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DEDICATION

To My Country, Libya which is part and parcel of the Arab Nation, and its people
ABSTRACT

The study is a content analysis of a sample of Western press coverage of the Libyan-American conflict of 1986. Three elite Western newspapers, The New York Times (United States), The Globe and Mail (Canada), and The Times (Great Britain) were selected for this study.

1,045 news stories were analyzed, representing all news stories in the three papers which dealt with Libya during the period of study from February 15th to June 30th, 1986.

In the period of study, the Western press still had the tendency to portray the Arab radical country negatively where evaluations were offered. As a revolutionary radical country, Libya was portrayed more negatively than positively, but the majority of stories in all three papers was coded "neutral".

The study confirmed that Western newspapers continue, in their coverage of Libya to apply a Western perspective. This was evident from where the news stories originated, from the news sources, from the lack of correspondents in Arab countries and from extensive use of local (London, New York, Toronto) newspaper staff. The Western perspective was also evident in the topics covered.

The Western press covered the raid period in great detail, especially its military aspects, and neglected other internal achievements in Libya. Only topics like oil and related issues of direct consequence to the West were treated repeatedly, while other economic, social, internal political news, as well as industrial and agricultural developments, were virtually ignored. The Western press is still dealing with crisis news in its coverage of Third World countries, and with a selected, limited choice of
topics (especially oil, terrorism): this may create an impression among readers that, while Libya was portrayed as a terrorist country, there was little or nothing occurring in Libya of a more positive nature.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1. The Purpose of the Study

This study analyzes the reporting of the continuing conflict between the United States of America and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in selected newspapers of three Western countries: The New York Times from the United States, The Times from Great Britain, and The Globe and Mail from Canada. The study examines, on a number of dimensions, the period surrounding the American air attack on Libya in the Spring of 1986. It compares the differences and similarities in the agendas set by these dailies, and examines the political direction of reporting of the issues.

Most Middle East countries claim that Western media consistently portray events there negatively and, moreover, promote the perception that people from the Middle East, and especially Libya, are terrorists. The concern of the present study is to analyze Libya, as an example of a radical Arab country, as it was portrayed in the Western press before, during, and after the American air raids against Libya.

Furthermore, in the West, Qaddafi and his country are perceived as being instigators of terrorist acts in the Middle East and in Western societies. It is not necessary to demonstrate that Western newspapers such as The New York Times, The Globe and Mail, and The Times share their societies’ perceptions about Libya’s leader, Qaddafi, and his revolutionary policy: this is understood. However, it is important to describe the quality of the commentaries that they make concerning
Libya and its leader. By that, I mean the kind of descriptors and phraseology, the degree of regard or lack of regard which they held for the central subject as well as the evaluation that these newspapers present in their overall assessment of Qaddafi. It is in this sense that it is possible to justify the importance of the study undertaken here. In addition, comments by others also point out the importance of the raid so as to make the study of the reportage significant. For example, Hackett's commentary is illustrated (1989:2):

the Libyan raid was subject to a wide range of possible interpretations. For example, it could be seen as a justified act of retaliation by an aggrieved victim against a state sponsor of terrorism, or alternatively, as itself an act of state terror against innocent civilians.

Hackett added,

the arguments surrounding the raid touched on many of the concepts (terrorism, appeasement, deterrence) prominent in discourses pertaining to peace and security. [Moreover,] for these reasons, the Libyan raid was a fruitful case study in the openness to dissent and handling of contending peace/security discourses by the [Western] press (1989:2).

Also, other elements related to the internal and external policy of the Libyan government are reflected in published news stories and thereby may make this study interesting as well as importance. For example, in terms of external policies:

1- The Libyan government since the revolution in 1969 has offered unlimited support for the Palestinian cause;

2- Libya has supported a variety of liberation movements in Africa, Asia, Europe, and Latin America; and

3- Libya has given the Soviet Union hard currency by buying arms.

Internal policies are also of significance:

1- Libya nationalized all Western oil companies operating in Libya;
2- Libya nationalized all foreign banks in Libya;

3- Libya expelled all Western military bases from Libya;

4- The revolutionary system in Libya adopted a new political, economical and social ideology based on the Third Universal Theory written by Qaddafi; and

5- The independence of the Libyan government from foreign aid depends on its oil industry.

In this context, certain hypotheses concerning the developed countries’ press coverage of Libyan events will be tested. Some background information is necessary in three areas:

1- Libya’s general treatment in the Western press;

2- The Libyan-American political relationship since the revolution of September 1969; and

3- The socio-political context in Libya, where the conflicts took place.

The period analyzed in this study is February 15th, 1986, to June 30th, 1986. It is divided into three main time periods:

1- (Tension) The pre-raid period from February 15th to April 14th, 1986.

Tension increased in this period due to two main events. First was the bombing of an West Berlin night club, in which one American soldier and one Turkish woman died. The American government accused Libya of this terrorist action, while Libya strongly denied the charge. The second event was the incident of the Gulf between U.S. and Libyan planes in the Gulf of Sidra on March 24th, 1986, along with the exercises of the American Sixth fleet near Libyan territorial waters at that time.
2- (Conflict) The raid period from April 15th to April 30, 1986.

The rationale behind choosing this period is that the American raids against Libya occurred in this month. At 2 AM, Libyan time, on Tuesday, April 15th, a number of American F-111 aircraft took off from American military bases in Britain and bombed the two largest Libyan cities, Tripoli and Benghazi, including the Azizya Barracks where the Libyan Leader (Qaddafi) and his family were living. Furthermore, Libyan retaliation against an Italian Island, Lampedusa, occurred in response to the American raids on Libya.

3- (Resolution) The post raid period from May 1st to June 30th, 1986.

In the aftermath of the raids, Western leaders, including those of Japan, gathered for an economic summit in Japan during May of 1986. They agreed on an announcement which mentioned Libya by name as the country responsible for encouraging terrorism.

These events permit this study to be divided into the three time periods indicated. Such a structure of the study will enable us to determine, on a comparative basis, which events were given attention, and how the Western press portrayed Libya, its political and revolutionary system, and its political leaders. We may also compare how the Western press reacted to these various events.

In summary, this study may prove useful in shedding further light on attitudes found in America, Great Britain, and Canada about radical Arab countries in general, and Libya in particular, at least from the perspective of the major newspapers of those three societies. In other words, the study analyzes which
aspects of behavior of the two parties of the conflict were covered by the three newspapers, and how they evaluated these aspects.

1.2. Theoretical Framework

1.2.1. The Agenda Setting Function

The theory used in this study is based on the concepts of gatekeeping and agenda setting. "The agenda setting function of the mass media is the capability of mass media to select and emphasize certain issues and thereby cause those issues to be perceived as important by the public" (Severin and Tankard, 1987:253).

Keeping this in mind, this study focuses upon the agenda developed in certain newspapers with respect to perceptions of the Libyan-American conflict, including attitudes toward the countries that are involved in the conflict and toward their political systems, ideologies and political leaders. What the public knows about certain affairs [conflict] at any given time is largely a product of media gatekeeping. Regarding this, McCombs and Shaw (1977:12) maintain:

This notion of the agenda setting function of the mass media is a relational concept specifying a strong positive relationship between the emphases of mass communication and the salience of these topics to the individuals in the audience. This concept is stated in casual terms: increased salience of a topic or issue in the mass media influences (causes) the salience of the topic or issue among the public.

The agenda-setting premise tries to build a relationship between the source and the receiver through the agenda. Agenda-setting affirms a relationship between what media emphasize and what the public comes to consider as significant. Through the media, people in general gain a fairly good understanding of public affairs. Furthermore, the media enable people to differentiate critical and important
topics from the trivial and unimportant ones. Accordingly, events related to the American-Libyan conflict are mediated by the three Western newspapers, which provide ideas or views which extend far beyond the readers' immediate experience. "Hence, the way in which the press reports the news [about a conflict] is extremely important if readers are to have an informed opinion" (Cuthbert, 1984:2).

The agenda-setting focus stresses the order in which media place issues before the public for discussion, and the effects thus created. Lang and Lang (1981:337) point out that "the mass media force attention to certain issues. They build up public images or political figures, they are constantly presenting objects suggesting what individuals in the mass media think about, know about, have feelings about." In this regard, Long said:

In a sense, the newspaper is the prime mover in setting the territorial agenda. It has a great part in determining what most people will talk about, what most people will think the facts are, and what most people will regard as the way problems are to be dealt with (Long, 1958:260).

Cohen observed that,

the press is significantly more than a purveyor of information. It may not be telling people what to think but it is stunningly successful in telling its readers what to think about. And it follows from this that the world looks different to different people, depending not only on their personal interests, but also on the map that is drawn for them by the writers, editors and publishers of the paper they read (1963:13).

The press can be used to inform the public about certain issues or to influence them to accept certain views related to various political and economic affairs. Also, some argue, "while the [press] may have little influence on the direction or intensity of attitudes, it is hypothesized that, the [press] sets the agenda for each political
campaign, influencing the salience of attitudes toward the political issues" (McCombs & Shaw, 1972:177). So, too, do the world's media affect public opinion concerning Libya.

Severin and Tankard have summarized agenda setting and its function as follows:

> agenda setting is one of the possible ways that the Media can have an effect on the public. Agenda setting is the idea that the news media, by their display of news come to determine the issues the public thinks about, talks about (Severin and Tankard, 1987:264).

The agendas set by the newspapers are due largely to gatekeepers' decisions. Gatekeepers in newspapers are those who determine what will be highlighted through the press and what will be neglected. Soderlund et al. offer this definition regarding the gatekeeper: "A gatekeeper is any social institution, social context, activity or thing that has as a consequence of its characteristics or behavior, the effect of modifying media content" (Soderlund et al., 1984:33).

Schramm (1960:120) indicated that, "a few important gatekeepers have an enormous power over views of our environment." He also developed the idea that the role of the gatekeeper in mass communication is that, "at every point along the chain, someone has the right to decide whether the message shall be received and re-transmitted in the same form, or with change" (Schramm, 1960:176). Schramm added that the gatekeepers, by saying yes or no to the messages that come to them along the chain, play one of the most important roles in social communication.

