McWhorter	NY76
The New York Times	11 March 2014	Snowden Tries to Rally Tech Conference to Buttress Privacy Shields	Jenna Wortham and Nicole Perlroth	NY77
The New York Times	13 March 2014	When A Senator and the C.I.A. Clash	Letter to the editor	NY78
The New York Times	26 March 2014	France's Springtime Secrets	Sylvie Kauffmann	NY79
The New York Times	26 March 2014	Mr. Obama's Limits on Phone Records	the editorial Board	NY80
The New York Times	19 April 2014	Twin Shocks Shake Foundation of German Power	Alison Smale	NY81
The New York Times	30 April 2014	In the Eye of the Information Age	Matt Wolf	NY82
The New York Times	3 May 2014	In Surveillance Debate, White House Turns Its Focus to Silicon Valley	David E. Sanger	NY83
The New York Times	13 May 2014	Snowden's Story, Behind the Scenes	Michiko Kakutani	NY84
The New York Times	18 May 2014	Never Forgetting a Face	Natasha Singer	NY85
The New York Times	23 May 2014	A Surveillance Bill That Falls Short	the editorial Board	NY86
The New York Times	2 June 2014	Expanding Duties for Irish Agency	Mark Scott	NY87
The New York Times	4 June 2014	A C.I.A. Mole Hunt in the Era of Hackers	Michiko Kakutani	NY88
The New York Times	12 June 2014	European Firms Turn Privacy Into Sales Pitch	Mark Scott	NY89
The New York Times	16 June 2014	Privacy Matters in Tech Trade-Off	Steve Lohr	NY90
The Globe and Mail	13 June 2013	Why are overshakers so upset about the Snowden affair?	Russell Smith	GM1
The Globe and Mail	15 June 2013	Documents reveal history of worries over Canada's metadata snooping	Colin Freeze	GM2
The Globe and Mail	15 June 2013	Pundits demand Snowden leak dating secrets	Tabatha Southey	GM3
The Globe and Mail	22 June 2013	Snowden charged with espionage, theft	Pete Yost	GM4

The Globe and Mail	26 June 2013	White House dials back demands for Snowden	Lara Jakes	GM5
The Globe and Mail	28 June 2013	Is Big IT still on the side of the angels? Our information highways are privately owned- if they want our data and our trust, they'd better join the struggle for transparency	Timothy Garton Ash	GM6
The Globe and Mail	3 July 2013	Turning Surveillance on its head	Sarah Nicole Prickett	GM7
The Globe and Mail	13 July 2013	Like a rolling Snowden: no direction home	Tabatha Southey	GM8
The Globe and Mail	10 August 2013	US boosts spying oversight	Steven R. Hurst	GM9
The Globe and Mail	30 August 2013	Our privacy dilemma: Edward Snowden revealed widespread snooping into consumer data. But will anyone ditch their Facebook account because of it?	Ivor Tossel	GM10
The Globe and Mail	31 August 2013	Vantage point; we are in the age of information overload, and films are no exception. As Liam Lacey writes, the best movies curate information and bring meaning to our world - which is why there's no better film to open TIFF than the Fifth Estate	Liam Lacy	GM11
The Globe and Mail	3 September 2013	Privacy commissioner has a passion for data protection; Elizabeth Denham: why should your digital communications be subject to surveillance?	Andrea Woo	GM12
The Globe and Mail	8 October 2013	Cyberwar threatens Brazil rift; President demands answers as leaked files suggest Ottawa accessed mining and energy ministry computers	Stephanie Nolen, Colin Freeze, Steven Chase	GM13
The Globe and Mail	8 October 2013	The slides that came in from Brazil	editorial	GM14
The Globe and Mail	10 October 2013	Brazil / Behind the controversy over economic espionage; The chief of	Steven Chase	GM15

