



Canadian Broadcast Media Wrong to Use 'America' in Productions Solely about People or Entities in or from United States

**Dr. Barry Wellar, C.M., RPP-Ontario (Lifetime)
Professor Emeritus, University of Ottawa
President, Information Research Board**

wellar.barry@gmail.com

<https://wellar.ca/informationresearch/>

October 2025

A. Report Objective

The objective of this report is to present a case for corporate and individual members of Canadian broadcast media to cease using the term 'America' when communicating solely about people or entities in or from United States.

B. Report Background

The first report in this component of the Information Research Board (IRB) program is [Canadian Politicians Wrong to Use 'America' in Public Statements Solely about People or Entities in or from United States](#), which was published in September 2025.

For reasons of research design, all the materials and findings in the precedent report directed at Canadian politicians are also pertinent to making a case for corporate and individual members of Canadian broadcast media to cease using the term 'America' when communicating solely about people or entities in or from United States.

As a result, pertinent materials and findings from the initial research report are overviewed. Interested readers may examine the source document for details in their original form.

C. Why Are Corporate and Individual Members of Canadian Broadcast Media Named as Parties to Cease Using the Term 'America' When Communicating about United States

In many of their productions, members of Canadian broadcast media report on statements made by Canadian politicians which refer to United States as 'America'.

As per the previous report, if Canadian politicians do not use the term 'America' when communicating about United States, then a possible source responsible for substituting America for United States in news productions is neutralized.

However, there are several ways that members of Canada's broadcast media can incorporate America in news productions that pertain solely to United States.

First, a politician's word choice of United States or any other person's word choice of United States can be replaced by a broadcast media person's word choice of America.

Second, a broadcast media person can use America as the term of choice for stories that pertain only to people or entities in or from United States, and not to people or entities in or from any of the other 33 countries, plus Greenland, plus protectorates and

territories that comprise continental America, which extends from Kaffeklubben Island, Greenland in the north to Aguila Islet, Chile in the south.

Third, a broadcast media person can repeat the term America as the term of choice for authors of or contributors (persons or entities) to stories that pertain only to people or entities in or from United States, and not to people or entities in or from any of the other 33 countries, plus Greenland, plus protectorates and territories that comprise continental America.

The primary reason for naming corporate and individual members of Canadian broadcast media to cease using the term America when communicating about United States is not because they can engage in actions one, two, and three, however, but because they do. Frequently.

And the fact that they do engage in such actions is cause for concern in several ways, as discussed in Section D, Section E, Section F, Section G, and Section H.

Section D outlines the test procedures and findings from the previous report ([Canadian Politicians Wrong to Use 'America' in Public Statements Solely about People or Entities in or from United States](#)) which provides fact-based reasons to call for Canadian politicians to cease using America in communications which refer solely to people or entities in or from United States.

Section E describes the catalysts for injecting this report into the Information Research Board's activity agenda at this time.

Section F discusses the principles and standards of Canadian journalism as the metric against which to assess the merits of calling for Canadian broadcast media members to cease using the term America in communications dealing with people or entities in or from United States.

Section G discusses the gap between the principles and standards of Canada's broadcast media community and its practices regarding the factually erroneous substitution of America for United States in stories about people or entities in or from United States.

And Section H explores popular (in the U.S.) Trump catchphrases such as "America First" and "Make America great again" along with several other U.S.-based Americentric phrases which add to the concern about Canadian broadcast media repeating what are basically shallow populist utterances.

D. Summary of Test Procedures and Findings from the Previous Study ([Canadian Politicians Wrong to Use 'America' in Public Statements Solely about People or Entities in or from United States](#)) Deemed Sufficient to Call on Canadian Politicians to Cease Using America as a Substitute for United States or U.S. in Communications Dealing with People or Entities in or from United States

There are five test procedures, and each of them generates a finding which is deemed sufficient to unequivocally confirm that America \neq United States, and United States \neq America.