As result of this, the news we see and hear or the information we receive from the various mass media about the American-Libyan conflict is the result of decisions made by gatekeepers. Thus, while many events took place in Libya during the period under study, it's likely that not all of these events were reported. The
public knowledge about the American-Libyan conflict comes primarily from the mass media. Shaw and McCombs (1977:7) stated "our knowledge of political affairs [like political or military conflict between two countries] is based on a tiny sample of the real political world. That real world shrinks as the news media decide what to cover and which aspects to transmit in their reports." The quality of foreign news gathering depends on the journalistic and professional skills of writers and reporters alike.

Therefore, a correspondent or reporter may work hard to report accurate and objective news. But the criteria of selecting news for printing and "the decision to highlight certain aspects of the news while ignoring others" (Rafiq, 1984:14) depend on the way a newspaper is organized. This process affects the final news story. In addition, reporters normally cannot give the same guarantee of anonymity that other interviewees are usually offered (Rafiq, 1984:14).

Thus, "everything the news source may say or do [about certain issues] in the presence of the newspaperman is coloured, almost inevitably, by the fact that what is said may find its way into print" (Carter Jr, 1958:143).

In summary, the newspapers set the agenda which, controlled by decisions made by the gatekeepers, influences the public and leads them to an awareness of certain issues.
1.2.2. Factors Influencing International News Flow

The flow of international news has been controlled by several factors. Regarding this matter, Ostgaard (1965:45-46) stated a number of determining factors, including political and economic factors, and "stressed that the news media tend to reinforce or at least to uphold the divisions of the world between high status nations and low status nations." Robinson and Sparkes (1976: 205-206) added more factors which may determine the flow of news; for example, "technical, economic, editorial weighing and pressures of the marketplace." Therefore, one can argue that the decision makers in newspapers face a very difficult task regarding the flow of international news.

The distance between the country where the news stories originated and the country that published these stories seems to be a factor in creating controversy. Some scholars argue that "news interest declined with distance" (Maclean and Pinna, 1958). On the other hand, Kariel and Rosenvall found "that no substantial relationship existed between news flow and physical distance; but when news flows from the U.S to Canada were analyzed, some cross-border affinities were present" (1984:510).

The conclusion can be made regarding physical distance that, in the age of information technology, the distance factors have no effect on flow of news as the new technological inventions turned our world into what McLuhan (1964) called the "Global Village."

Population and trade factors have been observed by scholars as causes of the flow of international news. A study about Middle East news in Swedish print media
by Rosengren and Rikardsson (1974:104) found that as a determining factor of news flow, trade is more important than population. Also, Kariel and Rosenvall in their study of flow of news between Canada and U.S. found that "a positive relationship does exist between news volume and the population size of the state of news origin" (1983-A: 54).

Finally, regarding the cultural affinity, Kariel and Rosenvall found in their study of news printed in the Canadian press "a significant relationship between news from the country with which there is the affinity, that is, French-language newspapers favour news from French-culture countries and English language newspapers favour news from the United Kingdom" (1983-B: 431-436).

1.3 Overview of the Study

Chapter one presents a general introduction to the study, and the main bases of it, plus the theoretical framework.

Chapter two reviews the literature on the coverage of news in the Western press about the Third World in general and the Middle East (Arabic countries) in particular, as well as the image of Libya in the Western press.

Chapter three reviews modern Libyan history since its independence. It especially touches on the 1969 revolution, followed by its radical changes, such as the 1977 declaration of the Authority of the People. The second section of this chapter deals briefly with the contradiction in the American-Libyan political relationship between 1969 and 1986, and how this relationship developed from a
political confrontation to a military one over the Gulf of Sidra, followed by the US air attack on Tripoli and Benghazi.

Chapter four details the methodology of this study, which is based in the content analysis of three elite Western newspapers.

Chapter five analyzes and discusses the content of the three selected Western newspapers, The New York Times, The Globe and Mail (Toronto) and The Times (London), papers which are influential in their own societies, between February 15th and June 30th, 1986.

The conclusions follow in Chapter Six.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1. Background of the Problem: Western News Coverage

This chapter deals with news coverage of foreign news in the Western media. Coverage of Third World news in particular has been creating a lot of controversy. Some researchers have indicated that the coverage of the Third World is very negative, others have argued that the coverage has become more positive. In this chapter, I will discuss how the Western media cover foreign news in general, how they cover the Third World, and the Middle East. Finally, I will discuss how Libya is treated in the Western media, and how Western reporters portray Libya’s leaders and its political system.

2.1.1. Coverage of Foreign News

Coverage of foreign news is costly and, to cut costs, as Rosenblum (1979:11-27) argues, the trend towards "parachute journalism" is rising. Journalists working at home or in big foreign offices are dispatched to trouble spots as major stories develop. Because of deadlines and the constraints of an information-hungry public, journalists do not have enough time to develop a solid feel for information, and the possibilities of misinterpretation of events are increased substantially.

Not fully knowing the local language maybe the main problem which foreign correspondents face when covering events in the Third World countries. In this regard, Carter Jr. (1958: 141) observed that "language barriers are, of course, real or potential
sources of difficulty in the interaction between news source and news writer." Rafiq said;

in situations of [conflict], the correspondent’s ability to reach and deal with information diminishes. The vast distances, inadequate communication and travel restrictions make it almost impossible to obtain first hand knowledge of a news story (1984:12).

Berman, (1983:5) offered an example from Libya when he reiterated the words of Jim McKillop of the Glasgow Herald who said "journalists were taken to the people's congress. We were kept there about three hours. I didn’t understand a word of it."

Accordingly, in a limited circumstance where the reporters have no common approach to public officials and have no knowledge of the local language, they manage to gain news from those sources most readily obtainable (Rafiq, 1984:12). For example, correspondents turn for help to "diplomatic sources such as American embassies" (Tyner, 1983:3). It has been reported that,

 correspondents told Davison¹ that diplomats often use them either to change a nation’s image or to communicate with another country... [Also], another study showed that New York Times editorial treatment of India increased favorably as United States relations with India improved. United States media coverage of the people's Republic of China before and after Nixon's visit to that country in the early 1970s would reveal similar findings" (Lent, 1977:47).

This may suggest that Western newspaper coverage of the Third World has been influenced by Western diplomats who identify the news with their political interests.

The problem of journalists' values also appears in the coverage of foreign news. Each reporter has a personal value system which emerges from his or her society, and these values are reflected in gathering and writing the news. Carter Jr. (1958:141)

¹ W. Phillips Davison is Professor of Journalism and Sociology at Columbia University.
points out that "each group has its own beliefs and values which are passed on to newcomers in the profession. On the other hand, there is a more inclusive value framework in our newsman's view of what is important and what is not." Peterson (1979:119) suggested that "this value orientation may affect news selection by establishing a preference among newsmen from Europe and North America for news events in which individual human beings (rather than social forces) are clearly the focus of the story."

The former Minister of Information in Tunis, Mustapha Masmoudi (1979:173), emphasized that

information is distorted by reference to moral, cultural or political values peculiar to certain states, in defiance of the values and concerns of other nations. The criteria governing the selection of news are consciously or unconsciously based on the political and economic interests of the transitional system and of the countries in which this system is established.

Also, Downing argues, "[United States] media commentary on political repression in the Third World has been said to be highly selective, with the governments allied to the United States, such as Indonesia and El Salvador, given little or no criticism on their human rights record" (Downing, 1988:6).

Western media work according to Western values and traditions in covering the news.

American news media may exhibit a pro-Western orientation in the selection of the subject matter of published news accounts. For example, Semmel concluded that American coverage of foreign news in four major United States dailies was' Eurocentric, big-power dominant, and Western oriented (Riffe & Shaw 1982: 617).
Similarly, Cuthbert stated "reporters are traditionally assumed to take their values from the standards and codes of their profession, which should result in similar coverage of events" (Cuthbert, 1984:3).

In any part of the world the press might contribute to the survival of the dominant economic and political system. This is the functional nature of the press prevailing in the socialist, communist and capitalist countries. In other words, media are often closely related to the political and economic dominant in the country they belong to.

Another problem of accurate reporting arises when reporters cannot enter a country. They may feel forced to write about events from the outside, which may lead them to publish incorrect news or news stories which are far from reality. Lent (1977:49) reports some objection from other researchers about foreign news coverage by the Western newspapers, and about special correspondents who cannot make decisions without contacting their office in New York.

In summary, there are many problems facing foreign correspondents. Some of these problems, such as the language problem, are considered social barriers. Other problems are created by the correspondents themselves, when they label news stories with their own political beliefs and values. Also, reporters are directed in activities by their news offices and editors and their values.

2.1.2. Controversy over Western Media Coverage of the Third World

Many Third World countries claim information is transmitted based on the interests of the First World. They claim news reports always contain negative coverage and give the rest of the world a bad image of their countries. Actually, this biased
news regarding the Third World has become a major subject of the continuing controversy over a New Information and Communication Order. Scholars point out that "research examining the characteristics and dynamics of international news flow typically has shown that news events in developing nations of Africa are only infrequently reported in the Western media and when they are, often focus on crisis events" (Hachten and Beil, 1985:626).

Although some journalists argue this is the "kind of news that Africa -- plagued by chronic political instability and economic chaos -- has been making, proponents of a New World Information Order view such crisis reporting as a major shortcoming of Western press coverage" (Hachten and Beil, 1985:626). Similarly, Downing (1988:5) concluded that the "[United States] coverage of Latin America has been rather minimal and coverage of central America very obviously dominated by crisis reporting."

The focus of the press in general on crisis events is not a new issue. As early as 1949 Harold Innis had condemned the press for being 'compelled to seek the striking rather than the fitting phrase, to emphasize crisis rather than developmental trends," as a result of "the pressure of the publishers and the advertisers" (Innis, 1949:15). To reinforce this point, Innis quotes Escott, the journalist, who said that "his [the journalist’s] duty to his paper requires the discovery of a new crisis or a new era." Innis adds that "[t]he journalist has long been and will always remain, a stormy petrel, a fisher in troubled waters, one whose activities tend to excite, not to moderate, the popular passions" (Innis, 1949:15).

Keenleyside, Mackie and Burton (1986-87:19) have argued that "the Canadian press focused on what can be described as 'hard news' items of political military
nature, while giving little attention to 'soft news' of a cultural, scientific, economic or development character." In addition, many studies concerning United States wire service coverage of foreign countries have suggested that, "general [United States] media coverage of the rest of the world, especially the Third World countries, tends to be crisis oriented and drawn to sensational and atypical happenings" (Weaver and Wilhoit, 1984:160).

