

Surveillance discourse in UK broadcasting since the Snowden revelations

Juliane A. Lischka

Abstract

The surveillance discourse in British broadcast news since the Snowden revelations covers justifications and challenges. Justification focuses on authorisation and rationalisation strategies stating terror threats explicitly, which are often expressed by governmental actors. Delegitimation strategies predominantly use moralising and mythopoetic arguments of civil liberties and are expressed by Snowden himself, politicians, rarely by journalists, non-governmental organisations, and very rarely by citizens. However, what exactly is at stake when mass surveillance increases remains obscure in the broadcast discourse. The surveillance discourse should be richer especially in order to give the audience a chance to understand the less concrete contra-surveillance arguments better.

Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Literature review.....	4
2.1. Surveillance, privacy, and the state	4
2.2. Surveillance discourses in the media.....	6
3. Method	8
3.1. Sample.....	8
3.2. Analytic framework.....	10
4. Results.....	11
4.1. Surveillance debate in broadcast news about Edward Snowden's unveiling.....	11
4.2. Surveillance debate in broadcast news about the David Miranda detention	12
4.3. Surveillance debate in broadcast news about the snooping on embassies and world leaders.....	14
4.4. Surveillance debate in broadcast news about the Lee Rigby report	14
4.5. Surveillance debate in broadcast news about the Charlie Hebdo aftermath	15
5. Discussion and conclusions.....	15
References	19
Appendix	22

1. Introduction

With the Internet and advanced technologies, people experience an increase of (online) mass surveillance and reduction of privacy. Since the 9/11 attacks in the U.S., the 7/7 attacks in the UK, and more recently since Snowden's revelations, media attention toward surveillance practices and technologies has increased in the UK as well as globally (Barnard-Wills, 2011). Since journalistic language may be related to power or ideologies and is described to exert power to the audience (Branum & Charteris-Black, 2015; Richardson, 2007), it is important to assess how surveillance is discussed and justified or countered in the news media. For example, Greenberg and Hier (2009) criticise that the Canadian media discourse on CCTV surveillance was poor. A deficient media coverage would not be able to establish mass surveillance as a salient issue or enhance the public debate about surveillance.

Generally speaking, media discourses occur in wider processes of social and cultural change, power relations and ideological societal processes (Fairclough, 1995). Social actors constitute knowledge or situations through discourses, which serve to construct certain social conditions on a macro level (van Leeuwen & Wodak, 1999, p. 92). Different actors and content compete for interpretative dominance of the media discourse. Government discourses may strive to "discipline the citizenry" (Simone, 2009, p. 12) and have to be analysed. On the one hand, the media takes up politicians' arguments, among others, and builds up its agenda on the other hand, based on assumptions about the audiences' common-sense opinions and issues that may have a long history (van Leeuwen & Wodak, 1999, p. 111). As stated by Allan (1998, p. 105), "televisual news claims to provide an up-to-the-minute (now) narrative which, in turn, projects for the viewer a particular place (here) from which she or he may 'make sense' of the significance of certain 'newsworthy' events for their daily lives". Broadcast news reports to a lay public audience according to specific news making principles and processes, which may differentiate across news outlets e.g. depending on economic constraints or editorial stance (see e.g. Sup Park, 2014). The resulting media discourse does not *reproduce* public opinion or real-world events. Instead, media discourse may be biased toward elite interpretations due to certain power constellations (see news bias and mediatization research, e.g., Hackett, 1984; Klein & Maccoby, 1954; McQuail, 1992; Strömbäck, 2008). The audience, in turn, decodes meaning based on the televisual messages.

This study analyses surveillance discourse in British broadcast news since the 2013 Snowden revelations for selected major events in news coverage until early 2015. The observation events comprise (1) the Snowden revelations in June 2013, (2) the embassy snooping in June and July in 2013 and the snooping on world leaders in October and November 2013, (3) the detention of David Miranda at Heathrow airport in August 2013, (4) the publication of the British parliamentary report into the death of Fusilier Lee Rigby in August 2014, and ending with (5) the Charlie Hebdo aftermath in January and February 2015.

The goal of this study is to decode discursive formation about mass surveillance in broadcast news by deconstructing the broadcast 'data' (Denscombe, 2010) using discourse analysis revealing what is intended in a text to form meaning to understand how the public may evaluate mass surveillance based on broadcast news. The research questions are as follows.

RQ 1. How are surveillance discourses articulated in the broadcast news debate?

RQ 2. How is mass surveillance (de)legitimised in the broadcast news debate?

- RQ 3. What actors and sources articulate opinions on mass surveillance and to what extent are citizens' voices included in the broadcast news debate?
- RQ 4. How do the David Miranda detention, the snooping on embassies and world leaders, the Lee Rigby report, and the Charlie Hebdo aftermath inform the news surveillance debate?

The paper is structured as followed. First, the literature on surveillance, privacy and the role of the state is reviewed (2.1). Second, previous studies on surveillance discourses in the media are described (2.2). The method section explains the sampling procedure (3.1) and analysis framework (3.2). Results are presented in a descriptive way in Section 4 for each case. Finally, Section 5 summarises findings and draws conclusions about the surveillance discourse.

2. Literature review

2.1. Surveillance, privacy, and the state

In the literature, mass surveillance is described as one means to secure the existence of a state and the security of its citizens. Mass surveillance has increased in scale and scope and surveillance technology has become more sophisticated. Lyon (2004, p. 135) defines surveillance as "the rationalised control of information within modern organisations, and involves in particular processing personal data for the purposes of influence, management, or control", globally catalysed by the terrorist attacks of 9/11. One development in the UK is the extensive CCTV surveillance, making Britain "the clear world leader in CCTV deployment" (Lyon, 2004, p. 142). In the digital age, citizens as well as organisations leave manifold footprints online. As a result, "We are experiencing a reduction in privacy, changes in norms of communicative behaviour, and unparalleled surveillance by commercial firms and governments alike" (Picard, 2015, p. 37).

State interventions limiting civil liberties are related to or legitimised through civil security. Legislation limiting civil liberties through surveillance is typically framed as counter-terrorism laws (MacDonald & Hunter, 2013; MacDonald, Hunter, & O'Regan, 2013; McGarrity, 2011). The reason for a need of mass surveillance lays in the state's purpose "to ensure the wellbeing of the population, expressed in its longevity, health and wealth" (MacDonald & Hunter, 2013, p. 124). Surveillance is one means of security, which constitutes one form of state power besides feudal sovereignty and individually restrictive discipline (i.e., through sentencing criminal acts) (Foucault, 2007). MacDonald and Hunter (2013, p. 125) describe that "security is exercised upon entire populations ('multiplicities') within wider ranging territorial spaces such as the nation state and 'milieus' within them, such as the town. [...] its essential function is to regulate the components of 'effective reality' and the relations between them." That is, surveillance is means for public order. Picard (2015) draws parallels to Platonic, Machiavellian, and Lockean arguments supporting governmental surveillance, because the state must protect its population and be prepared for war. Especially when the existence of the state is threatened, "ordinary morality does not apply" any longer, according to Platonic, Machiavellian, and Lockean arguments (Picard, 2015, p. 37). In these views, to put state surveillance at the costs of privacy appears to be legitimate. Otherwise, the state would not be able to recognise threats and would put itself at risk.

Counter-terrorism and preventing violent extremism discourses appeared more intensely after the 7/7 attacks on the London Transport system, expressed through keywords such as *security*, *extremism* or *terrorism* (MacDonald et al., 2013). MacDonald and Hunter (2013) conclude from an analysis of UK counter-terrorism policy documents between 2007 and 2011 that the issue of national security and the population remain a central concern in the background of the 7/7 attacks on the London public transport system. Simone (2009, p. 1) shows that the U.S. government discourse of surveillance emphasises the "government as protector, the American citizen as innocent and terrorists as a foreign menace" in order to legitimise the USA PATRIOT Act. More specifically, the argumentation follows four premises.

- (1) Security is necessary for liberty.
- (2) Terrorists have threatened US and global security.
- (3) The USA PATRIOT Act improves security.
- (4) Thus, the Act, as the symbol for security, enhances liberty. (Simone, 2009, p. 5)

For explaining surveillance legitimation expressed by the state, Schulze (2015, p. 199) refers to Max Weber's typology of authority structures, "either by relying on tradition and norms ('because it was always done like this'), authority or charismatic leadership ('because I say so') or by giving rational-legal reasons ('because it is the most effective way to do this' or 'because it is the law')," whereas the latter is said to be most common in democratic societies. Schulze (2015) analyses patterns of German governmental surveillance legitimation strategies in newspapers, TV debates, press interviews, and official press conferences in the background of the "NSA-surveillance scandal" in 2013. Surveillance legitimation practices are often (1) to deny any knowledge about or participation in lawless surveillance or denounce the trustworthiness of sources that argue against the unlawful practices of intelligence services and (2) to downplay and singularise the scope of mass surveillance. Third, surveillance was legitimised through the security of the population and soldiers as well as through threat of terrorism. The authority of the law was especially used by the German conservative party to legitimise surveillance, whereas the social-democratic opposition questioned inconsistent statements of the government and tried to broaden the debate (Schulze, 2015, p. 211). Further, the questions how to re-establish the relation to the U.S. and the German digital sovereignty were discussed. Overall, the governmental discourse in the media refers to legal, security, and autonomy viewpoints.