Moreover, in combination they present an overwhelming case for Canadian politicians, journalists, and persons with reasonable cognitive skills to cease using America in productions solely about people or entities in or from United States.

First, and as shown in Table 1, America consists of 34 countries plus Greenland, and United States is just one of those named entities.

On its face Table 1 is an unequivocal and logically inarguable demonstration that United States \neq America.

Or, to rephrase for added emphasis which seems to be needed to drive home the factual point that United States \neq America and America \neq United States, the United States is far, far removed from equivalency with America since United States constitutes less than three (3) per cent of the named entities in Table 1.

As asked above, how equivalency or even casual substitutability between United States and America ever took root in Canadian broadcast media productions is an analytical mystery which is discussed in Section G, Principles and Standards of Canadian Broadcast Media.

Second, members of Canadian broadcast media frequently complement or supplement the texts of news stories with graphics, including maps.

Figure 1 may therefore have particular pertinence to members familiar with the adage, "A picture is worth a thousand words".

Figure 1 is an outline map of America showing the 34 countries of America, plus Greenland. One of those 34 countries is United States.

Table 1. Names of Countries in America (2025), plus Greenland*

Antigua and Barbuda (TC)	Dominica (TC)	Panama (CA)
Argentina (SA)	Dominican Republic (TC)	Paraguay (SA)
Bahamas (TC)	Ecuador (SA)	Peru (SA)
Barbados (TC)	El Salvador (CA)	Saint Kitts and Nevis (TC)
Belize (CA)	Greenland* (NA)	Saint Lucia (TC)
Bolivia (SA)	Grenada (TC)	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TC)
Brazil (SA)	Guatemala (CA)	Trinidad and Tobago (TC)
Canada (NA)	Haïti (TC)	United States (NA)
Chile (SA)	Honduras (CA)	Uruguay (SA)
Colombia (SA)	Jamaica (TC)	Venezuela (SA)
Costa Rica (CA)	Mexico (NA)	
Cuba (TC)	Nicaragua (CA)	

**Greenland is included in part because of nationhood discussions that are again in the news, along with news noises such as those emanating from America First promoters and provocateurs. And it is included in part to show due respect to the world's largest island which at 2,166,086 km² in total area is larger than Nunavut (2,093,190 km²), Canada's largest territory or province, and at 1.723 million km² is larger than Alaska, the largest state in U.S. (Thank you, Wikipedia.) Further, given the geopolitical news stories about the relatively massive deposits of rare-earth metals beneath Greenland's ice sheet, its strategic location for military and shipping route operations, and the impact of climate change on its extensive ice field, it would be an extreme oversight to not explicitly recognize Greenland in Table 1 as part of America's landmass. (1)*

It appears reasonable to use the term 'obviously' in stating that the outline of contiguous states comprising United States plus Alaska is obviously a subset of and is contained within the outline of America. And, obviously, there are large amounts of America outside United States which *de facto* means that, geographically, United States ≠ America and America ≠ United States.

Or, to rephrase in numeric terms, the area of America is in the vicinity of 42,550,000 km², and the land area of United States is about 9,800,000 km², which makes the United States' share of the outline map in Figure 1 less than 25%.

Or, to rephrase yet again, the area of America outside the contiguous states plus Alaska is about 32,750,000 km², or an area more than three times (3x) the area of Europe.

On its face, Figure 1 is an unequivocal and logically inarguable demonstration that, geographically, United States ≠ America, but in fact the United States is far, far removed

Figure 1. Outline Map of America



from geographical equivalency with America since United States constitutes less than 25% of the area of America.

The question again arises as to how equivalency between United States and America ever took root in Canadian broadcast media productions given that the area of United States constitutes less than 25% of the area of America. This analytical mystery is revisited in Section G, Principles and Standards of Canadian Broadcast Media.

Third, Table 2 (Table 4 in the previous report) barely scratches the surface of a table of contents for a hyperdimensional geodatabase listing the physical characteristics that reveal similarities and differences among countries in America.