Furthermore, Schmitt and Soderlund (1982:71) found in their study regarding Canadian and United States media coverage of Latin America and Caribbean issues that coverage in the North American media is very similar. The evaluation of Latin America and Caribbean in this coverage was generally negative.

Not in all cases do the Western press report primarily crisis news. A study examining Ghana and Tanzania found that evidence "does not support the charges of Masmoudi and other proponents of a new order that the Western press reports only crisis events in these nations. Instead, they suggest a tendency for the Western press to report crisis events only when journalists judge that they are important enough to risk possible expulsion" (Hachten and Beil, 1985:629). On the other hand, Breslau (1987:46) said:

American coverage of African affairs has been striking for its paucity and lack of sophistication. More alarming than this troubling state of affairs, however, is how that sparse coverage has been shaped and used by various U.S administrations to further specific political agendas. A recent example of this kind of media manipulation was the orchestration of news during the months surrounding the American bombing of Tripoli and Benghazi, Libya, on April 15 1986.

Peterson has summarized the problems of Western news media coverage of the Third World; the criticisms have revolved around two particular points:
1-Western news coverage underreports Third World countries in comparison with the rest of the world; and

2-Western news coverage of the Third World is likely to be more negative. The Third World countries have created a Non-Aligned News pool the purpose of which is to integrate the news agencies of the nonaligned countries so as to reduce reliance upon Western news agencies (Peterson, 1981:159).

In addition, some argue, under-developed countries are part of the process which causes distortion and bias toward themselves. Not only do the first World countries get a misrepresented and biased image, but the Third World nations also get a distorted image of themselves through their use of First World wire agencies (Rafiq, 1984:9). This observation may lead us to believe the concept that the "Third World has not spoken with one voice" regarding its charges that the Western press distort their news (Okigbo, 1988:141). Indeed, some empirical studies suggest that Third World countries are "guilty of the same biases for which Western reporters are being accused by Third World governments" (Okigbo, 1988:142). A study regarding Nigerian press coverage of news found "that 76% of the total news stories were local, while 24% foreign" (Okigbo, 1988: 142). Nwuneli and Udoh found (1982:39) "that the Nigerian press publish more stories from the Third World countries than from the industrial nations and the communist World... Nigerian newspapers are largely local in orientation with little or no interest in international high-voltage political and economic news."

Also, another study done regarding foreign news in two Jordanian newspapers (Al-Ray 'Opinion' and Al-Dustur 'Constitution') found that "the papers gave more space to foreign news coming from the Third World than they did to foreign news coming from the developed countries. The papers devoted 3,584.5 column inches (23.63%) of their foreign news space to the developed countries" (EL Sarayrah, 1986). This report may
confirm the Third World press "to be much like the press of other World regions by focusing on events in its immediate locality" (Okigbo, 1988: 148); this may be natural for the function of the media everywhere.

In addition, the Third World press also sees the world in terms of conflict and crises. Nwuneli and Udoh report on several studies of the Nigerian press regarding the international news which found that Third World newspapers are guilty of the same bias of which the Western press has been accused (Nwuneli and Udoh, 1982:33). These studies found that the Nigerian press has the tendency to cover news stories associated with crises. Furthermore, news about the First World presented in the Nigerian press was chiefly "political conflicts, war and negotiations for arms, violence and crime" (Nwuneli and Udoh, 1982:33).

In summary, coverage of the Third World has been labelled by some scholars as negative, while others have said the Third World is getting neutral and positive coverage. Supporting their claim that reporting of Third World news is dominated by negative coverage, scholars say that most coverage by Western media is crisis reporting on events such as coups and natural disasters. On the other hand, researchers who believe that Western media contain positive and neutral coverage in their news said that most of the Third World countries have only one kind of news stories, those labelled as crises and conflicts, and if there is a problem of bad coverage, it does not originate with the reporters. The Third World countries are part of operations which distort their news and their image. Most of the Third World news agencies depend on Western wire services to cover international news. Accordingly they are themselves guilty of reporting crises and negative news about their countries.
2.1.3. Western Media Coverage of the Middle East

One of the most controversial issues in contemporary Western journalism is the question of whether Western newspapers are biased in dealing with issues related to the Third World in general and the Middle East (Arab countries) in particular. Specific studies do suggest that there is much to be desired in Western coverage of the Third World. Barton and Gregg (1982) found that "Middle East coverage reiterated certain limited themes and avoided detail, complexity, or ambiguity."

As we know, most of the Arab countries are Third World countries. Accordingly, Arab countries in general, and radical countries in particular, have complained that the Western media distort news about them. They claim that the Western coverage of Middle Eastern countries is more likely to be concentrated on crisis events, and biased.

Other researchers have affirmed that reporters in the Western press deal with negative events when they cover Third World news. For example, Delorme and Murad (1982: 24) argue that the "reliability and honesty of the American media in covering and relating Middle East events rates poorly." For example,

NewsWeek who published false photographs showing the Israeli Air Force bombing the Egyptian front in 1973 blindly associated Muammar Qadhafi with terrorism. The public believed what it read in the October 22nd issue article, although the photo had been taken in 1967 during an aerial pageant of the Israeli Air Force (Delorme and Murad, 1982:24).

Choquet (1984:79) observed that:

what happens when we get into the realm of commentary and analysis or what is known in the jargon as 'Public Affairs' coverage. If generally, we get poor reporting here about stories happening in the Middle East, [but] it is not necessarily because the reporting of stories concerning the Middle East is bad, it is rather, that the quality of reporting, generally speaking, is very poor, whatever the topic, and it is even poorer when the topic is as complex as the whole Middle East issues with all the ramifications of the Palestine question coming into play.
For the Canadian media, Keenleyside, Mackie and Burton (1986-87:21) have argued, "Canadian press coverage of the Middle East is part of the wider problem of inadequate Canadian media coverage of international events in general, [but] the Middle East is more poorly served than most other regions." This is due to the fact that there is a lack of news bureaus. Other difficulties, however, include tough measures imposed by Third World countries on any Western country with the intention of opening an information office in their territories. In this manner, Keenleyside, Mackie and Burton (1986-87:21) emphasized that neither "the Canadian Press news agency nor The Globe and Mail has a permanent correspondent in the region, even though the latter has recently opened several more foreign bureaus elsewhere in the world." They suggest as reasons why some of the Middle East countries still do not have foreign news bureaus the

special difficulties to be overcome in reporting and analyzing events in the Middle East such as problems of communication of the outsider in such linguistically and culturally diverse areas (Keenleyside, Mackie and Burton 1986-87:21).

In addition to these problems, and in regard to a Middle East country such as Lebanon, "the media did not seem to be aware that there was a civil war in Lebanon before the Israeli invasion; Lebanon had been effectively ignored or [news] suppressed" (Emerson, 1986-87:5). Moreover, the Canadian television networks and print media in their coverage of Middle East events depend on American material (Choquet, 1984:78). According to Hackett (1989:1) "in the case of Canada, a member of NATO and a close ally of the [United States], news coverage would tend to be supportive of the Western bloc and the [United States] role in the World, and 'hostile' to perceived
fundamental threats to Western interests, whether from external forces or internal dissent."

Other scholars affirm that the coverage of the Middle East in general and Arab countries in particular has become more positive. Especially after the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982, the amount of coverage of Arab countries in comparison with Israel has become more equal.

Barrance and Shyles (1988:178) have explained why the American media gave more and positive coverage to Israel than any country in the region: they indicate this is so, "because Israel is culturally, politically and ideologically closer to the United States than other Mideast nations". However, Emerson (1986-87:3) argues that bias is not the primary problem "I think what was wrong with American coverage of the Middle East in the past was not so much a lack of objectivity, whatever that means, but really a lack of enterprise and imagination".

Finally, Reston (1967:48) has described how American newspapers cover news stories.

In fact, the truth is that most American newspaper people are really more interested in dramatic spot news, the splashy story, than in anything else. They want to be in on the big blowout, no matter how silly, and would rather write about what happened than whether it made any sense (Reston, 1967:48).

The content of news stories and editorials is directed at audiences which have the same cultural and national identity. Media and audience share the values and interests and stereotypes prevailing in their society (Hackett, 1989:1). This statement can probably be made about the media of most, if not all countries; it is not an attribute of the Western press exclusively.
2.1.4. Libya’s Treatment in the Western Press

How Libya is presented in Western newspapers and the comparative frequency of foreign news appearing in the Western media are areas which have been researched. "The most striking results emerging from empirical studies show that foreign news distribution in the Western media is unjust and very selective" (Rafiq, 1984:17).

Many studies have indicated that the American press tends to reflect the relative distances between America and other national news targets (Semmel, 1977:317). In addition, Rafiq argued:

[Middle East] news is not a permanent feature on the agenda of the Western press, but rather that the Western media tend to reinforce the division of the world between high and low status nations; the relatively few developed countries are consistent news makers while the Third World countries are, for the most part, neglected" (Rafiq, 1984:18).

Generally speaking, journalists are based mostly in the leading capitals. Only a few writers and reporters cover other areas and capitals of the world. When events take place in areas lacking media coverage, correspondents and reporters go in flocks to these areas, and thus coverage increases remarkably. Nevertheless, as soon as these events are over the attention of reporters and correspondents is focused on other areas with fresh events (Rafiq, 1984).

An average Westerner gets news about Third World countries and their "peoples almost exclusively through the information media: the press and television. Because of this, the press and television have become powerful image makers by virtue of being the sole conveyors of news"(Abdul Baa’ith, 1982:77). Much of the information that Western people receive about Libyan affairs depends on which media they read or which newscasts they watch, and how these media have presented Libya. A 1982 survey found that Libya was viewed in the context of a single word: terrorism.
The reported 'terrorist' activities included Libya's support for Palestinian rights and the Palestine Liberation Organization...; support for a variety of liberation struggles including the Irish Republican Army, African liberation movements, and Muslim insurgents in Eritrea and Philippines (Abdul Baa'ith, 1982:78).