At the same time, the state risks its democratic existence through overstraining privacy through mass surveillance, and the Platonic, Machiavellian, Lockean, and Weberian arguments backfire to the existence of the state. Abu-Laban and Bakan (2012) argue that state interventions framed to protecting the public against terrorism and hate jeopardise the freedom of speech or freedom of assembly. In this regard, Sloan and Warner (2015, p. 3) warn that the massive governmental capacity of knowledge reduces privacy in public and thus risks people's ability to adequately manage and realise their selves. Normally, people willingly limit and control their knowledge of each other when they interact. This managing of private information is based on coordination norms. In times of surveillance, "Governmental surveillance can, and does, undermine the norm-based coordination on which privacy in public depends" (Sloan & Warner, 2015, p. 3). Similarly, it is reported that privacy mechanisms of online social networks threaten the ability to control personal information distribution and thus undermine coordination norms (Fogues, Such, Espinosa, & Garcia-Fornes, 2015). Hence,

"the erosion of privacy can threaten our autonomy, not merely as consumers but as citizens" (Acquisti, Brandimarte, & Loewenstein, 2015, p. 509).

Lyon (2004, p. 145) outlines the public resistance to surveillance, e.g. in forms of protests, which challenges the legitimacy of state surveillance. Coll (2014) shows based on ethnographic studies that privacy practice of citizens strongly deviates from their behaviour. People may express concerns about privacy but disclose private information quickly. Acquisti et al. (2015) report that the default visibility settings in Facebook disclose more information to a broader audience in 2014 compared to 2005, whereas people increasingly hide private information publicly on Facebook. Hence, people attempt to regain managing power over their privacy. The state is requested to adapt legislation to protect "real people—who are naïve, uncertain, and vulnerable" and restore "the balance of power between those holding the data and those who are the subjects of that data" (Acquisti et al., 2015, p. 514). However, "Although it is recognized – even within security agencies – that carrying out these [surveillance, JL] activities [...] pose risks to democracy [...] the public through acquiescence in pursuit of a perception of security – find them useful" (Picard, 2015, p. 37). Hence, civil security may win over civil liberty. Still, McGarrity (2011, p. 280) stresses that the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe (2005) has highlighted that free and unhindered information is most effective for mutual understanding and tolerance helping to prevent terrorism reminding "that in their fight against terrorism, states must take care not to adopt measures that are contrary to human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of expression, which is one of the very pillars of the democratic societies that terrorists seek to destroy".

In sum, arguments of the state supporting surveillance derive from its task to protect itself and its citizens. In a situation of threat, all means to maintain these goals seem to be legitimate for the state, including describing civil liberties as matters of security,—even if those may pose risks to privacy and thus to democracy. However, a more moderate state viewpoint would *not* ignore the question of adequacy and proportionality of terrorism-related surveillance legislation in a democratic society.

2.2. Surveillance discourses in the media

In a normative view, the media is regarded as fourth estate fulfilling tasks for democracy through informing citizens and shaping public discourse. As fourth estate, a media system is expected to hold governmental, judiciary, and executive powers to account. According to the Habermasian (1989) ideal of a discursive public sphere, the media discourse should enable rational discussions. Yet in the media, different actors and content compete for interpretative dominance of the media discourse. The resulting media discourse does not necessarily reproduce public opinion or real-world events but may be biased toward elite interpretations due to certain power constellations (see news bias and mediatization research, e.g., Hackett, 1984; Klein & Maccoby, 1954; McQuail, 1992; Strömbäck, 2008).

Regarding the "fight against terrorism", the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe (2005) suggests that public authorities should ensure access to information for journalists, reminds that "the fight against terrorism does not allow the authorities to circumvent [the right of journalists not to disclose their sources of information]", and requests the media and journalists to "refrain from jeopardising the safety of persons and the conduct of antiterrorist operations or judicial investigations of terrorism through the information they disseminate". Concerning reporting on

surveillance legislation, McGarrity (2011, p. 274) expects media to publish leaked information and to force "agencies to explain their actions, and thereby enables an intelligent and cool-headed assessment of whether these are proportionate to the threat of terrorism". However, access to information on national security matters is limited for media and thus it cannot effectively perform its watchdog role (McGarrity, 2011, p. 280). As a result, media performance is criticised and the media may rather function as government lapdog (McGarrity, 2011) leading to an agenda-silencing and a poor surveillance discourse (Greenberg & Hier, 2009; Herfroy-Mischler, 2015).

Herfroy-Mischler (2015) investigates the journalist-source relationship in intelligence events using news agencies' coverage of the failed Mossad operation in Bern in 1998. The study suggests that tensions between media, state, and intelligence service agencies lead to an agenda-silencing. In addition, journalistic framing opportunities on intelligence-related issues are reduced through censorship, so that "the framing relies mostly on hypotheses of interpretation which media are not able to assert openly" (Herfroy-Mischler, 2015, p. 244). Herfroy-Mischler (2015, p. 244) requests media to "communicate and legitimize silences orchestrated by security and intelligence censorship". Hence, the reporting would not match the 2005 recommendations of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe.

Barnard-Wills (2011) notes an increased media attention toward surveillance practices and technologies in the UK and shows that the surveillance discourse in UK newspapers ranges from preventing criminality to limiting personal liberty. Branum and Charteris-Black (2015) analyse the reporting strategies on the Edward Snowden affair of three major UK newspapers revealing that news are biased according to the newspaper's ideology, news values, and audience considerations. In the *Guardian*, surveillance is described as insidious and extensive. The *Guardian* uses legal, moral, and public-support arguments to justify reporting. The *Daily Mail* reports include keywords referring to Snowden's living situation and personal life and remains neutral and propositional (Branum & Charteris-Black, 2015, p. 210). The *Sun's* reporting defends surveillance through emphasising the damage caused by the leaks and criticises the *Guardian's* reports. Thus, the *Sun's* reports reflect protection-of-the-state arguments to legitimise surveillance whereas the *Guardian* focuses on the risks for democracy and unlawfulness. The *Daily Mail* does not seem to support either side explicitly but focuses on Snowden as a person, which relates to the news value of personalisation.

In a linguistic analysis of surveillance discourse themes in UK broadsheets in the period of 2001 to 2005, Wiegand (2015) reveals that "othering" is an often used theme, i.e., describing the union of America and Britain ("us") versus bin Laden and terrorism ("them"). This is based on a constructive macro strategy to establish particular groups, according to van Leeuwen and Wodak (1999). This grouping is revealed in ideology and power relations in news discourse (Hartley & Montgomery, 1985) and is used in an analysis of policy documents (MacDonald & Hunter, 2013). MacDonald and Hunter (2013, p. 136) conclude that "one concern regards the homogeneity of the population of the modern state in a period of unparalleled global flows of economic migrants and political refugees." Thus, the population consists of an in- and an out-group in the view of the state, which is enforced by media reports.

In sum, previous research suggests that the media discourse on surveillance is shaped by governmental actors and their legitimisation strategies and depends on intelligence services' censorship. The British "ideologically polarized press" (Brüggemann, Engesser, Büchel, Humprecht, &

Castro, 2014, p. 1043) often adopted the security and terrorism reasoning, framed according to their editorial stance. In addition to the press, the public-service broadcaster (PSB) BBC is a popular information source for publicly relevant issues having a "powerful effect [...] on the political knowledge of the citizenry" (Brüggemann et al., 2014, p. 1058). Previous research has not analysed the broadcasting surveillance discourse. The goal of the present analysis is to trace the British broadcast news debates on mass surveillance, civil liberties and the role of the state.

3. Method

3.1. Sample

Broadcasts were identified using search terms from two data bases, the Television and Radio Index for Learning and Teaching (TRILT) as well as Box of Broadcasts (BoB). The sample frame contains broadcasts of more than 475 TV and radio channels including all BBC TV and radio content. The sampling procedure encompasses two steps. First, to gain an overview over reports on mass surveillance and intelligence services, the broadcast data bases were searched by the terms "Edward Snowden," "GCHQ" or "NSA" for a two-year period from 27/06/2013 until 28/06/2015. From this search, major events in relation to the Snowden revelations and surveillance could be identified.

The observation period begins three days after the initial revelations with Edward Snowden's unveiling as the source of the leaks on 9. June 2013 and includes four further major events that were discussed in relation to mass surveillance and privacy, with the Charlie Hebdo aftermath in January and February 2015 representing the end of the observation period. The events include (1) Edward Snowden's unveiling, (2) the detention of journalist Glen Greenwald's partner David Miranda at Heathrow Airport under anti-terror legislation, (3) the interception of communications in foreign embassies and European Union offices and spying on world leaders' phone communications, in particular the German Chancellor Angela Merkel, (4) the publication of the British parliamentary report into the death of Fusilier Lee Rigby that raised debates about Facebook and social media companies' role in tackling terrorism, and (5) the Charlie Hebdo terror attacks in Paris which prompted debates about digital encryption, freedom of speech, and the resurrection of the so called "Snoopers' Charter" legislation.