Even so, for just that limited listing no evidence could be found that United States has equivalency with even one other country or Greenland for physical characteristics, much less all of America for many reasons including differences in latitude, altitude, geology, physiography, etc., which in turn affect climates and weather and, consequently, temperatures, aridity, humidity, fridity, seasonal variability, daylight hours, and so on.

Table 2. Physical Characteristics that Reveal Similarities and Differences Among Countries in America

Agricultural and non-agricultural land uses	Mineral resources
Agricultural products	metallic
Animals – domesticated	non-metallic
Animals – wild	energy resources
Blizzards	industrial resources
Boreal forests	fertilizer resources
Climate	rare metals
Deserts	Mountain ranges
Earthquake zones	Permafrost
Floods	Plant types
Forests	Rainforests
Fruits	Steppes
Glaciers	Topography
Grains	Tree types
Hurricanes	Vegetables
Ice fields	Volcanoes
Insects	Water area
Jungles	Water– fresh
Land area	Water– salt
	Weather

Figures 2, 3, 4, and 5 present a selection of small-scale physiographic maps for each of North America, Central America, The Caribbean, and South America to illustrate some of the differences in their physical geography characteristics. **(2)**

On its face, Table 2 provides the basis of an unequivocal and logically inarguable demonstration that, due to numerous differences in physical geography characterisations, United States \neq America, and in fact is far, far removed from equivalency with any country in America.

And, on their faces Figure 2, Figure 3, Figure 4, and Figure 5 provide the basis of an unequivocal and logically inarguable demonstration that, due to numerous readily observed differences in physical geography characterisations, United States \neq America, and in fact is far, far removed from equivalency with any country in America.

The question therefore again arises as to how equivalency or even casual substitutability between United States and America ever took root in Canadian broadcast media productions given the huge and obvious differences in physiographic characteristics of United States and the rest of America.

This analytical mystery is revisited in Section G, Principles and Standards of Canadian Broadcast Media.

Fourth, and expanding beyond the physical characterizations listed in Table 2 and illustrated in Figure 2, Figure 3, Figure 4, and Figure 5, there are innumerable social, cultural, lingual, political, racial, legal, criminal, institutional, governmental, financial, economic, educational, demographic, and technological characterizations which differentiate between United States and the other 33 countries and Greenland in America.

No evidence could be found which establishes that United States has one-to-one or even similar correspondence with any country in America, or Greenland, much less being representative of America for even one variable for any of those broad characterizations.

This brief extension of Table 2 provides the basis of an unequivocal and logically inarguable demonstration that due to differences in social, cultural, lingual, political, racial, institutional, financial, economic, educational, etc., characterisations, United States \neq America, and in fact is far removed from equivalency with any country in America.

Figure 2. Map Showing Physiographic Differences Between United States and Rest of North America



Figure 3. Map Showing Physiographic Differences in Central America v. United States in Figure 2



Figure 4. Map Showing Physiographic Differences in The Caribbean v. United States in Figure 2



Figure 5. Map Showing Physiographic Differences in South America v. United States in Figure 2



The question again arises as to how equivalency or even casual substitutability between United States and America ever took root in Canadian broadcast media productions given the huge differences in social, cultural, lingual, political, racial, institutional, financial, economic, educational, etc., characterizations of United States and the rest of America.

This analytical mystery is revisited in Section G, Principles and Standards of Canadian Broadcast Media.

And the fifth test procedure is based on the concept of distance, a popular topic among Canadians from east coast to north coast to west coast to Canada's border with the U.S. in the south, and for good reason.

Canada is the second largest country in the world, with approximate distance measurements such as more than 5,000 kms east to west, and more than 4,600 kms north to south.

It therefore follows that distance is mentioned in many broadcast media reports as part of the response to the where question in the Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How journalistic checklist of questions to answer in productions.

Bearing in mind, then, that distance ranks at the top of the scale with weather and hockey as core topics of conversation for many Canadians, questions again arise about substituting America for United States.