These groups are considered by Libya as liberation movements whose members are freedom fighters. Nevertheless, these same groups are viewed by the West as terrorist ones. Accordingly, this support to variety of liberation movements from the Libyan government may distort its image in world opinion, especially when some of these groups are not truly revolutionary movements, and carry out terrorist activities in the name of the revolution. This support may lead the Western media to portray Libya as a terrorist state. "The American media have [presented] Libya as a terrorist state, and this harmonizes with the American government's [perception of] Libya" (Abu-Osba, 1982:67). To confirm this point and to show how the American government perceives Libya, The New York Times reported on November 13, 1981:

After reporting to the committee that he had been told that the assailant was 'a young man in his early 30's bearded and of Middle Eastern origin', Mr. Haig said: We have no other information, except to underline once again that we do have repeated reports that come to us from reliable sources that Mr. Qaddafi has been funding, sponsoring, training, harbouring terrorist groups who conduct activities against the lives and well-being of American diplomats and facilities."

Furthermore, in mobilization of world opinion against Libya, three days before that report was released, an editorial in The Washington Post of November 10, 1981 portrayed Qaddafi as a barbaric, dangerous and terrorist person. The editorial asked:

How dangerous is Col.Qaddafi? One school of thought holds that he is an overcompensating anti-imperialist capable only of an occasional assassination and that the West simply gives him ideas and advertises its own importance by thinking he can do much more. But this is a patronizing and misleading view. His oil wealth, his Soviet connection, his feel for Arab and Islamic currents and his tactical boldness have
made him a menace out of all proportion to his nation's underdevelopment and small size.

It is possible that the initiative for portraying Libya and its leader negatively lies with policy makers in the U.S. government rather than with the Western press. Weimann (1986:12) argues that policy-makers can be blamed for manipulating the media. In the case of terrorism, however, both policy-makers and media might contribute to the "misinformation and distortion of facts". Weimann posits that "a perfect example of this is the deliberate portrayal of Qaddafi as the key figure and villain behind most of the World's terrorism, deliberately diffused to the American media by U.S. government officials for the purpose of raising public support for anti-Libyan action" (1986:12). This point could drive us to evaluate the coverage of Libya over the last ten years. This coverage suggests a Libyan connection with the Soviet Union and Libyan military affairs. Similarly, Breslau, in discussing media coverage of Libya since 1981 maintain:

Media coverage of Libya in the years and months preceding the bombing offers another clue. The demonizing of Qaddafi began in earnest in the summer of 1981 with the first U.S.-Libyan clash in the gulf of Sidra, in which two Libyan jets were shot down. Libya was then publicly identified as a prime mover in the Soviet-inspired "terror network" and Qaddafi had become, as Secretary of State George Shultz later called him, "his own smoking gun" (Breslau, 1987:46).

Eaks goes so far as to say that the "Western press gives the public disinformation about Libya: The Western press has carried reports of an alleged Soviet presence in Libya, despite the absence of any evidence to [support] such claim" (Eaks, 1982:28). On the other hand, European press coverage of the bombing in April 1986, was generally cautious, yet in the United States uncritical and jingoistic headlines, such as New York Newsday's 'SAY UNCLE!' abounded. By and large,
the American media's rush to judgment was as dramatic as Reagan's rise in the ratings following the bombing (Breslau, 1987:46).

Furthermore, a study of four West German newspapers about the two parties to the conflict conducted by Staab and Wright (1988:19) in the period of March 17th to May 18th, 1986, revealed that the coverage of the Libyan behavior was also generally negative.

Finally, Sono (1984-b:76) concludes that the American news media's treatment of Libya can be divided into seven categories:

1- reports of internal dissension and of coup attempts;
2- allegations of support for terrorist activities;
3- allegations of assassinations and attempted assassinations;
4- comments about the alleged "madness", "lunacy" and "terrorism" of Col. Muammar Qaddafi, the Libyan leader;
5- stories of mergers and alleged mergers with other counties, if not "empire building";
6- reports about Libyan destabilization of other countries and subversion of American interests in these regions; and
7- the Soviet connection.

There is no news bureau in Libya which belongs to an American or Western news agency or newspaper. Accordingly, the Western media get their news from Libya through five sources:

1- through wire services;
2- through their own special correspondents who come temporarily to Tripoli to cover the events;
3- through the Libyan news agency;
4- through Western diplomats; or
5- From reporters and/or media in neighbouring nations.

The limited options to gather news stories from Libya may lead to some difficulties for the reporters. For example, as a result of these difficulties, some reporters may look for news stories from other sources. These sources sometimes contain errors or disinformation. When correspondents report these stories, they may also colour them with their values and political beliefs. All this results in part from the lack of Western news offices in Middle East countries.

In summary, while covering foreign news, reporters face many problems which create controversy over whether coverage is negative or positive. Problems are created because of language barriers, difficulties entering countries to be able to report first hand, and reporters’ own values and inherent biases. In regard to Third World news, studies have shown that reporting tends to emphasize crises and the spectacular rather than normal events. Other writers claim that the Western media cover only what serves their own interests. Furthermore, in most underdeveloped countries in general and in the Middle East in particular, there are few foreign news offices.

In recent years the coverage of the Middle East has become more balanced and more positive as compared with other countries in the region, such as Israel (especially after Israel’s invasion of Lebanon in 1982). Still Libya’s general treatment in the Western press tends always to be connected with terrorism.
2.2. The Research Questions

The following research questions were formulated to examine how the three newspapers portrayed the American raid on Libya. With regard to each of the questions below, I will examine overall distributions and changes from the pre-bombing through the raid to the post-raid period. In addition, a key interest will be whether the Western elite papers differ in their coverage and their bias. In chapter five, findings relative to this question will be explicitly discussed for each of the questions below.

**Question 1**

How many news stories were published by the three newspapers, and how were they distributed over time?

**Question 2**

What were the news sources, where did stories originate, how important were wire services, and what were the areas of interest reflected in these stories?

**Question 3**

How was the military activity and the conflict portrayed for a radical Arab country such as Libya? How much information and coverage was there about the Gulf of Sidra and the disputed areas?

**Question 4**

What was the stance or "bias" of the coverage, anti-Libyan, pro-Libyan, or neutral? Was the bias related to sources, and did it change over time?

**Question 5**

How much coverage was there of non-conflictual matters of Libyan policy, such as social issues, domestic politics and economic matters?
Question 6

What was the coverage of the international reaction to the bombing?
Which areas of the world were covered in this regard?

2.3. Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated to express expectations about the coverage of the American-Libyan conflict in the Western elite newspapers from February 15th, 1986 to June 30th, 1986.

Hypothesis One

Due to the orientation of the Western press the structures of news gathering will be in terms of Western interests, sources and places of origin of stories, especially during sudden crises. This means that most of the Libyan-American conflict stories will originate from Western countries and focus on Western interests; stories originating from Libya will depend on special correspondents.

Hypothesis Two

Western attention to the Third World is generally low, but can be triggered by dramatic events on which Western attention remains with a narrow and short-lived focus. In the Libyan-American conflict, Western press coverage will focus on military matters, the raid and related topics. As a result of long-held views of Libya as a terrorist state, terrorism will be emphasized, while little attention is given to Libyan internal politics and to economic and social matters not connected to oil.

Hypothesis Three

The Western press has shown a tendency to portray the Third World, and especially radical countries, negatively. I expect to find evidence for negative coverage in various ways: (a) The overall slant of stories will be overwhelmingly negative; (b) the coverage will label Libya’s political system and her leaders with negative adjectives; and (c) coverage will generally focus on themes with negative connotations, such as international terrorism, association with the Soviet Union etc.
Hypothesis Four

There will be significant differences with respect to coverage of Libya among the three elite Western newspapers because the three newspapers are representative of three different Western countries: the U.S. is the main Western country involved in the conflict; the U.K. is the main assistant to the American raid, and Canada is only an observer. Proximity to the main protagonists in the conflict should have an impact on the coverage.
CHAPTER THREE
HISTORICAL REVIEW

3.1. The Libyan Context

Libya achieved independence on December 24th, 1951 following several centuries of Ottoman rule, followed by Italian, British, and French occupation. The country was a part of the Ottoman empire from the Sixteenth century until the Twentieth century. The empire met powerful resistance as the population showed a strong will to be free.

Hundreds of battles and thousands of martyrs have written pages of glory in Libyan history. The struggle against the Italian invaders was so strong that the invaders failed to occupy Tripoli and Cyrenaica until 1933, twenty three years after the beginning of the invasion (People’s Committee, 1982:47).

Italian occupation came to an end in 1942, when the British occupied Cyrenaica and Tripoli and the French entered Fezzan. Libya then become known as the Kingdom of Libya, under King Mohammed Idris Elsenussi. Libya was divided into three provinces, with one federal constitution: Cyrenaica in the east, Tripolitiani in the west and Fezzan in the south. But in 1963 Libya became a unitary state in political terms. In the early years of the new Libya, the people suffered from poverty and a weak economy. Libya was, in the opinion of the world, a desert where people, the majority of them illiterate, lived in a state of underdevelopment. El Fathaly and Palmer quote Benjamin Higgins’ description of Libya:

Libya...is a prototype of a poor country...[T]he bulk of people live on subsistence level. [there is] no source of power and no mineral resources, ...agricultural expansion is severely limited by climate conditions, ... capital formation is zero or less, ... there is no skilled labour supply and
no indigenous entrepreneurship. Libya is at the bottom of the range in income and resources (El Fathaly & Palmer, 1980:1).

The discovery of oil played an crucial role in Libyan development. In the 1950s Libya was dramatically changed by the oil industry into one of the wealthiest countries on the globe (El Fathaly, Palmer and Chackerian, 1977:1).

3.1.1. Evaluation of the New Political System

The new revolutionary regime has established itself strongly. "After the revolution of September 1st, 1969, Libya was declared a Libyan Arab Republic. The old monarchical constitution was abolished and the central committee of the free unionist officers that had brought about the bloodless revolution was transformed into a revolutionary command council (RCC). It became the highest political authority" (People Committee, 1982:51). Consequently, a new political life began. A temporary constitution was adopted, the "Constitutional Declaration", on December 11th, 1969. According to it, the RCC remained the primary legislative and executive body, but was supported by a council of ministers with a Prime Minister as head. This council became responsible for the implementation of policies approved by the RCC, and for the day-to-day direction of the new government (People’s Committee, 1982:51).