Second, key search terms were developed specifically for each event to ensure that all broadcasts related to the event are found (see

Table 1). Broadcasts were analysed only when the recording was available, which decreased the sample slightly for the David Miranda and Lee Rigby report cases. Analysis was based on the transcripts of each broadcast. Further, the data bases did not offer a search advanced enough to search for the embassy and world leader snooping terms.¹ No broadcasts were found searching versions of the term "embassy". The search term "Merkel's phone" was useful to detect broadcasts on snooping on world leaders. No broadcasts were found for Charlie Hebdo in combination with the

¹ The advanced set of search terms for the embassy and world leader snooping case were necessary for identifying UK press articles.

term "surveillance". However, the search for "surveillance" for the respective time period revealed one broadcast mentioning the Paris attacks, which is included to the sample.

It is important to note that due to searching in short summaries *and* transcripts of broadcasts, TV programmes had a greater chance to be part of the sample than radio programmes. For radio programmes, no transcripts are available in the data bases. In contrast, all TV programmes have a transcript (because of their subtitles). Thus, the radio programmes that did not contain the search terms in their short summary are systematically overlooked in our sample.

Table 1: Search terms and number of broadcasts per case

	(1) Edward Snowden's unveiling	(2) David Miranda	(3) Embassies and world leader snooping	(4) Lee Rigby report	(5) Charlie Hebdo aftermath
Timeframe	09/06/13 – 16/06/13	18/08/13 – 15/09/13	29/06/13 – 27/07/13 and 11/10/13 – 08/11/13	15/11/14 – 13/12/14	07/01/15 – 04/02/15
Search terms print articles	"Edward Snowden"	"David Miranda"	Embass! AND bugging OR spying OR snoop! OR tapping OR surveillance "world leaders" OR "foreign leaders" AND GCHQ OR NSA	"Lee Rigby" AND Facebook	"Charlie Hebdo" AND surveillance
Search terms broadcast	"Edward Snowden"	"David Miranda"	"European Commission" OR "Merkel's phone"	"Lee Rigby" AND Facebook	"Charlie Hebdo" AND surveillance
Number of broadcasts (programmes obtained)	4 (4)	12 (8)	0 (Embass!), 2 (2) (European Commission); 11 (11) (Merkel's phone)	8 (7)	0, 1 (1) (Paris AND surveillance)

Four broadcasts are found on Edward Snowden's unveiling: (1) *Sky News At 9* (09/06/13, ca. 6'30"), (2) *BBC NEWS* at 10pm (09/06/13, ca. 4'), (3) *BBC NEWS* at 3pm (11/06/13, ca. 6'), and (4) *BBC NEWS* at 10pm (13/06/13, ca. 2'30"). The first two broadcasts report on reactions to Snowden's revelations and the third and fourth about Snowden's disappearance in Hong Kong and his possible extradition.

Twelve broadcasts are found on David Miranda, of which for eight the programme could be obtained and were analysed: (1) *Today, BBC Radio 4*, at 7.50am (19/08/13, ca. 4'40"), (2) *Today, BBC Radio 4*, at 8am (19/08/13, ca. 1'), (3) *BBC News at Ten*, at 10pm (19/08/13, ca. 5'30"), (4) *Drive, BBC Radio 5*, at 4pm (20/08/13, ca. 4'30"), (5) *BBC News at Six*, at 6pm (20/08/13, ca. 5'10"), (6) *Channel 5 News*, at 9pm (20/08/13, ca. 20"), (7) *BBC News at Ten*, at 10pm (20/08/13, ca. 5'30"), and (8) *The Media Show, BBC Radio 4*, at 4.30pm (21/08/13, ca. 11'30").

Two broadcasts were found and obtained relating to the spying on EU offices: (1) *BBC News*, 6.35pm (30/06/2013, ca. 2'20") and (2) *BBC News at Ten*, 10pm (30./06/2013, ca. 2'20"). Both reports are similar.

Eleven broadcasts were found and obtained on the snooping on world leaders: (1) Sky News At 9, 9pm (23/10/2013, ca. 2'40"), (2) Sky News At 10, 10pm (23/10/2013, ca. 2'40"), (3) BBC News, at 9am (24/10/2013, ca. 7'50"), (4) Sky News, at 9am (24/10/2013, ca. 3'), (5) BBC News, at 10am (24/10/2013, ca. 5'30"), (6) BBC News, at 11am (24/10/2013, ca. 3'30"), (7) BBC News at One, at 1pm (24/10/2013, ca. 4'50"), (8) Breaking News, BBC NEWS, at 7.45pm (24/10/2013, ca. 3'10"), (9) News at eight, BBC NEWS, at 8pm (24/10/2013, ca. 4'), (10) Dateline London, BBC NEWS, at 11.30am (26/10/2013, ca. 11'40"), and (11) Politics Europe, BBC NEWS, at 5.30pm (24/10/2013, ca. 4'). The broadcasts of October 23rd and 24th are often similar in structure, content, and sources. Therefore, these broadcasts are taken as a whole.

Eight broadcasts were detected for the Lee Rigby report, of which the transcript for seven could be obtained: (1) Jeremy Vine on BBC Radio 2, 12.00 (25/11/2014, ca. 8'), (2) BBC News at One, at 1pm (25/11/2014, 7'), (3) Channel 4 News, at 7pm (25/11/2014, ca. 12'), (4) 5 News Update on Channel 4, at 7.55pm (25/11/2014, ca. 45"), (5) 5 News Update on Channel 4, at 20.58pm (25/11/2014, ca. 10"), (6) Sky News At Ten, 10pm (25/11/2014, ca. 4'), (7) ITV News at Ten & Weather, at 10pm (25/11/2014, ca. 7'), and (8) Today in Parliament on BBC Radio 4 (25/11/2014, ca. 7'). Broadcasts (4) and (5) very briefly summarise the event in one headline and will not be analysed.

One broadcast was detected on surveillance that refers to the Charlie Hebdo attacks: (1) Today in Parliament on BBC Radio 4, 11.30pm (14/01/2015).

The broadcast reports are described concerning arguments actors and sources per case from Appendix

Appendix 1 to Appendix 5.

3.2. Analytic framework

Matheson (2005, p. 178) describes discursive formation as "accumulated and interlinked statements about a topic, [...] a particular way of talking and thinking that shapes how we understand the topic." The deconstruction of discursive formation of arguments concerning surveillance over the course of the observation period follows a framework for analysis building up on multimodal (de)legitimation strategies by van Leeuwen and Wodak (1999), van Leeuwen (2007), and van Dijk (2006).

van Leeuwen and Wodak (1999) and van Leeuwen (2007) distinguish four sub-categories of justifying strategies, i.e., (1) authorisation through personal or impersonal institutionalised authorities (e.g., experts, parent, teacher, the law, through conformity ["everybody does it", use of statistics]), (2) instrumental or theoretical rationalisation through purposes (e.g., intrusion into private life of immigrants is justified "to protect rights and freedom of others" (1999, p.106)), (3) moral abstractions and evaluations that link activities to values such as leadership and governmental control, economic values (economic interest of a country), values of public interest, national security or public order, and (4) mythopoesis through telling stories. Similar legitimation strategies were also used in Schulze's (2015) analysis of the surveillance discourse of German politicians. In addition, van Dijk (2006, p.380) describes various forms of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation through "enhancing the power, moral superiority and credibility of the speaker(s), and

discrediting dissidents, while vilifying the Others, the enemy; the use of emotional appeals; and adducing seemingly irrefutable proofs of one's beliefs and reasons".

The analysis focuses on representation of actors and their thematic frames and (de)legitimation strategies of surveillance within the broadcasts per observed case. The primary level of analysis are the cases observed in order to trace how each case informs the surveillance debate and public understanding of surveillance, whereas actors, themes, and (de)legitimation strategies build a subordinated analysis level (see overview of results in Table 2).

4. Results

4.1. Surveillance debate in broadcast news about Edward Snowden's unveiling

The broadcast news reports on Snowden's unveiling articulate pro as well as contra arguments for mass surveillance. The focus lies on the discussion of the lawfulness of intelligence surveillance practices. The reports are structured along three lines of argumentation, (a) unlawfulness and public interest, usually expressed by Snowden and correspondents, (b) lawfulness expressed by governmental actors, and (c) the need to balance security against surveillance, usually expressed through a concluding remark of the reporters. A damage by the leaks as found in newspaper reporting by Branum and Charteris-Black (2015) is not part of the broadcast debate.

Civil liberty and public interest of the revelations are mentioned as initial arguments against surveillance. In this regard, the reports give much voice to Snowden himself, but give only once voice to a citizen for about ten seconds and once mention reactions of citizens to Snowden's revelations (report 3). In one report, a correspondent comments on Snowden's intentions and reports about "a storm of outrage" in the U.S. as well as mentioning the critical U.S. president's and the director of the NSA's stances (report 1). This part expresses that the revelations are in the public interest and that privacy should be protected. A security correspondent mentions the unlawfulness of surveillance practices since "Americans to spy on Britons" and that the revelations "sent shock waves ... through the most secret parts of our states" (report 2). An anchor also mentions a petition of supporters of Snowden "hailing him a national hero" and collecting "thousands of signatures" (report 3). The situation in Hong Kong is described mentioning that "Mr. Snowden is celebrated" by Hong Kong newspapers (report 3) An indirect quote of Snowden, "He told the South China Morning Post that he was neither a traitor nor hero accurate, just an American," the critical and positive views toward Snowden are expressed (report 4).