That is, what is the logic or other motivation behind substituting America for United States which in real-world terms requires ignoring or overlooking the 5,000 kms of America from the northern U.S. border to Kaffeklubben Island, Greenland, and 7,500 km of America from the southern U.S. border to Aguila Islet, Chile.

Or, to rephrase, how could it be that 12,000-13,000 linear kms of America outside United States in the N.-S. direction is not a number sufficient to establish that in the real world, and especially for Canadian broadcast media members, United States \neq America, and America \neq United States, not by a long-distance shot?

Again, for emphasis, and not to put too fine a point on the distance factor, but 12,000 - 13,000 kms is a huge amount of real estate to ignore or overlook in the process of substituting America for United states.

This analytical mystery is revisited in Section G, Principles and Standards of Canadian Broadcast Media.

Section E discusses the catalysts behind this report.

E. Catalysts for the Report, Canadian Broadcast Media Wrong to Use 'America' in Productions Solely about People or Entities in or from United States

Among their many deliverables, Canadian broadcast media inform Canadians of local, regional, national, and international events, situations, circumstances, processes, etc., involving people and entities, including people and entities in and from United States. Two catalysts account for producing this report at this time.

First, the conclusions arising from the previous report ([Canadian Politicians Wrong to Use 'America' in Public Statements Solely about People or Entities in or from United States](#)) are grounds for calling on Canadian politicians to cease using America in public statements which are about people and entities in or from the country of United States, and are not about people and entities in or from all countries plus Greenland plus territories and protectorates comprising America.

Due to the volume and frequency of Canadian broadcast media productions which report on Canadian politicians' statements, those findings could have major implications for Canadian broadcast media productions that use America rather than United States when referring to people or entities in or from United States.

Further, preliminary tests confirm the robustness of the test procedures, so it appears fair to say that the findings have general applicability regardless of the source which uses America rather than United States when referring to people or entities in or from United States.

The first catalyst, therefore, is paying service to the Information Research Board's Statement of Purpose (<https://wellar.ca/informationresearch/>). As noted above and in the previous report, the Information Research Board is deeply engaged in the reality → data → information → knowledge transform process, and that includes conducting methodologically designed research which can assist broadcast media achieve productions that better inform Canadians. **(3)**

And the second catalyst is derived from viewing and listening to Canadian broadcast media productions using the word America when reference is to people and entities in or from United States.

If the count came in at 2%-3% of productions, that is one thing. However, when it comes in at more than 90%, and with America being repeated multiple times in the span of a half-dozen paragraphs or comments, then I believe that is a matter of serious national concern for reasons contained in the conclusions from the previous report.

Examination of four high profile mentions of America in U.S. productions should be sufficient to illustrate the urgency behind the call for Canada's broadcast media community to cease using America when referring to people or entities in or from United States.

First, the phrase "Make America great again" has been described in multiple productions by such deprecatory terms as aimless, ambiguous, ambivalent, directionless, empty, fuzzy, indefinite, loose, meaningless, murky, nebulous, pointless, silly, vacuous, and vague, which makes it the stuff of a false narrative, fable, fiction, fantasy, etc., in part because it pertains only to United States and not to the 33 other countries plus Greenland which comprise America.

Numerous searches have not encountered any evidence-based arguments to the contrary regarding the emptiness of the phrase or its lack of real-world grounding.

It therefore appears fair to say that there is an urgent need to call "cease" on Canadian broadcast media members who might be inclined to take the phrase "Make America great again" at face value and erroneously include it in a production. **(4)**

Second, regarding the "America First" doctrine promoted for and by Donald Trump, no evidence was found of any prior examination of America First, including Canadian publications, which asked such basic and fundamental questions as:

1. Whether the term America is substantively described.
2. Whether the basis of the description is provided.
3. Whether there is evidence that the author(s) is(are) aware that there are 34 countries plus Greenland in America.
4. Whether there is mention that for reasons of logic, accuracy, and precision the proper reference in the digital communication is United States and not America.
5. Whether there is any evidence-based indication that America First is more than a slogan, motto, notion, catchphrase, and so on.