After the 1969 revolution, which ultimately brought the new Libyan regime to the Arab nation, "[i]t become evident that Libya’s new rulers in the RCC were strong supporters of President Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt. They saw their revolution in the Nasserist tradition and believed that they had brought Libya from the pro-western neo-colonialist fold of the Idris regime into the mainstream of Arab nationalism and unity, exemplifying Nasser’s ideas" (Henderson, 1984:37).
The new revolutionary regime immediately launched a different style of government in the call for a revival of Arab and Islamic integrity. "The new political system should be based on freedom, unity and social justice as an internal affair of Libya" (Naur, 1986:70). On June 11th, 1971, the RCC set up the Arab Socialist Union (ASU). During the first years of the revolution "Al Qaddafi tried to apply to Libya the social ideology of the Egyptian revolution as expounded in Abdal-Nasir's national charter" (Deeb and Deeb, 1982:130). This was planned as a chance to experiment with political parties in other Arab States.

Political parties, it was felt, created and fostered regional affiliations. They were [replaced] by the Arab Socialist Union, which brought all Libyans into one organization uniting all forces of the working people (Peoples' Committee, 1982:51).

On April 15th, 1973, Qaddafi gave a historical speech at Zuwra. "This speech changed the whole structure of the state" (People's Committee, 1982:52). Qaddafi asked people to take authority into their own hands. "Each geographic area was urged to establish people's committees elected openly by the people" (People's Committee, 1982:53). Institutions, similarly, were asked to set up committees. Committees were formed in factories, schools, universities, hospitals, and companies. Local governments were abolished, as were the offices of mayor and city councillor. Qaddafi announced five points as steps to recognize the new, unique regime:

1) The abrogation of all "reactionary law";

2) The purging of the "politically sick" and the "deviants" who represented counter-revolutionary forces (communists, capitalists, and the Muslim Brotherhood);

3) The distribution of weapons to the revolutionary masses;

4) The undertaking of a bureaucratic and administrative revolution; and

Thus, the new political system was based on Qaddafi’s Third Universal Theory of the Green Book. This theory is intended to permit the people to lead themselves by themselves, without a President, king or a traditional government. It was a necessary step to prepare the people for their new role. The main goal of this theory, that people must have the power, wealth, and arms in their hands, as well as the media. The people as a whole would become the source of power in Libya. True democracy exists only through the participation of the people, not through the activity of their representatives.

Democracy means popular power, not popular expression. The members of Jamahiriya society proclaim that power belongs to the people. The people exercise this power directly, without intermediary or representative, within the popular Congresses and the Peoples’s Committees. (People’s General Congress, 1988).

On March 2, 1977, the authority of the people was proclaimed. The Libyan Arab Republic became a Jamahiriya, the state of masses, and an era of the masses, or of direct democracy, began. By this history-making proclamation, all power and authority were recognized to be vested in the people. In other words, the masses of people were responsible for managing their own societies and institutions. The basic people’s congresses select the people’s committee. Their main work is to discuss and debate all current internal and external issues (People’s Committee, 1982:55).

The domestic policy of the Libyan revolutionary government terminated all privately-run businesses and investments. Eventually, these businesses were put under the full control of the productive labourers in cooperative structures.
3.1.2. Separation between Authority and the Revolution

At the present time, Qaddafi does not hold any executive or administrative post in the government. According to his ideas, the masses must be ruled by themselves; no one has the right to govern the masses. There is no authority above the authority of the people. Qaddafi said in several of his speeches:

I am not president or prime minister and there is no formal political structure. I have no government...Authority is in the hands of people in the people's congresses and committees (Abd Rabboh, 1985:72).

In another speech he said:

...But I am leading a revolution of masses, I believe in the masses and they must prevail as a matter of fact. The masses should decide their own destiny (Anonymous, 1982:12)

After the separation between the authority and the revolution Qaddafi in many speeches has affirmed that he will not practice authority. He will be practising the revolution with the revolutionary movements. The masses alone will practice the authority.

According to this, the basic political authority in Libya are the basic People's Congresses and the General People's Congress (GPC). According to his Green Book, Qaddafi rejects both Western Democracy and Communism because they keep the masses from any meaningful opportunities to rule themselves and have concentrated power and wealth in the hands of the privileged or the state. In the new society of Jamahiriya the state does not own, the state does not hire, and the state does not rule. According to the Green Book, in the representative democracy "the party is only part of the people, but the sovereignty of the people is indivisible" (Qathafi, 1983: 11). According to the Third Universal Theory, "that representative party democracy is merely the democracy of the parties, not of the people... [The] party is the dictatorial instrument of modern government" and "is the rule of a part over the whole" (Qathafi,
1983:11). Moreover, where there is more than one political party, there is always a struggle between them.

3.1.3. Revolutionary Committees

In the second half of the 1970s, Qaddafi called on Libyan revolutionaries throughout the country to form their own committees. Revolutionary committees were organized "in every office, business and educational institution, and also in the armed forces" (El Khawas, 1986:57). These committees quickly became highly organized, with a structure parallel to the people's committees. Membership in these revolutionary committees is not based on election but is open to anyone who firmly believes in Qaddafi's ideology, and who does not ask for authority or any governmental position.

In January 1980 the revolutionary committees started publishing a weekly ideological newspaper, AL-Zahf AL-Akhdar (The Green March), which propounds the views of the Third Universal Theory, which is expounded in the three volumes of The Green Book. The revolutionary committees' main concern is to carry out revolutionary ideas and aims. Their duties have been outlined as follows:

1) Inciting the masses to exercise authority;
2) Firmly establishing the people's authority;
3) Practising revolutionary supervision;
4) Agitating the popular congresses;
5) Leading the popular committees and secretaries of the congresses to the right way; and
6) Protecting, defending, and propagating the revolution (Naur, 1986: 84).

Thus, the committees are worthy of mention because they are part of this unique regime, and also because they can be considered a revolutionary instrument which has taken many revolutionary actions inside Libya.
In summary, Qaddafi worked productively to achieve Libya's self determination. He closed all foreign military bases in an attempt to liquidate all patterns of Western influence. He nationalized banks and insurance corporations, oil distribution facilities and oil companies. Qaddafi's aim was to redirect Libya's economic resources to regain its own national economy, and to stop the foreign control of so much of the Libyan economy. With this in mind, Qaddafi planned his internal and external policy. This policy was designed to serve Libyan and Arab interests. Qaddafi always rejected both Communist and Capitalist ideology. Instead, he established his own political, economic, and social beliefs, expounded in The Third Universal Theory.

3.2. Falling out with the West

In the beginning of the 1969 revolution, "Qaddafi opposed both marxism and imperialism; but as the revolution grew, imperialism became increasingly identified as the prime target" (St. John, 1986:111).

In 1970, all belongings of Italians and non-resident Jews were expropriated. In addition, Qaddafi broke all diplomatic ties with what he called pro-Western or reactionary Arab regimes like the Jordanian government, after a military confrontation between Jordanian forces and Palestinian fighters (Anderson, 1986:94).

The oil wealth is the primary natural resource in Libya's Arab Jamahiriya. For that reason, in July, 1970 the Libyan government nationalized oil marketing, which had been operated by foreign companies, and invested the Libyan National Oil Corporation with this task. Anderson provides another reason for nationalized oil marketing. "In December, 1971, Qaddafi nationalized the Libyan holdings of the British Petroleum company in [revenge] for the British government's failure to [stop] Iran from
occupying the Tumb Islands in the [Arabian] Gulf." Anderson (1986: 95) added "[Qaddafi alienated] the British first by intervening in the 1971-72 dispute between Britain and Malta over the British bases there. [He expressed] support for the Mintoff government against Britain". Furthermore, "Libya declared support for the Irish Republican Army, and in other ways antagonized Western governments" (Hackett, 1989:5). Also, Qaddafi took part in the oil boycott of the United States following the 1973 war between Arabs and Israel. All these events helped to increase Western enmity against the Libyan government. Furthermore, these events were presented in the Western media as serving anti-Western interests in the Middle East, Africa and South America.

In a report released by the U.S. Department of State (1986) about the Libyan activities in the Western hemisphere, the U.S government accused Libya of conducting some actions to eliminate the American presence in Central America: for example, helping guerrilla groups in Central America and the Caribbean by providing covert funding to these radical groups, such as the Sandinistas before and after they took power in Nicaragua (U.S. Department, 1986:1-8). According to the Department of State (1988:5), "Libyan leader Muammar Qaddafi has long been the World leader most closely identified with sponsorship of terrorist groups". This is the way the Libyan leader has been seen or presented to the whole world.

3.3. A History of the American-Libyan Political Relationship

3.3.1. The Libyan-American Relations since 1969

On September 1st, 1969, the young officers declared the establishment of the Libyan Arab Republic under the control of the Revolutionary Command Council
(RCC). The RCC's first communiqué was broadcast on a Benghazi Radio station. "On the day of the revolution, Qaddafi stated that it would create a revolutionary and undoctrinaire socialist state, based on the ethical values of the Koran, which would transform Libya into a progressive nation fighting against colonialism. The new republic would carry the flag of Arab nationalism and attach great importance to the unity of all developing countries" (Anderson, 1986:91).

The main concern of Qaddafi's foreign policy was the Palestinian cause, which was considered the prime threat to the nature of both Islam and the Arab Nation. Qaddafi views Palestine as an integral part of the Arab Nation.

The actions of the Libyan government since 1969 helped to increase the tensions between the United States and Libya.

Washington had for years criticized Libya's outspoken support for international violence and terrorism, and for aggression against some of its neighbours, such as Chad, [Tunisia, and Egypt]. It also disputed Libya's claim to all waters south of the 32°-30 parallel [including the Gulf of Sidra] as its own territorial waters. The United States of America insisted that this was a violation of the principles of international maritime law (Africa Contemporary Record 1986-87: B-538).

The United States and Libya have been in confrontation since 1969. The new Libyan regime had dismantled American bases, nationalized oil companies and pursued a policy of non-alignment. Since then the Libyans have forced the Americans out of their country. In November 1969, Qaddafi made a speech at a public rally in Tripoli and announced the determination of the revolution that foreign bases must be removed from Libya. "In an early action, he asked the United States and Britain to close their military bases in Libya. They both complied without protest"(El Khawas, 1986:120).

Negotiations began in December 1969 and the Western nations decided to start withdrawal immediately. The British evacuated their base at Eladam and the contingent
of their troops at Tobruk on March 28th, 1970. The Americans followed by pulling out from their Wheelus base near Tripoli on June 11th of the same year (Fergiani, 1976:111). Later, the Libyan revolutionary government moved to gain control of the oil industry in the country. The first oil company to be nationalized was the British Petroleum Company, in December 1971, followed by the nationalization of American companies, in June 1973.