Most statements by governmental bodies are critical about Snowden and supportive of the current state of surveillance practices. An often showed statement of the Foreign Secretary MP describes Snowden's accusations as "baseless", "fanciful" and "nonsense". A member of the Ministry of Defence emphasises that "surveillance is necessary in cyber as in ordinary space" and there is "no need to worry" for the public (report 1). These messages express that intelligence services should be trusted and need secrecy.

The need to balance security against surveillance is often a conclusion in the reports. A security correspondent summarises a pro and contrary view on surveillance, "Some will share his concern about this huge scale of surveillance. Others will say this is what is needed to prevent terrorist attacks and worry that his revelations might compromise that ability" (report 2). Snowden's point that mass surveillance risks democracy is not explicitly taken on by editorial agents or other sources. However, a reporter mentions that "there is a point where you have to draw the line" followed by a statement of the Business Secretary MP emphasising that surveillance has to be proportionate and needs oversight (report 1).

The conclusions from the news reports are that current surveillance practices might not be in full compliance with the law, that surveillance is necessary especially against terror, and that privacy should be balanced with security. Two critical voices, one UK politician and one U.S. citizen, request an oversight over intelligence service's surveillance practice. Mass surveillance is mostly justified by its lawfulness and its ability to prevent terror within statements of these reports. As arguments challenging mass surveillance, its scope ("massive," "huge scale"), a lack of oversight over intelligence services, and the unlawfulness of surveillance practice are mentioned.

Related to van Leeuwen and Wodak's (1999) (de)legitimation strategies, governmental actors legitimise surveillance by referring to the law as institutionalised authority and conformity ("as in ordinary space"). Further, reporters suggest rationalisation through the purpose of preventing terrorism. Delegitimation of mass surveillance is created by ascribing authority to Snowden through positive attributions of being a celebrated and a hero. At the same time, governmental actors discredit and de-authorise Snowden by calling his revelations "fanciful accusations", which refers to negative other-representation as described by van Dijk (2006). Snowden's arguments to delegitimise surveillance relate to moralising values of public interest. Arguments about the scale of surveillance suggest that intelligence services are doing something wrong implicating an oversight over intelligence services, which relates to moral delegitimation. Finally, Snowden's disappearance in Hong Kong is presented as mythopoetic story with open ending. Since it tells that Snowden has to hide, it suggests two interpretations. First, Snowden is an outlaw and a traitor, which is why the government wants to jail him. Second, the security agencies' and governments' power is globally threatening Snowden's wellbeing. Table 2 provides an overview over (de)legitimation strategies for each case.

4.2. Surveillance debate in broadcast news about the David Miranda detention

Arguments pro and contra government surveillance are expressed in the David Miranda case that centre on state security versus press freedom and privacy. Reports partly use emotional expressions such as "extraordinary," "awful," "abused" or "stretched" law, causing "huge reactions" from a "furious" public etc., indicating that the detention is dubious and cannot be supported. In one case, the public is indirectly quoted by a Liberal Democrats spokesperson mentioning reactions on Twitter (report 4), "They are furious that this has happened. They are extremely concerned at the idea that anybody can be detained on such slim evidence and such slim guidance on nine hours."

Whereas the BBC reports in detail and from supporting and opposing perspectives, news on other channels have not reported about the detention or only very briefly from one perspective, as on

Channel 5 News. These shorter reports often begin from the state's perspective supporting its need for security. For example, report 6 starts with, "The Home Office and Scotland Yard have been threatened with legal action." Further, the statement of the Home Secretary is part of the reports, "the government should protect the public if the police believe somebody has highly sensitive stolen information which could help terrorists and lead to a loss of lives." Longer news reports rather start from the journalists' perspective suggesting that the state made a mistake and conclude with implications for press freedom. After the initial reports, the following ones take an overall journalists' standpoint beginning with the argument of threatening press freedom. However, also perspectives opposing the detention take state security into consideration.

Mass surveillance, or more specifically, the detention, is justified by state and data security and possible threats through terrorism. However, the relating law, the Terrorism Act 2000, is discussed from the perspective of press freedom as well. A reporter concludes (report 3), "Before this detention, the talk around this particular law [Terrorism Act 2000, JL] had focussed on civil liberties. Now the issue of journalistic freedom is part of the debate." The need for a public debate and thus the necessity to report about mass surveillance is mentioned as arguments against secret government actions.

The reports give voice to the persons concerned, David Miranda and Glenn Greenwald, who are upset about the events. Further, the Home Secretary Theresa May's comment is often played and/or mentioned, defending the security state's point-of-view. The Chair of the Home Affairs Select Committee and the Liberal Democrat's spokesman critically comment the detention. Thus, mostly politicians commenting and journalists as people concerned with the events get voice in the reports. The public itself is partly indirectly mentioned. Only one source, the Home Secretary, takes up a solely supportive opinion on the government's actions, whereas the other sources express rather concerned opinions. Also journalists' or reporters' statements reveal a critical opinion toward the state's actions.

The detention and destruction of the *Guardian's* hard drives adds a further press freedom example to mass surveillance issues and recalls the necessity of a public debate about mass surveillance. Although in the beginning, the reports' focus was on the detention itself, with the reports on the destruction of the *Guardian's* hard drives (reports 7 and 12), the focus broadens. Since it remains unclear who ordered the detention and knew about it beforehand and since the government forced the *Guardian* to destroy its hard drives, one may get the impression that the UK is a surveillance state. However, the short report on Channel 5 News (report 6) suggests that other news outlets may report from a closer government-supportive view taking up the security argument.

The discussion around the lawfulness (stretching the law) of the detention relates to van Leeuwen and Wodak's (1999) authorisation delegitimation strategy. Governmental actors follow a rationalisation strategy, legitimising the detention through state and data security needed to prevent terrorism. In contrast, state control is discussed to negatively determine the values of the public and press freedom, which associates with moral delegitimation. The questioning and destruction of the *Guardian's* hard drives is story-like described by David Miranda and Alan Rusbridger, respectively, which can be seen as mythopoesis strategy for delegitimation (see Table 2).

4.3. Surveillance debate in broadcast news about the snooping on embassies and world leaders

The case shows that the scale of surveillance by the NSA is wide-ranging and does not stop at partner countries. A justification of economic and industrial espionage is added to the terrorism reasoning of surveillance. The revelations are related to Edward Snowden who is called a "hero" by Julian Assange in the report of the spying on EU offices case (reports 1 and 2 on embassy snooping). The outrage of Angela Merkel, the German people or the anger of the French diplomat and President of the EU Parliament is touched on several times. However, UK sources part in the second wave of reports, be it politicians or foreign correspondents, do not express great surprise about the U.S. spying activities (reports 8, 10, and 11). It is assumed that Merkel's anger is played, since she "has to really climb the highest ladder of annoyance but a lot of crocodile tears are being shared here," because they suggest that everybody is spying on each other (report 10). Whereas the reactions of German or French sources point at a moral difficulty of the spying activities by the U.S., the lack of outrage by the UK sources and the lack of a debate whether this had any consequences for the UK mutes such a moral question. At most, the U.S. spying activities are restrainedly criticised by sources. Further, the public outrage in Germany is explained by the specific history of abused power by German intelligence service. While this example relates state surveillance to a negative example in Germany's history, it highlights a serious and threatening aspect of surveillance for a population. However, such an aspect is not taken up or even discussed in relation to the current surveillance situation by the sources or journalists reporting.

Regarding (de)legitimation strategies (van Leeuwen & Wodak, 1999), the reports stress the conformity of spying on each other on country level and refer to economic interests, which are authorisation and moralising strategies, respectively. The reports ascribe authorisation to Snowden through Assange's quote, which can be seen as delegitimation strategy for state surveillance. Further, the partnership between the U.S. and European countries as well as referring to the German history are moralising strategies (see Table 2).

4.4. Surveillance debate in broadcast news about the Lee Rigby report

The broadcasts on the Lee Rigby report are related to online service providers (OSP) who are requested to support security agencies. Broadcasts usually begin with statements from the Prime Minister requesting legislation enabling broader surveillance. The emergency of further legislation is emphasised in a statement of an MP (report 8), "that people will die in this country who would have been safe if that [legislation, JL] had been in place". Facebook as an OSP is described as "safe-haven" for terrorists (reports 3 and 6). Also, the difficulty of identifying "lone wolf terrorists" not communicating online and equipped with low technology is mentioned (report 1).

In addition, many broadcasts contrast the Prime Minister's request for a new legislation by adding alternative sources such as representatives of the Open Rights Group and other non-governmental organisations criticising surveillance. These sources refer to the balance between surveillance and privacy, the public debate that is needed, and criticise security agencies' surveillance practices as well as blaming OSPs. A human-rights activist states (report 6), "At a times when they [security agencies, JL] want to pull back on civil liberties, snoop on, they pull out terrorism as a trump card." A

spokesperson of a counter-extremism organisation states that searching in online communication for terrorism search terms "would not help you find a needle in a haystack. It would add more hay" (report 7). These alternative sources themselves and their critical statements on surveillance practices are unique in the broadcast surveillance debate. This explicit criticism was either absent in previous cases or at most indicated through statements of Snowden himself or partly through Alan Rusbridger regarding the destruction of the *Guardian's* hard drives.