The substantive aspect of America First is minimal, and texts about America First might best be described as exercises in "veneering" because the America part is a false narrative, a fiction, a fable, a fantasy, – United States is not America –, no matter how many times that false narrative, fiction, fable, or fantasy is repeated.

It therefore appears fair to say that there is an urgent need to call "cease" on Canadian broadcast media members who take the America First doctrine at face value and include doctrinal materials in productions in a truth-without-proof manner. **(5)**

The third high-profile reference to America is the pronouncement by Donald Trump to relabel Gulf of Mexico as Gulf of America.

I hasten to emphasize that while the pronouncement is relevant to this report, its relevance is not due to Trump. Rather, it is due to the broadcast media response to the pronouncement. The back story is as follows.

The 2019 report, [DOES DONALD TRUMP HAVE THE KNOW-HOW TO SAVE THE U.S.A.?](#), revealed that Trump has little regard for and little or no training in science, with more than 99% of his 'knowledge' stemming from such non-scientific ways of knowing as authority, common sense-everyday experience, intuition, and revelation.

Based on that research, it is no surprise that Trump performed at the low expectations level when he pronounced Gulf of Mexico to be known as Gulf of America, apparently with no substantive argument to support the pronouncement, and no apparent direction or guidance from the U.S. Board on Geographic Names.

The late William Kelley, one of Trump's professors at the University of Pennsylvania, provided a heads up on the low expectations matter when he described Trump as "The dumbest goddam student I ever had". **(6)**

With that back story in place, questions arise about whatever happened to U.S., and Canadian broadcast media communities that so few of their productions took issue with the sheer inanity of Trump's pronouncement.

Did the respective broadcast media communities know of the above back story and related backstories regarding Trump's intellectual limitations, and decide that the foolishness of the pronouncement did not merit critical comment?

Did the respective broadcast media communities regard the pronouncement as nonsense on its face, and not worthy of comment, critical or otherwise?

Did the respective broadcast media communities not know the full extent of the manifest pomposity underlying the pronouncement, and simply let it pass as more Trump bombast not worthy of critical broadcast media consideration?

Did anyone in the respective broadcast media communities ask, "Why Gulf of America" and, if needed for the purpose of clarity. "What does Trump mean by America?"

And the fourth high-profile reference to America is the recent pronouncement by Donald Trump that the suspension by ABC News of late-night TV host Jimmy Kimmel represents

“Great news for America”.

Say what?

Each of the three preceding high-profile references to America is deemed false narrative, fiction, fable, or fantasy, but the “Great news for America” tag significantly compounds the false narrative, fiction, fable, or fantasy label attached to the slogan “Make America great again” and the doctrine of “America First”.

In brief, the catchphrase “Great news for America” uttered by the sitting U.S. president is an anti-free speech comment which should be anathema to the entire Canadian broadcast media community and put a sharper edge to the reasons for rejecting the substitution of America for United States.

Further, in that context the tag “Great news for America” has fascistic and anti-democratic tones which are amplified by the words in common with the slogan “Make America great again”.

It would have been one thing for Trump to leave his words at home, that is, refer to United States and not America.

However, evidence has not been found to expect discrete usage of the terms America and United States by Trump, which buttresses the argument for Canadian broadcast media productions to not substitute America for United States.

As for “Great news for America” and “America First”, there is little or nothing that the Canadian broadcast media community can do about the phrase or the doctrine *per se*, but in terms of doing what is within their power, it can ensure that Canadians are made aware that in both cases America is erroneously substituted for United States.

Section F provides a list of links to materials describing the principles and standards of Canada’s broadcast media industry, community, profession, affiliations, etc. The materials which can be digitally accessed via this selection appear sufficient to inform the reader of the broadcast media context which shaped the report.