In 1979, Libyan Students attacked the American Embassy in Tripoli, because America would not stop entering territorial waters as declared by Libya without permission from the Libyan government. In return, "the United States government asked all Americans to leave Libya and banned high-technology exports to that country" (Sono, 1984-a:12). On May 6th, 1981, the U.S. State Department closed the Libyan People’s Bureau [Libyan Embassy] in Washington, D.C. under the excuse of the alleged Libyan role in Soviet-inspired international terrorism. Libya judged this act to be part of a plan to discredit the country in the eyes of the international community (Sono, 1984-a:12).

Libya has been blamed for many activities, including the exporting of terrorism, manipulating oil prices, creating assassination squads, and subverting United States interests in Africa and the Middle East. As well, it has been accused of being a surrogate for the Soviet Union. Libya was accused of fabrications, "coups, revolutions, separatist movements, and terrorism in dozens of countries around the world" (Sono, 1984-a:14).

Libya is a radical country in its support of those seeking change in the world system, and it is independent from outside aid. "Other radical Arab countries such as Syria or South Yemen do not have the economic independence to challenge the U.S.A.
Hence, Libya is a target of the American government. There have been frequent calls for the overthrow of the Libyan revolution by force" (Sono, 1984-a:11).

3.3.2. The Dispute in the Gulf of Sidra (Sirte)

The Gulf of Sidra (Sirte) is situated off the Libyan shore in the Mediterranean sea. On the eastern shore of this gulf lies the city of Benghazi. On the western shore is the city of Misurata. At the southern end of the gulf lies the city of Sirte itself.

The Gulf of Sirte is considered by Libya to be an integral part of Libya's territory because it is surrounded by Libyan regions on three sides. For this reason, Libya has declared that the Gulf of Sirte should be considered as an inner sea, and an inseparable portion of its territory.


The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya proclaims that the Gulf of Sirte, situated in its territory and bordered on south, and east and the west by the Libyan desert, and by latitude 32° and 30, is considered is an integral part of Libyan territory, ...Finally under the full sovereignty of the Libyan state,... and under national control, from juridical, legal, administrative, political, and geographical aspects of the question (All Moukif, 1982:179).

According to this declaration, Libyan territorial waters extended over a distance of 200 nautical miles into the Mediterranean Sea. The American government has contested that claim, and considered that Libyan territorial waters should not exceed a distance of three miles.

The Libyan government presented examples of similar gulfs around the world to support its decision to control this gulf: "Hudson gulf, the opening of which exceeds 250 miles, or the Saint Lawrence gulf, with an opening of 460 miles" (All Moukif,
1982:218). It even gave the example of various Latin American states, which adopted the same principles.

The same was done also by France, in 1956, when it was engaged in its war with Algeria. In 1976, the United States under the pretence of having to ensure the protection of its fishing fleets, decided to extended the limits of its territorial waters for fishing up to 200 miles (Ali Moukif, 1982:214).

3.3.3. The U.S. Sixth Fleet’s Exercise near the Libyan Coast

Qaddafi has opposed any United States show of force, whether it involved the presence of the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean Sea or naval exercises off the Libyan coast. "He saw them as a threat and part of a campaign to destabilize his country and to overthrow his system of government" (EL Khawas, 1986:125). Since the 1969 revolution, the Libyan government has always been against an American presence in the Middle East, and in Libya in particular. As result of the Libyan policy, by 1972 American diplomatic representation in Tripoli had been reduced to the level of a charge d'affaires. In 1975, the United States refused to deliver military transport planes ordered and paid for by Libya.

Since President Reagan took over the White House, the U.S Sixth Fleet was in the habit of exercising almost annually near the Libyan coast. These exercises were meant to demonstrate two things: first, American political opposition to the revolutionary political system in Libya, and second, the refusal of the United States to accept the declaration by Libya that its territorial waters include the Gulf of Sidra. However, according to the Libyan view, the United States Sixth Fleet violated Libya’s declared sea and air space many times. (Africa Contemporary Record, 1985:p:B-547).
The dispute over the Gulf of Sidra (Sirte)

Source: (Al Moukif, 1982)
The aim or goal of the United States of America, according to an article published in *Africa Contemporary Record*, was to provoke the Libyan army and put it in "disorder" (*Africa Contemporary Record*, 1985:p:B-547).

Regarding Libya's relationship with the U.S.S.R. and Qaddafi's policy of "positive neutrality", St. John argued that "Qaddafi's concept of positive neutrality brought him into increasing conflict with policies of the United States, while promoting a dependent relationship with the Soviet Union. Moscow soon became Libya's major arms supplier, and in October 1985 the two governments concluded a long term economic and technical agreement" (1986:111).

According to Abbas and Hyman (1981:56) who quote the Daily World of (August 26th, 1981), the Gulf of Sidra affair "in fact, opened up an endless frontier of aggression for Washington. '[A]nti-Sovietism and anti-national liberationism is [Washington's] foreign policy.' The Reagan 'provocation against Libya... was a planned blow aimed not only against Libya but also the Soviet Union, as an administration spokesman emphasized.

On March 20th, 1986, one month before the American raid on Libya, Reagan approved naval exercises that would send American warships across the 32°-30 parallel, which Qaddafi had declared as the "line of death".

### 3.3.4. The Air Attack on Libyan Cities

After dramatic terrorist action in Europe had increased, the possibility of military strikes against Libya increased. The United States government claimed to have evidence to prove that Libya was involved in the bombing of a West Berlin nightclub. In this bombing, one U.S soldier and one Turkish woman were killed. However, the
full evidence has not being brought to the attention of the public. If there is evidence in this regard, Chomsky (1987:117) says the "standards of evidence are also conveniently set so as to achieve the emperor's goals. To demonstrate Libya's role as a state terrorist, the flimsiest evidence, or none at all, will suffice." In The Globe and Mail (April 5th, 1986: A9), the former Secretary of State George Shultz was quoted as saying, "Washington had long wanted to blow the whistle on Col. Gaddafi because he is doing things that are against our interests." In a nationally televised news conference on April 9, 1986, Reagan labelled Qaddafi "this mad dog of the Middle East...more than a bad smell" (Hackett, 1989:6). The intensified rhetorical campaign against Qaddafi could easily be interpreted as preparation for military activities against Libya.

On April 15, 1986, F-111s flew from England, where the American military bases are located, toward the Libyan cities. The American air forces struck five targets (including the personal residence of Qaddafi and his family which the U.S referred to as terrorist centers) in Tripoli and Benghazi. In this raid many innocent Libyan people were killed, including Qaddafi's adopted baby daughter.

It has been suggested that the U.S. government bombing of Libya

...had nothing to do with 'terrorism', even in the cynical Western sense of the world. In fact, it was clear enough that the Gulf of Sidra operation and the bombing of Libyan cities would if anything incite such retail terrorism, one major reason that the likely targets in Europe pleaded with the U.S. to refrain from such action (Chomsky, 1987:138). And Hackett (1989:7-8) asked: "Was the [United States'] motive really to retaliate against terrorist acts, as the Reagan administration claimed?" The answer is probably no, because the American government did not provide full evidence proving the so-called involvement of Libya in the bombing of the West Berlin night club. It has been
"suggested that Syria and Iran may hold a bigger responsibility for that terrorist act than Libya" (Hackett, 1989:7-8). Hackett raises the possibility that to achieve their goals, the American government might even consider the "fabrication of evidence which cannot be dismissed to justify the raid" (Hackett, 1989:7-8). For example, The Washington Post "later revealed that the White House during the summer of 1986 endorsed a plan to spread disinformation through the U.S press in order to unnerve Qaddafi and provoke him so as to overthrow him" (Hackett, 1989: 7-8).

World wide, the raid was condemned, except by U.S. allies. "It met widespread congressional and public approval in the U.S., but elsewhere, only the governments of Israel, South Africa and Britain strongly endorsed it" (Hackett, 1989:7). Other Western countries' reactions varied between moral support and criticism of the U.S attack. The Canadian government regretted the loss of innocent lives, but it also offered its moral support to the U.S. government and denounced terrorism in all its forms.

In Europe, "the European Parliament expressed its disapproval of the U.S. attack with a vote of 151 vs. 150 as a striking violation of international law and a menace to international security and peace" (Staab and Wright, 1988:9).

France was the only European country that had two different kinds of reaction regarding this conflict. First, it refused to give permission for American air force planes to cross French airspace on their way to bomb Libya. Second, however, a statement issued by the French government after the raid indicated it would support military action against Libya if the purpose was to oust the current Libyan regime.

In Spain the raid was condemned by the main independent newspaper El País:

The military action of the United States is not only an offence against international law and a grave threat to peace in the Mediterranean, but a mockery of its European allies, who did not find motives for economic
sanctions against Libya in a meeting Monday, despite being previously and unsuccessfully pressured to adopt sanctions (Chomsky, 1987:131).

The reluctance to adopt sanctions arose out of controversy over American oil companies that were still operating in Libya, and because of the United States' own limited sanctions against Libya.

Several European governments...also argued that the U.S has not been serious in its application of economic sanctions and that sanctions, in any case, are not effective. Italy and France, in particular, were reluctant to follow the American lead because they did not believe the latter was serious in its progressive application of economic sanctions. They asked why they should risk their relatively greater investment for what was seen as only a symbolic demonstration of disapproval of Libyan policy (St.John, 1986:114).

Other factors helped to increase the tension, such as the Tokyo meeting in May, 1986. "At least some of the tensions were increased when the meeting of Western leaders in Tokyo in May did agree on a statement which mentioned Libya by name as a country responsible for encouraging terrorism" (Gent, 1986:95).

In addition, the Libyan crisis may have made the publics of Western Europe more aware of the consequences of having American air bases on their soil:

[The] American-Libyan conflict may have sufficiently awakened the general public of Western Europe to the negative consequences of alliance with the [United States'], to shift some basic attitudes to security. Economic interests cannot be shifted so easily, but government attitudes to the [United States] political role in Western Europe will ultimately depend on public support (Phillips, 1986:47).