Legitimation strategies for online surveillance provide rational reasoning relating to preventing terrorism and enhancing civil security. Delegitimation strategies apply moralising through public interest and mythopoesis through presuming that the terrorism argument is strategically used to increase surveillance although it would not be effective (see Table 2).

4.5. Surveillance debate in broadcast news about the Charlie Hebdo aftermath

In the single report relating to surveillance and "the Paris attacks", the Charlie Hebdo attacks are used to emphasise the threat through terrorism in order to make changes to legislation easing online surveillance for security agencies. Whereas broadcasts on the Lee Rigby report involve non-governmental, surveillance-critical voices, reporting the Charlie Hebdo attacks seem to again intensify the terrorist theme and not discussing surveillance critically with non-governmental actors. Still, the Liberal Democrats oppose the data legislation they refer to as "Snooper's Charter" and it is warned that too much power is given to security agencies. A conservative MP states that "Public safety must come above everything else and that civil liberty must include not being bombed, shocked or beheaded." Thus, the previously enhancing of critical arguments are overshadowed by the Charlie Hebdo attacks.

Hence, in the final case, surveillance is rationalised through the arguments of preventing terrorism and protecting civil security and delegitimised through indirectly referring to civil liberty values through power of security agencies (see Table 2).

5. Discussion and conclusions

Mass and state surveillance are issues on the British broadcast news agenda. The British news covers general aspects of the selected cases, which are discussed in more detail on further informational programmes within the sample. Perspectives on surveillance narrow down to the major theme terrorism versus privacy, which is similar to Barnard-Wills' (2011) result of preventing criminality to limiting personal liberty. Whereas Branum and Charteris-Black (2015) show major differences in the surveillance discourse of British newspapers caused by their editorial stance, such differences are not similarly appearing in broadcasts. Whereas the *Guardian* explicitly focuses on risks for democracy and the *Sun* emphasises the damage caused by the leaks, the broadcast discourse appears to be more moderate.

On a rational legitimation level (van Leeuwen & Wodak, 1999), mass surveillance is *justified* to protect people from terrorist attacks. This legitimation strategy relates to the purpose of a state to protect its population as lined out by Foucault (2007). This issue of national security was also

dominant in UK counter-terrorism policy documents (MacDonald & Hunter, 2013). In the first three cases, i.e., Snowden's unveiling, David Miranda's detention, and the embassy and world leader snooping, surveillance is legitimised using authoritative references on the law and on conformity with past and universal behaviour. Similarly, Schulze (2015) shows that referring to the law is a dominant authorisation strategy in the German debate around the NSA surveillance scandal, which refers to the embassies and world leader snooping case in this study. In the reports on Snowden's unveiling, his authority is discredited by referring to his accusations as unbelievable and himself as outlaw, being in contrast to the authorisation strategy explicitly referring to the law. In the embassies and world leader snooping case, a moralising argument of economic interests is mentioned. Overall, to legitimate surveillance, predominantly authorisation and rationalisation strategies, as well as moralising in one case, are used. These legitimisation strategies are often employed by political, especially governmental actors. In three cases, i.e., Snowden's unveiling, the Lee Rigby report, and the aftermath of Charlie Hebdo, the focus is on these elite actors and they can mainly frame the surveillance interpretation as legitimate within broadcasts.

When comparing the rationalisation arguments of terrorist threats, the explicitness increases over time. Over the course of the cases, the expressions used for terroristic threats become more detailed. In the beginning, "terrorist attacks" are rather factually mentioned (e.g., report 2 Snowden's unveiling), then terrorism "could [...] lead to a loss of lives" (report 6, David Miranda detention), later "people *will* die in this country" (report 8, Lee Rigby report), and finally "being bombed, shocked or beheaded" (report 1, Charlie Hebdo aftermath) explicitly describes several ways leading to a loss of lives.

Whereas legitimisation strategies focus on authorisation and rationalisation, *delegitimation* strategies of surveillance predominantly use moralising and mythopoetic arguments. That is, public interest, civil liberties, privacy, as well as press freedom are presented as values that have to be protected. In the embassies and world leader snooping case, delegitimising moralising arguments refer to partnership between countries and a negative historic example of state surveillance in Germany. Concerning to a mythopoetic strategy, Snowden's disappearing and David Miranda's detention are story-like told and thus may cause sympathy for the main characters. Parts of the delegitimising arguments in the Lee Rigby report broadcasts are mythopoetically using a metaphor for the ineffectiveness of online surveillance ("needle in a haystack"). Overall, there are topics touched in reporting that reveal problematic aspects of state surveillance. However, there are no arguments challenging surveillance in general, but challenging arguments are related to surveillance *practices*. Risks for democracy and society as described by Sloan and Warner (2015) or Acquisti et al. (2015) are not part of the analysed broadcasts. The most critical discourses on surveillance are held in reporting the David Miranda detention and the Lee Rigby report. The former is treated as infringing press freedom. The latter refers to ineffective surveillance practices pointing out that broader online surveillance "would not help you find a needle in a haystack. It would add more hay." The delegitimation strategies of these two cases are mostly expressed by journalists and non-governmental organisations. Further delegitimation arguments are expressed by Snowden himself, politicians, and citizens (see Table 2). Whereas the sources for legitimisation are often governmental actors, sources of delegitimation arguments are more diverse and vary for each case.

The delegitimising moralising arguments remain less explicitly than the legitimising rationalisation argument referring to terrorist threats. Civil liberties and people's privacy remain abstract, intangible

terms. Except for obtaining bank records and reading emails (report 3, Snowden's unveiling), the detention of potentially innocent people in the David Miranda case, and destruction of corporate property in the case of the *Guardian's* hard drives, no threats to civil liberties of general people are mentioned. Thus, threats to civil liberties and privacy appear negligible compared to terrorist threats within the British broadcast discourse on surveillance.

In line with the literature, arguments of the state support surveillance in order to comply with its duty to protect citizens. Some (oppositional) politicians request a discussion about the proportionality of surveillance, which is a sign of a more moderate viewpoint. However, the broadcast discourse tends to give governmental, pro-surveillance actors a voice by default. In contrast, it is harder for non-governmental actors to continuously interpret the broadcast discourse.

Table 2: (De)legitimation strategies and actors of the British broadcast surveillance discourse

	(1) Edward Snowden's unveiling	(2) David Miranda	(3) Embassies and world leader snooping	(4) Lee Rigby report	(5) Charlie Hebdo aftermath
Analysed reports	4	8	2 and 11	7	1
Surveillance themes discussed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Civil liberty and public interest - We live in surveillance states - Surveillance practices not fully lawful - Privacy to be balanced with security 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - State security versus press freedom and civil liberty - UK is a surveillance state (indirect) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Morally difficult to spy on allies - Affect the relations between the EU and the U.S. - Spying on allies not surprising 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Online service providers (OSP) to support security agencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gaps in security agencies' surveillance ability versus "Snooper's Charter" - UK becomes a surveill-ance state
(De)legitimation strategies					
(1) Authorisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lawful vs. unlawful - Conformity to "ordinary space" - Of Snowden (fanciful, traitor vs. celebrated hero) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lawful vs. unlawful 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Of Snowden (hero) - Conformity (everybody does it) 		
(2) Rationalisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preventing terrorism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preventing terrorism - State / data security 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preventing terrorism - Civil security 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preventing terrorism - Civil security
(3) Moralising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public interest: Risk 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - State control vs. values of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Economic interests 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public interest: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (Civil liberty)

	to democracy and civil liberties	public interest and press freedom	- Partnership - German history	privacy	
(4) Mytho- poesis	- Control over intelligence - Snowden's disappearing	- Detention and questioning - Destruction of <i>Guardian's</i> hard dives		- Terrorism strategically used by intelligence - Online sur- veillance "adds more hay"	
Sources/ actors pro surveillance	- US or UK government actors	- UK Home Secretary	- UK MEP	- UK Prime Minister - UK MPs - Relative of Lee Rigby	- UK Home Secretary - UK MPs
Sources/ actors contra surveillance	- Snowden himself - UK MP - US citizen	- Persons involved (Miranda, Greenwald) - Chair of the Home Affairs Select Committee - Liberal Democrat politician - Amnesty Interntl. - Lawyer - (Twitter users) - Alan Rusbridger - Reporters/ journalists	- EU politicians/ diplomat - Julian Assange - Foreign correspond- ents - UK MEP - German people (indirectly)	- Representa- tives of non- govern- mental orga- nisations - Member of the Joint Intelligence and Security Committee	- UK Liberal Democrat MPs

Notes. Most often mentioned/most dominant aspects and sources in bold. Green = pro-surveillance, red = contra-surveillance arguments and sources.