F. Links to Materials Providing a Broadcast Media Context for the Report

The objective of this section is to inform readers and the Canadian broadcast media community in particular of the sources examined in arriving at the call for the community to cease wrongly using America as a substitute for United States in their public productions.

Further, readers may be aware of significant omissions on my part and are invited to bring these productions to my attention.

Due to time and resource constraints, the literature search and review activity is illustrative rather than comprehensive, but it is deemed sufficient for this report. Again, suggestions from readers about missed “must read” sources are invited.

Table 3. Links to Materials Reviewed for Canadian Broadcast Media Principles and Standards

<https://caj.ca/wp-content/uploads/principles.pdf>
<https://www.thecanadianpress.com/about/our-team-values/our-news-principles/>
<https://cbc.radio-canada.ca/en/vision/governance/journalistic-standards-and-practices>
<https://globalnews.ca/pages/principles-practices/>
<https://rtdnacanada.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/2016RTDNA Code Poster EN.pdf>
<https://www.theglobeandmail.com/about/editorial-code/>
<https://cjf-fjc.ca/codes-journalism-ethics/>
<https://nmc-mic.ca/about-newspapers/statement-of-principles/https://www.press-presse.ca/en/information/white-paper>
<https://cjf-fjc.ca/nature-journalism-ethics/>
<https://sites.ualberta.ca/~fchrste/LawsuitDocA/Ethics-CAJinvest.htm>
<https://j-schoolscanada.ca/blog/2-what-do-some-of-the-major-canadian-media-organisations-have-to-say-about-objectivity-impartiality-and-social-media-use/>
<https://canadacommons.ca/artifacts/19979513/guiding-principles-for-science-journalism/20880041/>
https://thetyee.ca/about_us/
https://www.thestar.com/about/toronto-star-statement-of-principles/article_2badeb9e-5812-58e8-b07b-add00ca67206.html
<https://www.cpac.ca/programming-policies>
[https://communication.iresearchnet.com/media/canada-media-system/ \(7\)](https://communication.iresearchnet.com/media/canada-media-system/)

Section G presents the principles and standards derived from review of materials associated with the links in Table 3.

G. Canadian Broadcast Media Principles and Standards Identified for this Report

Approximately 50 productions (media texts, columns, editorials, and videos, as well as academic texts) were reviewed to identify the core principles and standards to be upheld by the Canadian broadcast media community, and which are to be met by its individual members as editorial writers, columnists, reporters, supervisors, or in other capacities designated by the broadcast media community.

The primary objective in conducting the literature review, therefore, is to obtain from those materials the intended properties of productions created by members of Canada's broadcast media community.

That done, the properties can be used as an instrument to assess the appropriateness of calling on Canada's broadcast media community to cease using America when referring to people or entities in or from United States.

Table 4 lists the properties derived from examination of materials covered by the links in Table 3. The properties are listed in alphabetical order because establishing order of frequency, order of importance, order of priority, order of significance, etc. of 24 properties is beyond the scope of this humble project.

As the reader may notice, properties such as those in Table 4 may be expressed as nouns, adjectives, verbs, adverbs, gerunds, infinitives, or other figures of speech, and may refer to a production or to a member of the Canadian broadcast media community.

I am optimistic that readers will make whatever adjustments are needed to accept the terms as intended.

That list and the materials found by opening the links in Table 3 are informative in two respects pertinent to this report.

First, many of the properties and links point to the need or requirement of the Canadian broadcast media community to take a hard, sustained, critical look at populist terms which cut a wide swath, so to speak, such as America, which generates 3,440,000,000 web page results in a Google search. True, it has long been noted that language is an evolving process, but that is no excuse for throwing principles and standards out the window and accommodating those who have limited regard for communications principles and standards.