In almost "every European country except France, public opinion polls showed massive opposition to the American raids against Libya. The first flash of opinion polls indicated that in Britain and West Germany large majorities opposed the bombing" (Kaldor, 1986:7).
In the Eastern bloc the raid was widely condemned. Most of the Eastern countries, headed by the Soviet Union, strongly condemned the American military action against Libya. As result of this raid, the Soviet Union cancelled an important meeting with the American government. Furthermore, the Soviet Union's government said the Libyan raid may hurt American-Soviet ties. Gorbachev characterized the American air strike on Libya as part of a "militaristic and aggressive" policy that he warned could damage relations between Moscow and Washington. In addition, he said, the air raid on Libya demonstrated the "bankruptcy of American policy in the Middle East."

In the Middle East and Third World countries the American raid was denounced. "Arab [Islamic] and other Third World countries except a few like Chad were virtually unanimous in their angry condemnation of the attack on Tripoli" (Africa Contemporary Record, 1986-87:p.B-540). The protest against American military action turned to violence when one American working in the American embassy in the capital of the Sudan was gunned down.

In an announcement of the Peoples' Committee of the Libyan Foreign Office on the day of the American raid, all Islamic nations were invited to publicly boycott and combat America, and also to impose sanctions against countries which -- like England -- were involved in the air attack. The same day the Libyan Foreign Office, Iran, and Syria announced a communiqué, in which they asserted the action of the American government to be an attack against the whole Arab nation and violation against the United Nations Charta. The Libyan media reported that Libyan-Arabian forces had demolished a telecommunications station on the Italian island Lampedusa.
The Italian officials did confirm the attack, but denied the achievements of the action (Staab & Wright, 1988:8).

3.4. Summary

Since September 1969 Libya has become a revolutionary country with national aspirations and goals to be independent from any foreign influences. The new regime is strongly in favour of a pan-Arab nation. It also calls for an Islamic revival.

Later on, this new revolutionary regime adopted a new and unique political and economic ideology. This ideology is based in the Third Universal Theory by Qaddafi. This theory depends on the masses to rule themselves by themselves without any kind of traditional government.

In the early years of the new regime, the Libyan revolution called for closure of all foreign military bases stationed in the country. The military bases belonged to the America and British governments. Furthermore, Qaddafi has nationalized the oil industry and banks.

Because the Palestinian question was the main concern of the Libyan foreign policy, Libya was likely to find itself in political confrontation with America.

During the Reagan administration the tension between the two countries had developed into military confrontation over the disputed Gulf of Sidra. This confrontation was embodied by the April raid on Libyan cities 1986.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESEARCH METHODS

4.1. Content Analysis

The research method used in this study is content analysis. There are many definitions of content analysis. For example, some define it as a "technique which aims at describing, with optimum objectivity, precision, and generality, what is said on a given place at a given time" (Lasswell et al., 1952: 34). Other definitions emphasize the coding of the manifest content: "Content analysis is a research technique for the objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication" (Berelson, 1952:18). Through content analysis, this study attempts to describe news coverage, and then locate regularities and tendencies in the messages transmitted by the press. Blake and Haroldsen (1979:140) confirmed that "content analysis always involves relating or comparing findings to some standard, norms or theory. It does so to discover latent attributes" (in describing a communications flow). Blake and Haroldsen, (1979: 141) stated that content analysis is used for different purposes:

It has been used for purposes as varied as inferring enemy intentions from wartime propaganda to settling questions of disputed authorship. It has been applied not only to the mass media but to pottery fragments and psychoanalytic interviews.

The present study is concerned with the perspective and performance of three elite Western newspapers in their reporting on one Middle East country. The quantitative approach will produce details about "key variables", such as:
1- Volume of news stories;

2- Type (editorials, features, news stories) and placement of items, on the first page or inside pages;

3- Utilization of news sources wire services special correspondents and local staff;

4- Datelines;

5- Positive and negative biases toward Libya, its leader and its political system.

4.2. The Newspapers under Study

Three elite Western daily newspapers have been chosen for the study: The New York Times in the United States of America, The Times in the United Kingdom and The Globe and Mail in Canada. These newspapers are considered to be among the most important newspapers in their countries.

The logic behind the selection of elite newspapers is that these newspapers have a reputation for extensive and accurate coverage of global events. These newspapers would definitely be expected to touch upon the content under investigation. As quality newspapers with high journalistic standards, they would also have a powerful agenda setting function for readers as well as other newspapers in their respective societies. They serve as opinion leaders for journalists from other media as well.

These three Western newspapers fulfill these criteria. Indeed, they are trustworthy enough to be used frequently as data sources in social science research. For example, according to Peterson; "The Times is... utilized by events data
researchers. The Conflict and Peace Data Bank (COPDAB) lists the London Times Index as one of its data sources" (Peterson, 1981:144).

4.2.1. The New York Times

The New York Times is one of the excellent elite newspapers in the United States of America. Merrill and Fisher (1980:220) reported that "The New York Times is the biggest in total operations among American elite papers, with 854,000 copies daily". In its coverage of international news it is "the only newspaper to take all five major international wire services, AP, UPI, Reuter, Tass, and AFP" (Merrill and Fisher, 1980:223).

They added that "in all its writing and reporting, [The New York Times] excels in accuracy and comprehensiveness, even, sometimes, to the detriment of easy readability" (Merrill and Fisher, 1980:230). The New York Times is published seven days a week, with a large Sunday edition.

4.2.2. The Times (London)

The Times is one of the world’s great cosmopolitan newspapers, and it gets news from different sources. "[The Times] gathers international news from many sources, 68 staff correspondents and stringers stationed around the world, Agence France Presse (AFP), Associated Press (AP), The New York Times wire service, Reuter and United Press International (UPI). The news gathered from these sources is processed and published in 4 or 5 daily editions" (Peterson 1981:149). Merrill and Fisher (1980:320) have described The Times as "much more than a newspaper, it is a national institution." It is widely accepted among the members of the community.
The Times "not only is read by key elites such as the attentive public and government decision makers, but it is also relied upon by the scholarly community." The Times is published six days a week. The Sunday Times is published on Sundays.

4.2.3. The Globe and Mail

The Globe and Mail (published in Toronto) is one of the biggest daily newspapers in Canada. "It comes closest of all Canadian dailies to being a national newspaper. It is the nation's best known daily with over 263,000 copies sold each day" (Merrill and Fisher 1980:138). Hackett (1989:3) said "...[it] is a small-c conservative, 'quality' paper with a national distribution and a relatively affluent and educated readership. With its news gathering resources and its prestige, the Globe helps to set the agenda for other Canadian media."


4.3. Sampling Procedure

For The New York Times and The Times, the selection of news stories was based on the news indexes of the respective papers.
It was found that The Globe and Mail's news index was not complete, as it did not include all the news stories about the conflict central to this study. Its news index just contained the main stories related to the conflict, such as front page news stories or editorials. As a result, stories for this study were gathered based on Info-Globe, The Globe and Mail's on-line data base. News stories were included if they related to Libya, or to events related to the relevant conflict. I selected news stories that contained references to Libya, Qaddafi (in all different spellings), Sidra. Since the number of news stories still appeared low, additional stories were selected if they referred to Libyans or to the Gulf of Sirte in the headline or in leading paragraphs. The number of news stories from this paper still appeared low, so in the third stage, I added references to Tripoli and Benghazi. The result still may not reflect the actual number of news stories related to the conflict under study that were published by this paper, but the resulting number of selected stories is similar to the other two papers. This difference in selection procedures may affect the validity of the study where numbers of news stories are compared among papers. However, there is no reason to suspect that the selection procedure resulted in a biased sample with respect to the type of stories, content, or slant.

The period analyzed in this thesis includes the time from February 15th to June 30th, 1986. This time span was divided into three period: the period prior to the American raid on Libyan cities from February 15th to April 14th, 1986 (59 days); the period around the raid itself, April 15th to April 30th, 1986 (16 days); and, finally, the post raid period from May 1st to June 30th, 1986 (61 days). In total the period spanned 136 days.
Both *The New York Times* and *The Times* published editions on all 136 days. Since the Canadian newspaper, *The Globe and Mail*, does not publish on Sundays, the news stories in *The Globe and Mail* cover only 116 days. The three newspapers yielded 1054 relevant news stories: for *The New York Times*, 420 stories (equals 3.1 items per publishing day); for *The Times*, 357 stories (equals 2.6 per day); and for *The Globe and Mail*, 277 stories (equals 2.4 per day).

In each newspaper, any stories published in the following locations were analyzed and the position recorded: the first page, the editorial page, the letters to the editor, and the inside pages containing the 'overseas news'. The news sources and "place of origin" of the story were also recorded. The aim behind selecting these sections of the newspapers and for recording the story location is that these indicate the importance of stories.

### 4.4. Coding

Generally speaking, coding is considered to be an exchange of qualitative symbols for quantitative ones. The aim of this is to facilitate the coding procedure and make it easy and understandable after combining all other similar groups in tables so as to be examined later on (Holsti, 1969:94).

The coding categories were not easily established. The process went through several stages to prevent bias that might occur during the coding process. First of all, we established categories that contained details about the conflict, and attempted "pro-Libya", "anti-Libya", and "neutral" classifications in each category. The original coding sheet was changed repeatedly in order to add relevant variables and to eliminate impractical (and unreliable) variables. The most radical changes concern the
evaluations: instead of attempting to establish evaluative classifications for each category, the themes (categories) were coded as "mentioned" or "not mentioned," depending on their occurrence in the news story. "Slant" was coded only once for each news story, evaluating the item as a whole. The rationale is to reduce bias and unreliability during the coding process.

To analyze the content of the three newspapers in a replicable way, the coding rules were prepared as follows:

1- When a photo appears by itself without a story, it is to be counted as one item;
2- When a photo is attached to a story, the two are to be treated as one item;
3- News items are treated as one item without regard to length;
4- When a cartoon appears by itself without a story, it is to be counted as one item;
5- When a cartoon is attached to a story, the two are to be treated as one item.

The final coding categories were established on the basis of trial coding news stories from the three newspapers (See the Code book attached as Appendix B).