From a normative view, the broadcast news discourse touches challenging and justifying arguments, which is necessary to enable rational discussions in public. Thus, broadcast news cannot be described as government lapdog (McGarrity, 2011). However, pro-surveillance arguments are expressed explicitly through terrorism having a great negative threat for society compared to contra-surveillance arguments. The threat of terrorism has more serious consequences for a member of society than mass surveillance. Thus, the more powerful arguments in combination with a default coverage may be received as more convincing by the audience than contra-surveillance arguments. In fact, what exactly is at stake when mass surveillance is broadened remains obscure in the

broadcast discourse and is thus non-existent. The reasoning suggested by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe (2005) that "fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of expression, which is one of the very pillars of the democratic societies that terrorists seek to destroy" may be at risk in a surveillance state, cannot be drawn from the broadcast discourse. Within the on broadcast related to Charlie Hebdo, an MP defines civil liberty to include civil security. In this regard, Simone (2009, p. 12) concludes related to the PATRIOT Act, "If surveillance is security and security is liberty, then perhaps we would be better off living dangerously."

In sum, the surveillance discourse for the selected cases in British broadcast media transforms from affecting civil liberties over press freedom to foreign relations towards civil *security*. To conclude, the surveillance discourse should be richer especially in order to give the audience a chance to understand the less concrete contra-surveillance arguments better. This underreporting is not caused by "security and intelligence censorship" (Herfroy-Mischler, 2015) but by not extensively enough including alternative sources than governmental actors and by the challenge to explain surveillance threats to democracy in a vivid, concrete, and more tangible way to the public.

There are major limitations connected to this broadcast analysis. First, the sample is the best that could be accessed based on two extensive data bases. Since the observation periods are selected based on previously identified major events in surveillance coverage, major broadcast reports are part of the sample. However, it remains unclear how many reports are missed due to the keyword search and the way TV versus radio broadcasts are represented in the data bases used for searching. Further, the analysis is related to the surveillance discussion within five cases. Although one can expect that the majority of broadcasts covering surveillance are analysed, broadcasts on surveillance not related to one of the cases are overlooked. For example, only one broadcast was found discussing surveillance from the background of the Charlie Hebdo attacks and it is explicitly related to the parliament discussion (and thus does not include other sources than MPs). However, surveillance matters may be discussed more broadly in other broadcasts. Hence, a conclusion that the surveillance debate has become less diverse and gives pro-surveillance arguments more room since the Lee Rigby report cannot be drawn. Second, this analysis did not focus on the visual aspects of broadcasts. As a next step, an analysis of visuals used to illustrate surveillance and intelligence agencies within broadcasts can reveal additional findings relating to audience understanding. Third, the analysis cannot evaluate whether the coverage of surveillance in British media is extensive relative to other topics. Fourth, in order to assess the British news *media* discourse on surveillance, an additional analysis of newspaper and online news outlets are necessary. Further, alternative news sources such as blogs can reveal a discourse produced by a wider circle of actors than journalists and editors. Finally, it would be interesting to assess how the audiences actually perceive and understand the surveillance discourse in the media.

References

- Abu-Laban, Y., & Bakan, A. B. (2012). After 9/11: Canada, the Israel/Palestine conflict, and the surveillance of public discourse. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*, 27(3), 319–339.
- Acquisti, A., Brandimarte, L., & Loewenstein, G. (2015). Privacy and human behavior in the age of information. *Science*, 347(6221), 509–514. doi:10.1126/science.aaa1465

- Allan, S. (1998). News from NowHere: Televisual news discourse and the construction of hegemony. In A. Bell & P. Garrett (Eds.), *Approaches to media discourse* (pp. 105–141). Oxford, Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Barnard-Wills, D. (2011). UK news media discourses of surveillance. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 52(4), 548–567. doi:10.1111/j.1533-8525.2011.01219.x
- Branum, J., & Charteris-Black, J. (2015). The Edward Snowden affair: A corpus study of the British press. *Discourse & Communication*, 9(2), 199–220. doi:10.1177/1750481314568544
- Brüggemann, M., Engesser, S., Büchel, F., Humprecht, E., & Castro, L. (2014). Hallin and Mancini Revisited: Four Empirical Types of Western Media Systems. *Journal of Communication*, 64(6), 1037–1065. doi:10.1111/jcom.12127
- Coll, S. (2014). Power, knowledge, and the subjects of privacy: Understanding privacy as the ally of surveillance. *Information, Communication & Society*, 17(10), 1250–1263. doi:10.1080/1369118X.2014.918636
- Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe. (2005). *Declaration on freedom of expression and information in the media in the context of the fight against terrorism*. Retrieved from <https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?id=830679&Site=CM>
- Denscombe, M. (2010). *The good research guide: For small-scale social research projects* (4th ed.). *Open UP study skills*. Maidenhead, England: McGraw-Hill/Open University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media discourse*. London, New York: E. Arnold.
- Fogues, R., Such, J. M., Espinosa, A., & Garcia-Fornes, A. (2015). Open challenges in relationship-based privacy mechanisms for social network services. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 31(5), 350–370. doi:10.1080/10447318.2014.1001300
- Foucault, M. (2007). *Security, territory, population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-78*. Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan; République Française.
- Greenberg, J., & Hier, S. (2009). CCTV surveillance and the poverty of media discourse: A content analysis of Canadian newspaper coverage. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 34(3), 461–486.
- Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hackett, R. A. (1984). Decline of a paradigm? Bias and objectivity in news media studies. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 1(3), 329. doi:10.1080/15295038409360036
- Hartley, J., & Montgomery, M. (1985). Representations and relations: Ideology and power in press and TV news. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse and communication. New approaches to the analysis of mass media discourse and communication* (pp. 233–269). Berlin, New York: W. de Gruyter.
- Herfroy-Mischler, A. (2015). Silencing the agenda?: Journalism practices and intelligence events: A case study. *Media, War & Conflict*, 8(2), 244–263. doi:10.1177/1750635215584285
- Klein, M. W., & Maccoby, N. (1954). Newspaper objectivity in the 1952 campaign. *Journalism Quarterly*, 31, 285–296.
- Lyon, D. (2004). Globalizing surveillance: Comparative and sociological perspectives. *International Sociology*, 19(2), 135–149. doi:10.1177/0268580904042897

- MacDonald, M. N., & Hunter, D. (2013). Security, population and governmentality: UK counter-terrorism discourse (2007-2011). *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines*, 7(1), 123–140.
- MacDonald, M. N., Hunter, D., & O'Regan, J. P. (2013). Citizenship, community, and counter-terrorism: UK security discourse, 2001–2011. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 12(3), 445–473. doi:10.1075/jlp.12.3.07mac
- Matheson, D. (2005). *Media discourses: Analysing media texts. Issues in cultural and media studies*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- McGarrity, N. (2011). Fourth estate or government lapdog? The role of the Australian media in the counter-terrorism context. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies*, 25(2), 273–283. doi:10.1080/10304312.2011.553946
- McQuail, D. (1992). *Media performance: Mass communication and the public interest*. London: Sage.
- Picard, R. G. (2015). The humanisation of media?: Social media and the reformation of communication. *Communication Research and Practice*, 1(1), 32–41. doi:10.1080/22041451.2015.1042421
- Richardson, J. E. (2007). *Analysing newspapers: An approach from critical discourse analysis*. Basingstoke [England], New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schulze, M. (2015). Patterns of surveillance legitimization: The German discourse on the NSA scandal. *Surveillance & Society*, 13(2), 197–217.
- Simone, M. A. (2009). Give me liberty and give me surveillance: A case study of the US Government's discourse of surveillance. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 6(1), 1–14. doi:10.1080/17405900802559977
- Sloan, R. H., & Warner, R. (2015). The harm in merely knowing: Privacy, complicity, surveillance, and the self. *Journal of Internet Law*, 19(1), 3–14.
- Strömbäck, J. (2008). Four phases of mediatization: An analysis of the mediatization of politics. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 13(3), 228–246. doi:10.1177/1940161208319097
- Sup Park, C. (2014). Media cross-ownership and threat to diversity: A discourse analysis of news coverage on the permission for cross-ownership between broadcasters and newspapers in South Korea. *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics*, 10(1), 43–64. doi:10.1386/macp.10.1.43_1
- van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17(3), 359–383. doi:10.1177/0957926506060250
- van Leeuwen, T. (2007). Legitimation in discourse and communication. *Discourse & Communication*, 1(1), 91–112. doi:10.1177/1750481307071986
- van Leeuwen, T., & Wodak, R. (1999). Legitimizing immigration control: A discourse-historical analysis. *Discourse Studies*, 1(1), 83–118. doi:10.1177/1461445699001001005
- Wiegand, V. (2015, July). *The representation of surveillance discourses in UK broadsheets: A corpus linguistic approach*. Lancaster University. Corpus Linguistics 2015, Lancaster.