Table 4. Properties Which Are Deemed by the Canadian Broadcast Media Community to Show Due Regard for Its Principles and Standards

Accountab/le/ility	Complete/ness	Fair	Reliab/le/ility
Accurate/ly	Comprehensive	Honest/y	Responsib/le/ity
Actual	Context/ualized	Impartial/ity	Transparen/t/cy
Attribut/ed/ion	Corroborat/ed/ion	Integrity	Truth/ful
Balance/d	Ethical	Objectiv/e/ity	Unbiased
Cl/ear/clarity	Fact/ual	Open	Verif/y/ication

**The properties are listed alphabetically, and are not necessarily in order of frequency, importance, significance, or other order specified by Canadian broadcast media.*

Second, while there do not seem to be many comparative studies linking people in politics and those in journalism, Table 2 in the previous report and Table 4 in this report serve a very similar purpose.

That is, Table 2 from the previous report which is shown here as Table 5 presents a selection of properties describing the strengths of politicians' productions. Terms in Table 4 that are also found in Table 5 are highlighted in **green**.

Table 5. Examples of Criteria, Diagnostics, Characterizations, Features, Qualities, etc., which Canadian Politicians Could Use in Decisions to Accept Productions Which Substitute America for United States

accountable	dependable	integrous	realistic
accurate	direct	knowledge-based	reliable
actual	documented	lucid	replicable
authentic	ethical	measurable	robust
calculable	evidence-based	observable	science-based
candid	exact	open	sound
certain	explicit	practical	straightforward
clear	evaluable	precise	testable
confirmable	factual	principled	transparent
data-based	forthright	provable	truthful
defined	honest	proven	valid
demonstrable	information-based	rational	verifiable

As shown, there is direct overlap for ten terms, and if synonyms are used it seems likely that many and perhaps most terms in Table 5 would be deemed acceptable for inclusion in a broader list of properties within the scope of journalism's body of principles and standards.

All in all, then, and given that the terms in Table 5 are likely applicable to productions of Canada's most demanding organizations (8) it is reasonable to expect that members of Canada's broadcast media community also apply the terms in Table 5 with all due diligence and vigour when engaged with productions that do or could substitute America for United States.

Or, to rephrase in terms that are directly pertinent to this study, because broadcast media journalism in Canada is a profession whose productions are true to properties which are consistent with highest order methodologically designed research, there is reason for Canadians and the journalism profession to be concerned if the substitution of America for United States in broadcast media productions is more than an occasional blip.

Section H explores the disconnect between the words describing the properties of broadcast media principles and standards which on the evidence provided here point to not substituting America for United States, and broadcast media actions which include frequent occurrences of such substitutions in broadcast media print, radio, television, and digital productions.

H. Addressing the Disconnect Between Words and Actions of Canada's Broadcast Media Community in Dealing with an Error Such as Substituting America for United States in Public Productions

Substituting America for United States is factually wrong in several significant ways as demonstrated in the preceding report, [Canadian Politicians Wrong to Use 'America' in Public Statements Solely about People or Entities in or from United States](#).

The factual errors are summarized as follows.

1. America consists of 34 countries plus Greenland, and United States is just one of those named entities, so United States \neq America and America \neq United States.
2. The area of the Americas is in the vicinity of 42,550,000 km², and the land area of United States is about 9,800,000 km², so United States \neq America and America \neq United States.

3. Innumerable social, cultural, lingual, political, racial, institutional, legal, governmental, financial, economic, educational, criminal, demographic, and technological characterizations differentiate between United States and the other 33 countries and Greenland in America, so United States ≠ America and America ≠ United States.
4. Due to differences in latitude, altitude, physiography, geology, geomorphology, etc., which in turn affect climates and weather and, consequently, temperature, aridity, humidity, fridity, seasonal variability, daylight hours, etc., there is no equivalency in physical geography between United States and even one other country or Greenland much less all of America, so United States ≠ America and America ≠ United States.
5. America extends 5,000 kms north beyond the northern border of continental U.S. to Kaffeklubben Island, Greenland, and it extends 7,500 kms south beyond the southern border of continental U.S. to Aguila Islet, Chile, so distance-wise in a N-S orientation United States ≠ America and America ≠ United States by about 12,500 kms.