		Canada's electronic eavesdropping agency says everything it does 'follows Canadian law.' The actions of Communications Security Establishment Canada are under intense scrutiny after documents made public appear to show that it was surveying the telecommunications of the Brazilian Ministry of Mines and Energy. What the agency is alleged to have done – and how Canada and Brazil are responding		
The Globe and Mail	15 October 2013	BitTorrent banks on privacy fears; BitTorrent's popular software is best-known for its use in illegally sharing copyrighted material. Now, users fearful of prying eyes are turning to the technology in a bid to prevent government spying	Omar el Akkad	GM16
The Globe and Mail	19 October 2013	Slides reveal Canada's powerful espionage tool	Colin Freeze and Stephanie Nolen	GM17
The Globe and Mail	22 October 2013	Obama calls Hollande over spying revelations	Deb Riechmann, Kimberly Dozier	GM18
The Globe and Mail	28 October 2013	Too much info going in..	editorial	GM19
The Globe and Mail	29 October 2013	Spain joins outrage over US spying; intelligence experts say some of the shock among European countries over monitored calls is feigned to win political points	Mark MacKinnon	GM20
The Globe and Mail	30 October 2013	US spy chief defends foreign wiretap operation	Paul Koring	GM21
The Globe and Mail	1 November 2013	Government spying? Worry about yourself; Of course states are surveilling each other. With data spilling across borders, the vital issue is the monitoring of innocent individuals	Timothy Garton Ash	GM22

The Globe and Mail	4 November 2013	Snowden says greater debate on surveillance needed	Michelle Martin	GM23
The Globe and Mail	9 November 2013	Is Edward Snowden a hero?	editorial	GM24
The Globe and Mail	18 November 2013	E-mail outsourcing stokes spying worry; Canadian universities are debating whether to switch to American-based companies, leaving many worried about data mining	James Bradshaw	GM25
The Globe and Mail	10 December 2013	Tech giants ask Obama to limit data surveillance	Omar el Akkad	GM26
The Globe and Mail	23 December 2013	Be discreet both at work and home; Signals intelligence 'is not what you see in Hollywood!' That's one piece of advice for newly recruited spies at Canada's electronic-eavesdropping agency, Communications Security Establishment Canada. Colin Freeze scans the partly redacted 650-page guide for other tips	Colin Freeze	GM27
The Globe and Mail	4 January 2014	Spies take a toll on Silicon Valley; Omar El Akkad reports from Portland Or	Omar el Akkad	GM28
The Globe and Mail	6 January 2014	Electronics expo adapts to changing times	Omar el Akkad	GM29
The Globe and Mail	21 January 2014	To spy? Yes, but the devil's in how and why; Barack Obama believes principles and reality can be reconciled. At least the U.S. is talking about it, writes Wesley Wark	Wesley Wark	GM30
The Globe and Mail	27 January 2014	Why the silence around privacy?	Ann Cavoukian	GM31
The Globe and Mail	27 January 2014	Tech giants report earnings amid online privacy concerns	Omar el Akkad	GM32
The Globe and Mail	29 January 2014	Watchdog wants to limit snooping; Interim Privacy Commissioner wants disclosure of spy agencies'	Josh Wingrove	GM33

		surveillance activities and limits on access to personal information		
The Globe and Mail	3 February 2014	As government snoops, Canadians... take a nap	Elizabeth Renzetti	GM34
The Globe and Mail	20 February 2014	Canada pursues wider biometric data sharing with Five Eyes allies	Jim Bronskill	GM35
The Globe and Mail	22 February 2014	Never a private moment; New home-monitoring systems let helicopter parents supervise their children like never before. But at what cost? Adam Bisby explores the erosion of youth privacy, and what it means for child development	Adam Bisby	GM36
The Globe and Mail	22 February 2014	CSI of cyberspace wins grant	Colin Freeze	GM37
The Globe and Mail	1 March 2014	We should love it if people were to trust us; the globe goes inside Canada's top secret spy agency	Colin Freeze	GM38
The Globe and Mail	5 March 2014	Life after invade your do – track. ; Is your government gathering masses of cellphone information to protect you, or to ? Smartphones. Tablets. Laptops. All produce metadata that spy agencies can – and or national security: Have spy agencies gone too far by collecting personal data?	Colin Freeze	GM39
The Globe and Mail	17 March 2014	Probe uncovers wrongdoing, ethics breaches at Canada's electronic spy agency	Jim Bronskill	GM40
The Globe and Mail	25 March 2014	Carter criticizes US intelligence	Associated Press	GM41
The Toronto Star	11 June 2013	Big Brother really is watching - and listening; They call it 'metadata' mining and the Americans aren't the only ones doing it	Andrew Mitrovica	T1