Appendix

Appendix 1: Description of reports about Edward Snowden's unveiling

The first broadcast (*Sky News At 9*, 09/06/13, ca. 6'30'') expresses three points of view on surveillance. The first part argues against (by Snowden and a correspondent), the second pro surveillance (by the Foreign Secretary MP and the Ministry of Defence), and the third part conditionally accepts surveillance (by a reporter and the Business Secretary MP). The anchor begins with summarising the news on Snowden, "The man behind one of the biggest leaks in U.S. political history has revealed his identity. Former CIA man, 29-year-old Edward Snowden, has admitted telling the *Guardian* newspaper about a secret U.S. government surveillance programme," and cites Snowden stating that he "has done nothing wrong." The report proceeds with Snowden himself explaining the reasons for his revelations (about 1') followed by a correspondent commenting on Snowden's intentions and reporting about "a storm of outrage" in the U.S. as well as mentioning the critical U.S. president's and the director of the NSA's stances (2'20"). This first part of the report expresses that the revelations are in the public interest and that privacy should be protected. Surveillance is not justified but described as risk to democracy due to its range and volume. Next, a reporter indicates that websites can become places to "hatch terror plots," followed by statements of the Foreign Secretary MP describing Snowden's accusations as "fanciful" and "nonsense," and a member of the Ministry of Defence emphasising that "surveillance is necessary in cyber as in ordinary space" and there is "no need to worry" for the public. These messages express that intelligence services should be trusted and need secrecy. This part justifies surveillance through potentially preventing terror, being lawful and similar to "ordinary" space. Finally, a reporter mentions that "there is a point where you have to draw the line" followed by a statement of the Business Secretary MP emphasising that surveillance has to be proportionate and needs oversight. In this third part, surveillance is justified through terrorism or economic crimes but must be balanced with privacy.

In the second broadcast (*BBC NEWS*, 09/06/13, ca. 4'), the anchor summarises Snowden's allegations and quotes Snowden describing surveillance as "grave threat to civil liberties," which is contrasted with the Foreign Secretary's statement that Snowden's accusations are "fanciful" and "nonsense." Next, the security correspondent explains that surveillance practices of NSA and GCHQ could be unlawful since "Americans to spy on Britons", which is complemented with Snowden's direct description of mass surveillance practices. From these parts, the audience can come to the conclusion that they are living in a surveillance state and that Snowden's leaks are in the public interest. The unlawfulness of the surveillance practice of GCHQ is used to argue against surveillance. The security respondent also mentions that the revelations "sent shock waves ... through the most secret parts of our states." Finally, the security correspondent summarises a pro and contrary view on surveillance, "Some will share his concern about this huge scale of surveillance. Others will say this is what is needed to prevent terrorist attacks and worry that his revelations might compromise that ability". Similar to the first broadcast, the conclusion is that surveillance is acceptable if it helps to fight terror but must be balanced with privacy. Whereas the first report gives voice to a politician with a critical view, this report does not include another contrary view on surveillance other than Snowden himself.

The third broadcast (*BBC NEWS*, 11/06/13, ca. 6') reports on Snowden's disappearance in Hong Kong starting with the anchor saying, "The man who's revealed he is the source of leaks about the massive American surveillance programme has gone missing," followed by mentioning the legal consequences for Snowden facing "decades in jail." The anchor also mentions a petition of supporters of Snowden "hailing him a national hero" and collecting "thousands of signatures." Next, Snowden himself states that intelligence services are "after me" and a White House spokesperson explains that an investigation is under way referring to Snowden as "this individual." After a reporter quoted that the U.S. president sees scope for debate about surveillance, a citizen mentions examples of mass surveillance in private life and the lack of oversight over intelligence services, "Your bank records, your phone conversations, your e-mail, your documents. Anything that is connected online, they are taking" (ca. 10"). This statement is contrasted by the Foreign Secretary stating that Snowden's accusations are "baseless" (ca. 5"). The report continues with a correspondent extensively reporting the situation in Hong Kong, also mentioning that "Mr. Snowden is celebrated" by Hong Kong newspapers. This report predominantly argues against surveillance and for the Snowden leaks being in the public interest as well as receiving broad support from U.S. citizens as well as from the media in Hong Kong.

Whereas the first three news reports were the opener of each news show, the fourth news broadcast (*BBC NEWS*, 13/06/13, ca. 2'30") is the presented toward the end of the news show. The anchor explains that Snowden fights his extradition and "accused Washington of bullying the Hong Kong government." The anchor indirectly cites Snowden, "He told the South China Morning Post that he was neither a traitor nor hero accurate, just an American." Later in the report, this sentence is repeated. A statement of the NSA Chief confirming that Snowden worked as systems administrator is shown. Afterwards, the reporter mentions that Snowden left his home in Hawaii, which is shown on footage, and Snowden himself states that he was "not here to hide in justice. I am here to reveal criminality." The reporter mentions that no extradition request was filed and concludes that Snowden's "revelations keep coming." Except for Snowden's direct statements about the criminality of the intelligence services implying that mass surveillance practices are illegal, surveillance is not discussed in this report. No other source than Snowden is quoted with a critical view and Snowden as a person is stronger in focus than in the previous news reports.

Appendix 2: Description of reports about the David Miranda detention

The first radio report (*Today, BBC Radio 4*, at 7.50am, 19/08/13, ca. 4'40") summarises the details of David Miranda's detention at Heathrow airport, whereas the detention duration "nine hours" is phonetically emphasised as well as having caused "huge reactions." The relation to Snowden's leaked documents is stated. The Guardian's critical reaction and the Brazilian government's complaints are mentioned. Glenn Greenwald's critique is cited directly and is followed by a short interview with the Chair of the Home Affairs Select Committee revealing his surprises ("raises more than my eyebrows" and "extraordinary," which were suggestively implied by the anchor). Overall, the report's message is that the detention under the Terrorism Act 2000 may not have been correct. Critical opinions about surveillance and privacy may derive from the report but are not explicitly discussed.

The second radio report (*Today, BBC Radio 4*, at 8am, 19/08/13, ca. 1') summarises the beforehand mentioned briefly within the news. The news mentions critical reactions of Brazil's Foreign Office

and Amnesty International indirectly citing "the incident shows that the law can be abused". Again, the news report's message is that the detention under the Terrorism Act 2000 may not have been correct.

On the same day, it is the lead story in *BBC News at Ten* (at 10pm (19/08/13, ca. 5'30"), the third report within the sample. The anchor asks whether "anti-terror laws are being stretched too far." David Miranda's summary of the events and Glen Greenwald's announcement to reveal more insights about the UK are shown, followed by background information on David Miranda's visit in Berlin given by the reporter. Next, a White House spokesman states that the U.S. was not involved in the detention. Afterward, the reporter explains how the Terrorism Act was applied in the past and mentions that "there is concern that there are too many of these stops," which is fortified by a quote from a lawyer. Then, the reporter mentions that the UK Home Office plans to change the referring legislation and states as final sentence, "Before this detention, the talk around this particular law had focussed on civil liberties. Now the issue of journalistic freedom is part of the debate." Back in the studio, the anchor asks the Security Correspondent who may have ordered the arrest. The Security Correspondent summarises the possibly stretched Terrorism Act and leaves the answer open. This report strongly implies that the detention under the Terrorism Act 2000 was not correct, which is reinforced by the information that the corresponding law will be changed. It also associates the event with the discussion about civil liberties suggesting that press freedom is now a further liberty that may be restricted.

On the following day, the event is discussed in *Drive, BBC Radio 5* (at 4pm, 20/08/13, ca. 4'30"), the fourth report in the sample. The anchor discusses with Julian Huppert who is the Liberal Democrats spokesman. The spokesman calls the terrorism laws problematic and the David Miranda case "awful," which is scrutinised by the anchor pointing out that the police acted within current law. The effectiveness of laws supporting the identification of terrorists are discussed. Finally, the spokesman mentions reactions on Twitter, which he assumes to partly represent the public opinion, as follows, "They are furious that this has happened. They are extremely concerned at the idea that anybody can be detained on such slim evidence and such slim guidance on nine hours." This discussion also suggests that the detention under the Terrorism Act 2000 may not have been correct. In addition, the public gets a voice in the discussion.

On that same day, the story is on *BBC News at Six* ((5), at 6pm (20/08/13, ca. 5'10", lead story), *Channel 5 News* ((6), at 9pm (20/08/13, ca. 20", second story), and *BBC News at Ten* ((7), at 10pm (20/08/13, ca. 5'30", lead story). *Channel 5 News* reports briefly on the events and states that "The Home Office and Scotland Yard have been threatened with legal action." The support of the Home Secretary is mentioned. On *BBC News at Six*, it is mentioned in the beginning of the report that the Home Secretary Theresa May supports the police's decision of the detention, "if they believed national security was at stake." *BBC News at Ten* adds the *Guardian's* reaction stating that the detention was a "threat to press freedom" and a reporter states that "after pressure the Government broke their silence." Both *BBC* news shows play the statement of the Home Secretary stating that "the government should protect the public if the police believe somebody has highly sensitive stolen information which could help terrorists and lead to a loss of lives." Further, David Miranda's statement that he is not directly involved in the NSA story reporting is shown and the reporter mentions that Miranda's lawyers will challenge the lawfulness of his detention. Toward the end of the *BBC News at Six* report, the handing over of Edward Snowden's documents to the

government as well as government surveillance get into focus and the *Guardian's* editor Alan Rusbridger states "This is subject of high public importance [...] You cannot write about that if you have not got informed material and facts to deal with. [...] The British government has moved against the *Guardian* in a way that would be undoable in America." Finally, the reporter suggests that "Anyone familiar with this says that the police would have been acting in tandem with the intelligence services, and there is never any public comment about the role of the intelligence services." In the *BBC News at Ten*, Alan Rusbridger explains the destruction of *The Guardian's* hard drives containing the Snowden documents, "We were quite clear we were not going to hand this material back to the British Government and so we destroyed it ourselves but under advice from a couple of GCHQ intelligence experts." The reporter calls it "act of vandalism" and concludes "The Government will be hoping that the public is convinced by this argument of public safety rather than the *Guardian's* argument about press freedom and the need to use the secrets to start a debate about the level of Government surveillance." Whereas *Channel 5 News* reports briefly and depict the British government as "threatened" victim, *BBC news* discusses the relation between safety interests, promoted by the government, and privacy and press freedom, promoted by the *Guardian*.