Returning to Table 4 and properties in the broadcast media body of principles and standards such as accuracy, clarity, completeness, context, corroboration, factuality, and transparency, with those properties in play 24/7, I cannot comprehend how the substitution of America for Unites States occurs with regularity, much less the high frequency of that substitution in all manner, depth, and societal significance of productions.

The end point is that I have been unable to find or imagine an explanation that might disabuse me of a seeming bizarre contradiction between words and actions by the broadcast media community regarding the substitution of America for United States.

As a result, in the absence of an explanation consistent with the properties in Table 4 for substituting America for United States, the call of this report is for Canada's broadcast media community to cease using the continental term America when referring to people and entities in or from United States because United States ≠ America and America ≠ United States.

I. Conclusion

Canada's broadcast media community has long been complicit in the practice of substituting America for United States, even though America is a distinct entity and is shown in this report to be drastically different from the United States to the

point that in multiple sections the reader is reminded that on the evidence United States ≠ America and America ≠ United States.

The flawed notion that there is equivalency between America and United States is frequently characterized in the report by terms such as fantasy, fable, and false narrative because the facts are irrefutable: United States ≠ America and America ≠ United States.

The bottom line, therefore, is that it is past time for the Canadian broadcast media community to collectively respect the properties of its body of principles and standards and **Cease Using America to Refer Solely to People or Entities in or from United States.**

J. Endnotes

1. In addition to the 34 countries plus Greenland, the land mass of America also consists of protectorates and territories. The notion that the country United States = America gets more bizarre with each scan.
2. There are millions of hardcopy and digital images available for anyone seeking more physiographic details at variable scales, levels of resolution, colour schemes, cross-sectional and longitudinal time frames, etc.
3. The reality → data → information → knowledge transform process is a fundamental component of scientific inquiry with its emphasis on methodologically designed research. For discussion of the transform process in the field of geographic information systems and science see, for example, ***Foundations of Urban and Regional Information Systems and Geographic Information Systems and Science*** (https://cdn.ymaws.com/thegpn.org/resource/resmgr/documents/resources/foundations_final2.pdf)
4. The term 'erroneously' is used to emphasize that substituting America for United States is not just a slip in the field of journalism – see Table 4 for properties of principles and standards of Canada's broadcast media community – it is an error that fails most of the properties in Table 4 and does not properly inform Canadians.
5. Same again you might say, repeating Endnote 4, because accepting the America First doctrine at face value in a truth-without-proof manner is a flat-out contradiction of properties in Table 4, with the result that lowering the quality of a news story means Canadians are not properly informed.

6. The quote by Professor Kelley has been the subject of much discussion, some of which can be viewed at <https://www.quora.com/>. The essence of the discussion seems to be whether Prof. Kelley ranked Trump as the worst student, the dumbest student, or the dumbest goddam student that he ever encountered, but the bottom line appears to be that Trump was a dud as a student.

7. The title that appears upon activating the link is Canada: Media System, and under the Communication Research drop-down menu is a very impressive list of subjects. Upon activating <https://communication.iresearchnet.com/media/united-states-of-america-media-system/>, the text that appears is titled United States of America: Media System, and, by now no surprise, the term 'American' is used to refer to the United States' approach.

8. Bodies that come to mind as having high-standing principles and standards include the Supreme Court of Canada and lower courts throughout Canada, the Order of Canada Advisory Council, and professional organizations in Ontario, for example, such as Ontario Professional Planners Institute, Association of Ontario Land Surveyors, Ontario Association of Architects, Professional Foresters Association, Professional Geoscientists of Ontario, and Professional Engineers Ontario which have a statutory duty to serve the public interest.

Acknowledgements

With much appreciation thanks are given to

- **Craig MacAulay** for proofreading assistance.
- **Sam Herold**, a University of Ottawa alumnus and one of my former students (Geography, Environmental Studies, and Geomatics) who made valuable contributions to this report through his text formatting, graphic design, and technical assistance.