The Toronto Star	12 June 2013	U.S. snoopers know you are guilty	Heather Mallick	T2
The Toronto Star	14 June 2013	In praise of young leakers	Rick Salutin	T3
The Toronto Star	29 June 2013	Snowden and the media smell test; Snowden leaks force Al Qaeda to change how they communicate	Opinion	T4
The Toronto Star	5 January 2014	Maintaining privacy in the Internet age; Edward Snowden's NSA leaks reminds us our web-browsing data is not confidential	Daniel Baird	T5
The Toronto Star	8 January 2014	Getting to root of privacy debate	Opinion	T6
The Toronto Star	17 January 2014	Fight back against surveillance	Rick Salutin	T7
The Toronto Star	2 February 2014	Canada's oversight of spy agencies falls short;	editorial/opinion	T8
The Toronto Star	5 February 2014	A glimpse at our Kfkaesque future	Opinion	T9
The Toronto Star	3 March 2014	How spies stole your Yahoo webcam stills: Mallick	Opinion	T10
The Toronto Star	27 March 2014	Enough of Big Brother watching	Opinion	T11

### 3. Complete list of the frames found in this analysis

**Positive = Talk about Snowden in a positive light/ Disclosures as performing critical duty, service / Condemn NSA practices / Call for increased oversight / Show general understanding of Snowden's stated mission**

No instances of stopping imminent attack - program useless

- NY68, NY69

Preventing terrorist attacks is a critical and complex job. But as the advisory report rightly emphasizes a free society must have another kind of security as well: the security of its citizens from "the fear that their communications are being watched, monitored, questioned, interrogated or scrutinized"

- NY59

We are talking about privacy because of Edward Snowden HE BROUGHT FORTH THE **DEBATE/ long overdue debate needed**

- W30, NY3, NY9, NY12, W34, W37, NY12, NY31, NY36, NY39, NY47, NY48, NY49, NY50, NY54, NY61, NY63, NY67, NY71, NY86

NSA Surveillance and our desired acceptance of it in pursuit of security in age of terror - we are here because of 9/11 - Great Disorientation since 9/11 - took advantage of mindset

- W37, W30, NY12, NY19, NY53, NY71, NU83

NSA program is excessive, violation of rights, **criminal/ threat to our privacy/ "abuses"**

- W30, NY11, NY37, NY14, NY32, NY40, NY8, NY9, NY12, NY14, NY49, NY53, NY54, NY61, NY73, NY74

Need to strengthen civil liberties

- NY14

Web companies don't have the prosecute individuals but law enforcement does

- NY41

The gleanings of the surveillance state will eventually be **MISUSED** by the mischievous, the malicious and the ignorant in ways the creators of the system did not intend" -

- W37, NY9, NY25, NY64

- Government tells us everything is okay, but it is a secret and we don't really know - saying everyone does it is not an excuse

- NY39

**Distrust** in government

- W37, NY2, NY11, NY80

Revelations have not enraged most people (Americans or Canadians) - instead of shock reaction is **meh (have not led to concrete demands)**

- NY11, NY17, NY44, NY46

Germans (international community Europeans) appalled at disclosures, eroding EU-US relationship

- NY14, NY17, NY25, NY35, NY37, NY40, NY46, NY49, NY81

You could be transformed into a terrorist with the wrong move/action

- NY18

### **About Snowden**

By being transparent, using the web, and speaking on his own behalf, bravery to come forward, not letting the government define him

- NY3

Snowden as reasonable, thoughtful, careful, performed a critical service/ important revelations

- NY3, NY12, N14, NY36, NY37, NY49, NY51, NY52, NY61

Snowden should come home and face his accusers

- NY24

He was justified in thinking his only option was to blow the whistle and leak the documents

- NY61

Critics say Snowden did massive damage but no evidence has been presented evidence his disclosures hurt national security

- NY61

When someone reveals that government officials have routinely broken the law, that person should not face life in prison at the hands of the same government