For three *BBC Radio 5* reports and discussions on the subject, only the summaries could be obtained. According to the summary, *5 live Breakfast* (21/08/13) discusses the questions, "Counter-terrorism powers – are they too heavy-handed? Or necessary to keep us safe?" and thus picks up the two major arguments produced, i.e., civil liberties versus state security.

The Media Show, BBC Radio 4 ((12) at 4.30pm, 21/08/13, ca. 11'30") takes up the David Miranda detention and discusses press freedom and the destruction of the *Guardian's* hard drives with Alan Rusbridger. The anchor starts with "It's been described as the most serious threat to press freedom Britain has seen for ages. Alternatively, it was the action of the state, concerned for the welfare and security of its citizens. Desperate measures for desperate times." This initial statement summarises the main arguments of opponents and supporters of the detention, respectively. David Miranda's description of the events and Theresa May's supporting comment are played. Afterwards, an interview with Alan Rusbridger starts. Alan Rusbridger calls the Terrorism Act "bizarre" and lines out that "That's what's disturbing people. That a measure that's supposed to be against terrorists is being used against journalists." Further, he emphasises that a debate on mass surveillance is needed and that "whole Europe is discussing this." On the destruction of the hard drives, he presumes "There must have been an internal discussion whether they [the government] wanted to send the police in or whether they wanted to injunct the *Guardian* or whether they wanted a criminal attack on the paper." He calls the destruction disproportionate and reflecting an "old-fashioned attitude towards national security." He also gives an outlook on future stories, "Over the next months or so we will learn more about the relation between the government and IT companies that we all use, millions of millions in our daily lives. Quite disturbing revelations. You're going to have to have the consent of the public in a way that you didn't have to with old-fashioned spying. It may be that the public says it's fine. We're prepared to surrender our privacy in return for security but you got to have that debate." Hence, in this report, the detention of David Miranda is explicitly discussed in relation to mass surveillance from a critical stance toward surveillance. It is noticeable that Alan Rusbridger refers to "the people" and the public a lot. Although voices from the public are not explicitly embedded, the most important stakeholder group of mass surveillance is addressed.

Appendix 3: Description of reports about the snooping on embassies and world leaders

The two obtained broadcasts on embassy snooping report that the European Commission demands an explanation from the U.S., shows a statement of the President of the European Parliament saying he was "deeply shocked" and "angry" that the U.S. spies on friends or allies, and relates the revelations to Edward Snowden. An abc news clip is shown containing a statement of Julian Assange, who is referred to "himself a target of the U.S. justice system," calling Snowden a "hero" because "he has told the people of the world and the United States that there is mess, unlawful interception of their communication." The question is raised whether this disclosure will affect the relations between the EU and the U.S.

The Sky news (1, 2, 4) cite Angela Merkel calling the case unacceptable and turn to their U.S. foreign correspondent as well as showing the White House spokesperson's statement that the U.S. does and will not spy on Angela Merkel's phone. The news mentions a possible "grave breach of trust" and anger in Germany and Brussels. The BBC news (3, 5, 6, 7, 9) add that a German news magazine has revealed the information to Angela Merkel and that the German public reacts sensitively to surveillance due to the distinctive past of Stasi in East Germany, "Memories here of surveillance in East Germany are fresh, and Germans were outraged about leaks coming from Edward Snowden." The news also refers to the NSA spying on buildings of the European Commission and senior diplomats that was revealed in June 2013, cite a critical statement of a French diplomat, mention that *Le Monde* has reported NSA spying on French phone calls, the Brazilian president cancelling a meeting with the U.S. president in protest of NSA spying in their country, and cite Edward Snowden suggesting that spying was "more widespread than previously known with more than 35 world leaders targeted" (9).

BBC's breaking news (8) invited foreign correspondent for a German news outlet and Dateline London (10) several foreign correspondents to discuss the matter. The German correspondent highlights that "that they cannot go along paranoid and spying on their friends." Within the correspondent's discussion it is noted that spying of world leaders is not preventing terrorism but because of national economic interest. Correspondents (10) argue that Merkel "has to really climb the highest ladder of annoyance but are a lot of crocodile tears are being shared here," because they suggest that "everybody is doing it [spying on each other]." A correspondent mentions that "There is a lot going on that the Americans can do that is useful, but we will never really understand it in the public realm because they cannot talk about it." The correspondents are also worried about surveillance possibilities brought by technological advances and add "there is a great deal of outrage about the thought that people all over the world may have their information hovered up."

Finally, in Politics Europe (11), two British MEPs discuss that it is naive thinking that there is no spying between countries but criticise the scale as disproportionate. They also report that the "president of the European Parliament is so outraged he says Europe should call off its free-trade with America," which is seen as "ridiculous". The intelligence services are described to do what they have to do "to keep us in one piece." The report concludes with stating that "Most of the time we don't really know what they want to do or what they need to do. They need to all get over this."

Appendix 4: Description of reports about the Lee Rigby report

In the first broadcast (1), details of Lee Rigby report are reported and Prime Minister calls agencies "silent heroes" and requests for areas of change in order to detect potential terrorists including "lone wolf terrorists" and the role of Internet companies "to keep us safe". BBC security correspondent comments on the report details and the debates the responsibility of American Internet companies "to help a British counter-terrorist investigation." Finally, the correspondent mentions that low-tech terrorism attacks are hard to detect through online surveillance since "all they need is a knife and who might not have contact with other networks and don't care if they get caught then spotting them [...] is much harder."

In the second report (2), a relative of the victim requests that both, intelligence agencies and Internet service providers have to work together. The report closes with the correspondent concluding that "Parliament and public expect those lessons to be learnt."

The third report (3) refers to Facebook as "safe haven for terrorists" and show the Prime Minister requesting access to online communication for intelligence services and passing "emergency legislation." The statement is contrasted by a representative of the Open Rights Group pointing out that if security agencies have access to any information would lead to "an absolute surveillance state at which point nobody has any kind of freedom to manoeuvre. You sacrifice the very thin you're tempting to defend. Terrorists win." A following discussion between a member of the Joint Intelligence and Security Committee publishing the Lee Rigby report and a representative from the organisation 'Don't Spy On Us' raises the problem of finding a balance for the access to online communication and privacy. Data security is touched, i.e., data could get into the hands of oppressive regimes, as well as intelligence agencies going on a "fishing expedition" on communication content through PRISM and Tempora by the security agencies, and accusing the security agencies to have dropped surveillance on the two key suspects now stressing a "narrative" that "these large companies are to blame." The discussion chair asks whether the new legislation is about "softening up for greater surveillance, chapter in the piece of a surveillance state, it's all about getting more powers" and the Don't Spy On Us representative stresses that a broad public debate needed for new legislation.

Reports 4 and 5 are similar and briefly summarise the murder and the requests towards OSP to take "their responsibility to act".

Also in the sixth report (6) also uses the "safe-haven" term to describe Facebook using terrorists and shows, besides the Prime Minister's and a victim's relative's statement, a statement of a human-rights activist saying, "At a times when they [security agencies, JL] want to pull back on civil liberties, snoop on, they pull out terrorism as a trump card."

The seventh report (7) focuses on the practicality of online communication surveillance and discusses the Internet service provider's responsibility to report to authorities as well as the intelligence agencies' mistakes. A spokesperson of a counter-extremism organisation states that searching in online communication for terrorism search terms "would not help you find a needle in a haystack. It would add more hay". Instead, another spokesperson requests that only targeted information should be handed on.

The eights broadcast (8) reports the discussion of MPs following the Lee Rigby report with the commission, mentioning to move forward the communications data bill proposing "that people will die in this country who would have been safe if that had been in place".

Appendix 5: Description of reports about the Charlie Hebdo aftermath

The only report detected starts with mentioning that there is less political consensus on how to monitor terrorist suspects online. Especially the Liberal Democrats oppose the data legislation called "Snooper's Charter" to give security agencies more power to look at online communications whereas security chiefs want to close gaps in their "surveillance ability." A conservative MP states that "Public safety must come above everything else and that civil liberty must include not being bombed, shocked or beheaded." Home Secretary urges to bring forward the data bill and warns that "every day that passes, the capability of the people who keep us safe diminishes. As those more people in danger, crimes unpunished. Innocent lives will be put at risk." The Home Secretary further assumes that "communications data was used in the Paris attacks to locate the suspects." It is mentioned that the draft data bill was rejected by a committee because it was "too vague, too widely drawn, too much power in the hands of Home Secretary. They recommended that a new legislation was needed in a far more limited way and the government should provide more evidence and clarity about what they wanted to achieve." Further, the banning of encrypted communication is criticised, whereas the supporters justify this with no safe spaces for terrorists.