- NY61

### Miscellaneous

- Companies
  - NY89, NY90, NY85, NY83, NY77, NY75, NY74, NY70, NY41, NY72
- Citizens concerns for NSA program is okay, privacy and civil liberties are important (to all americans) **Privacy v. national security**
  - W36, W31, W27, NY9, NY20, NY31, NY53, NY66, NY67, NY71
- Call for Civil libertarians to give specific proposals for how the want NSA to change
  - W27, W19
- Programs transparency and privacy protections should be increased - **increased oversight of NSA**
  - W24, NY8, NY19, NY61, NY77, NY80
- Privacy - reality of information age is **we all have less expectations of privacy** - anyone who uses modern technology can not truly believe that he is not entrusting data to third parties - most of us just let it slip away
  - W16, W20, NY8, , NY38, GM1, GM3

No one asked if “the promise of increased security from these kinds of surveillance programs justified giving governments virtually unchecked authority to watch and know us”

- GM3

### **NEGATIVE FRAMES = Misunderstanding of Snowden’s Disclosures / Defence of NSA practices / Condemnation of Snowden**

#### **Against Obama**

- Rather than throw out the programs, Obama tried to convince the public they were being run appropriately/then flipfopped and said American public had right to be suspicious and upset
  - NY65, NY66
- He shouldn’t reign in NSA (let court tie him down with oversights)
  - W31
- He should use his powers to support the NSA/ He didnt support the NSA like he should have/ Conceding to much to his critics/ belatedly fighting back
  - W41, W40, W33, W31, W28, W22, W16, W11
- He promised to cut down surveillance when he was running for office, but didn’t/did the opposite -
  - NY20, NY14, NY56, NY63
- hypocrite for being upset about foreign spying when doing the same
  - NY7

- Obama administration fueled distrust of government and made reaction to Snowdens leaks worse (widened trust deficit plaguing the country)/ public trust issue
  - W36, W35, W34, W37
- The president would rather protect us from hypothetical abuses then from present dangers

### Against Snowden

- Edward committed worse crime than NSA
  - W33, W18
- Traitor
- Sociopath
  - W17
- Leaker, sabatoge, treason, theft, spy
- Thief, sociopath, traitor
  - W31 W25 W22, W9, W7, W5, NY2
- Reckless (reckless self-indulgence)
  - W34, W9
- Where he has chosen to seek asylum (neg.)
  - W39, W33, W8, W9, NY24
- Damaged US security by leaking documents which will encourage terrorists to change their tactics (dissidents suffer when documents become public)
  - W41, W36, W28, W17, NY45
- Claims of spying abuse are exaggerated and irrational, political paranoia, fantasy world
  - W40, W39, W18, W13, W12, W9, W2, W1
- If he suspected abuse he could have gone to his superiors
  - W39
- Comments about education or character (negative)
  - W39, W11, NY2 (hasnt visited mom in years)
- (SAID SOMETHING NEGATIVE ABOUT SNOWDEN)
  - W11, W39, W36, W34, W33, W31, W28, W25, W24, W23, W22, W21, W19, W18, W17, W14, W13, W12, W11, W10, W8, W9, W5, W7, W2, W1, NY1, NY2, NY5

### Support for NSA surveillance program

- Reports regarding NSA intrusiveness into private lives are false, incorrect, or wrong (cannot listen on content of calls)
  - W36, W33, W25, W18, W14, W12, W9, W2, W1, W29, NY1, NY26
- NSA only intercepted small number of domestic communications
  - W28
- **Restricting** the NSA program will be harmful to national security (degrades ability to prevent attacks)
  - W41, W36, W28, W27, W25, W24, W23, W22, W19, W17, W12, W11, W10, W7, W1, NY1, NY5
- If NSA programs were available before 9/11 we could have thwarted terrorist plot
  - W36, W33, W25, W24,

- NSA surveillance program is necessary to prevent another 9/11 (to protect us in today's world full of terrorists) - we should fear another 9/11 - Risks of abuse must be measured in proportion to the damages they might prevent - important for counterterrorism (NSA program saves lives) Surveillance saves lives - metadata reasonable way to prevent terrorism
  - W41, W40, W38, W36, W34, W31, W28, W27, W25, W24, W19, W17, W15, W14, W11, W1, W29, NY5, NY38
- NSA data mining program is **constitutional** (NOT UNLAWFUL) (Legal)
  - W41, W40, W36, W27, W24, W23, W19, W15
- NSA data mining program protects individual privacy by collecting such HUGE amounts of data -annonymity in numbers- isnt bad because of large numbers
  - W41, W16, W14, W1
- No **abuses** revealed to have occurred by NSA
  - W41, W39, W38, W31, W28, W23, W11, W29, NY5, NY8
- NSA programs subject to tireless **oversight (compliance)**
  - W36, W34, W28, W24, W23, W18, W13, W29, NY5
- NSA has documented cases of thwarting terrorist plots with its dragnet (Boston) (New York Subway)/ practices like data-mining save lives
  - W41(New York Subway), W40 (NY Subway), W36 (NY Subway), W33 (NY Subway)
- We should have all already known the NSA was doing this - exposures reveal nothing/no big deal
  - W41, W20, NY19
- It is normal for countries to spy on each other (For us to spy on foreign countries)
  - W40, W23, W22, W21, W19, W12, W29, W20, NY38, NY39, GM2
- The IRS (or other government programs, i.e., ObamaCare) are worse than NSA
  - W38, W33, W6, W29
- Members of **Congress** are engaging in disingenuous outrage when they were given opportunity to learn about programs or shut them down
  - W36, W25, W10

## CANDIAN FRAMES

**Positive = Talk about Snowden in a positive light/ Disclosures as performing critical duty, service / Condemn NSA practices / Call for increased oversight / Show general understanding of Snowden's stated mission**

You reveal everything online you shouldn't be mad about NSA

- GM1, GM6

Revelations revealed Canada is as guilty as the rest of the world (surveillance)/Canadians know little about the programs/ Gov not divulging/ gov should divulge! Entitled to know

- GM2, GM17, GM13, GM19, GM31, GM14, T1

No one asking questions following the leaks (Canadians?)(Canada not having debate)(shameful Canadian silence on surveillance)

- GM3, GM30, GM31, GM34, T7

Just because you reveal things online doesn't mean you want to surrender all of your privacy (choosing how to appear is an action, privacy v. right to privacy)

- GM3, GM7

Refusals by China and Russia to return Snowden serve as wake up call to US that it can't expect everyone to comply with its requests

- GM5

Lives and liberty threatened not only by terrorism, but by massive deprivations to our privacy in the name of counterterrorism (post 9/11)

- GM6, GM24

In a democracy it is for the citizenry to judge where to put the balance between security and privacy, safety and liberty (need a **debate**)

- GM6, GM12, GM24, GM30, T5, T6, T9, T10, T11

Commercial accumulation of intimate personal information is worrying (leaks effect on companies)(evolving technology)

- GM6, GM12, GM16, GM22, GM25, GM26, GM28, GM29, GM32, GM36, GM41, GM10, T5

Rift between Canada and **Brazil** caused by disclosures

- GM13, GM19, GM14

Practices between countries spying on each other (allies) is unacceptable

- GM18, GM35

Increased **oversight** of CSEC (scrutiny of CSEC)

- GM19, GM31, GM33, GM40, GM12, T8, T11

Privacy under threat from NSA

- GM22, T2, T5, T6, T9

The fact that Obama and Congress plan to "tighten things up" demonstrate that something was wrong

- GM22, GM23

Recently debate has gone off on tangent about friendly countries spying on one another - but that's not what the debate should be about it should be about privacy!

- GM22

We need intelligence but information gathering laws are seriously outdated

- GM39

Snowden's decision to leak carefully considered/hero

- T1, T3

Appallingly successful assault on freedoms

- T2

Government circumventing the constitution not abiding by laws

- T3

Might not be able to have cake and eat it too - might have to pull back our online lives if we want more privacy

- T5

Anyone with that much power will abuse it

- T7

**NEGATIVE FRAMES = Misunderstanding of Snowden's Disclosures / Defence of NSA practices / Condemnation of Snowden**

**Against Obama**

**Snowden didn't understand the material that came into his hands**

- GM8

Americans want their cake and to eat it to by wanting security and privacy/ sometimes standardized programs NSA surveillance are in order

- GM8

Outrage by foreign countries is feigned to further positions/ outrage is tactical/ governments should'nt be surprised

- GM20, GM21