To code the "slant" of news stories in a replicable manner, rules for coding stories as having pro-Libyan, anti-Libyan bias or being neutral have been formulated as follows:

1- A news story was assumed to be "pro-Libyan" when the respective newspaper used "positive" adjectives to describe an event or to portray a political system or leader: for example, national hero of Arab nation, calm, good leader, regime, unique democracy (Qaddafi’s ideology) and so on. Budd (1962:83-84) has defined favourable as follows: "those items reflecting social cohesion and cooperation and political and economic stability and/or strength. Favorability will be judged on the basis of international cooperation (political, social and economic)" as Libya, its political
system, its ideology, and its leaders, are depicted as strong, right, or cooperative. In other words, "pro-Libyan" is to be supportive of Libya, its policy or attitude or political leader or political system;

2- A news story was classified as "neutral" when the respective newspaper described the event without colouring by praise or condemnation of the activity or person under study, also by presenting views of two sides about an event. Budd (1962:83-84) describes as "neutral: those items which reflect neither favourable or unfavourable conditions either through balance of content or a lack of controversial material." The definition of "neutral" was automatically applied unless the item was defined as "anti-Libyan" or "pro-Libyan";

3- A news story was classified as "anti-Libyan" when the respective newspaper used "negative" adjectives to describe Libyan activity, the political system or leader, or people; description included for example: outlaw country, supporting international terrorism, training terrorists, despicable, depression, erratic, lunatic, unstable, and unpredictable. Budd (1962:83-84) has identified unfavourable as "those items which report social conflict and disorganization and political economic instability/ and or weakness. Un-favorability will be judged on the basis of international tensions (political, social and economic)." Representing Libya, its political or economic system or its leaders as weak, wrong or uncooperative is to be seen as negative. In other words, by definition, "anti-Libyan" is opposition to the Libyan people or their policies or attitudes or political leaders. Any news stories containing the following six major themes are classified as "anti-Libyan":

1- Qaddafi as the patron saint of terror;

2- Libya as militaristic and imperialistic;
3. Libya as a Soviet surrogate;
4. Qaddafi as a "madman", "dangerous", or a "terrorist";
5. Libya as suffering acute mismanagement and waste, not meeting the people’s needs; and

4.5. InterCoder Reliability

In any empirical content analysis study, the question of reliability has to be addressed. To test the degree of reliability, 105 news stories were randomly chosen from the three newspapers, stratified to represent the three periods under study. Sixty stories or about 10% of the news stories in the pre- and post-raid periods in each newspaper were coded by a total of 6 independent coders as a reliability check. In addition, 45 stories or 15% of the news items from the raid period were coded by independent coders. The coders were graduate students in the Department of Communication Studies at the University of Windsor.

The overall reliability shown by these coders was very high, and the variation among the coders was small. The intercoder reliability index regarding the three periods under study, ranged between .94 and .95 based on the formula proposed by Holsti (1969:61):

\[
\text{Inter-Coder reliability} = \frac{2M}{N_1 + N_2}
\]

when \( M \) is equal to the number of decisions where coders are in agreement, and \( N_1, N_2 \) are the number of coding decisions made by each coder.
The level of agreement (the intercoder-reliability) should be high in this study, in part because the coding scheme for many of the items allowed only two choices: "yes" or "no"; in other words, persons, nations or themes (like Qaddafi, Libya, Reagan, terrorism) were used as either "mentioned" or "not mentioned". Such dichotomous codes easily result in deceptively high inter-coder reliability.

The most difficult (and evaluative) coding decision concerned the overall "slant" of the coverage. Consequently, the reliability coefficient was calculated separately for the "slant" variable. The reliability shown by the independent coders regarding the overall slant of the stories is .83; this is lower than the overall reliability, within acceptable limits.

Overall, then, we can have confidence that the coding is reliable. Thus, statistical analyses of the coded stories should allow insights into Western newspaper coverage of the American-Libyan confrontation.
CHAPTER FIVE

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

5.1. The Compilation of Data

The primary purpose of this study is to show the portrayal of the Libyan-American conflict of 1986 in three elite Western newspapers. As indicated earlier, it is apparent, from even a very brief reading of the three newspapers, that these papers oppose activities associated with anyone who supported terrorism. Libya had helped some groups which were not genuine revolutionary movements but which (as Qaddafi was quoted to have said) "were practising terrorism for the sake of terrorism and for other objectives that had nothing to do with the [Arab] national cause". Qaddafi added that those "groups that practice terror in the name of revolutionary violence may have harmed Libya". He told the Egyptian weekly magazine Al-Mussawar: "that hijacking planes and killing civilians are acts of murder that have nothing to do with combat...[Libya] should not be called to account for any of these acts, because we have withdrawn our support of such groups" (The Globe and Mail, October 26, 1989).

It is clear that these newspapers had strong feelings concerning Libya's support of "revolutionary groups". It is not necessary to offer proof of such sentiments. However, it is important to understand the degree and the kind of feeling which the three newspapers presented to their readers. The present chapter attempts to describe and analyze this portrayal.

To produce a useful description of the relationships among the variables under study, cross tabulations were analyzed to detect similarities and differences between the
three Western newspapers. Statistical significance tests were applied to test the hypotheses and the research questions.

5.1.1. Question One

How many news stories were published by the three newspapers, and how were they distributed over time?

Where there is conflict, there are media. Most discussions of the coverage of Third World events confirm that conflict is the dominant topic in the Western media. Accordingly, I expect the three newspapers to devote a lot of coverage to the Libyan-American conflict, with some degree of difference between papers. The New York Times, followed by The Times, will be in the lead. Because these newspapers are from the main countries involved in the conflict, they will publish more news stories on the conflict than The Globe and Mail. Also, the raid period should gain greater coverage than the pre- and post-raid periods, with the post raid period getting the least attention.

Table 5-1 shows the total number of news stories which were coded in the three newspapers: 1,054. Most of the news stories (39.8%) were published by The New York Times. The Times ran a close second, with 33.9% of the stories. The Globe and Mail represented 26.3% of the total number of news stories.

The percentages of stories in The Globe and Mail may also have been lower because The Globe and Mail does not publish on Sundays. I have adjusted for this difference by computing the average number of news stories published per publishing day. For The New York Times, the average over 136 days is 3.1; for The Times, 2.6; and for The Globe and Mail, 2.4 stories per day over 116 days.
Table 5-1
Volume of news stories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The New York Times</th>
<th>The Globe and Mail</th>
<th>The Times</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>1054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of all stories</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story per day</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-2 shows no significant differences among the three newspapers in coverage of the phases of the conflict. *The New York Times* had a slight lead in pre- and post-coverage of the raids, while *The Times* had a slightly higher coverage during time of the raid. Overall, most news stories related to the conflict were published during the raid. This coverage dropped sharply after the raid to about half the number of articles published by the papers during the pre-raid period. Thus, the post raid period, compared with the other periods, got less attention from the three papers. This may confirm the notion that the Western media deal mainly with crisis and war news in the third World.

Table 5-3 shows that the largest number of news stories per day was printed during the raid period (11.1 to 13.9 stories per day). *The New York Times* and *The Times* published about the same number of articles during this period. In the pre-raid period, *The New York Times* maintained its lead as it printed 2.1 stories per day, compared to 1.7 for *The Times* and 1.3 for *The Globe and Mail*. 
Table 5-2
Distribution of stories by newspaper, controlling for period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-raid</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The raid</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-raid</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 4.17  Sig .3825  Cramer’s V .044

Table 5-3
Average number of news stories per day by newspaper, controlling for period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>New York Times N=420</th>
<th>Globe * Mail N=277</th>
<th>The Times N=357</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-raid Feb 15- April 14</td>
<td>n=125 2.1</td>
<td>n=72 1.3</td>
<td>n=100 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raid April 15-April 30</td>
<td>n=223 13.9</td>
<td>n=156 11.1</td>
<td>n=209 13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-raid May 1st-June 30</td>
<td>n=71 1.2</td>
<td>n=49 0.9</td>
<td>n=48 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total all period</td>
<td>N=420 3.1</td>
<td>N=277 2.4</td>
<td>N=357 2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The total days for The Globe and mail is 116

Overall, as expected, the three newspapers published most of their news in the raid period (conflict time). All three printed at least five times as many as stories per day as in the pre-raid period, and more than ten times as many stories as they did in the post-raid period.

A variable that sheds light on agenda-setting is the place accorded to a news story. Table 5-4 shows that the three newspapers printed most of their news regarding the conflict between Libya and America on "inside pages," The New York Times slightly more so than the other papers.
It was an unexpected finding that the three Western newspapers published equal percentages of news stories about the conflict on the front page. In addition, these percentages are very high in comparison with the percentages on inside pages, reflecting the importance of this conflict and its effect in the Middle East. Interestingly, the percentage of front page stories was highest during the pre-raid period, rather than during the raid period.

It was also unexpected that, except for a slight lead in the post raid period, The New York Times was not publishing more of its news stories on the front page than the other papers. The Globe and Mail and The Times ran larger proportions of stories on their first pages in the pre-raid period, and at least as many front page stories as The New York Times during the raid period and thereafter.

The Canadian newspaper, The Globe and Mail lagged slightly behind The Times and The New York Times in publishing features, perhaps because the latter two newspapers publish Sunday editions while The Globe and Mail does not. The New York Times had the lead during the raid and post-raid periods with higher percentages of features stories, while The Times had a very slight lead in the pre-raid period.

The Globe and Mail published more letters to the editor during the raid- and post-raid periods. Perhaps The Globe and Mail gives fuller attention to its readers. Alternatively, since The Globe and Mail did not use as many special correspondents to cover the crisis (see below), in order to cover the conflict it turned to other sources of news, including its readers for their reactions and evaluations. In contrast, The New York Times had the lowest percentage of letters to the editor. This may be because it focused on analyzing the events through publishing more commentaries and feature news stories.
Table 5-4

Type of Item by period, controlling for newspaper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Item</th>
<th>The New York Times</th>
<th>The Globe and Mail</th>
<th>The Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre Raid n=126</td>
<td>The Raid n=223</td>
<td>Post Raid n=71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News First Page</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Inside Pages</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader Letter</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo or Chart</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square           | 14.78  | Sig. .1402 | Cramer’s V .13 (NYT)* |
|                    | 31.29  | .0018     | .23 (G&M) |
|                    | 31.45  | .0441     | .17 (LT)  |

* When more than one Chi-Square is listed for a Table, significance levels refer to the relationships between the row variable and a column variable (not the newspaper) calculated separately for each newspaper. For example, the Chi-Square of 14.78 (p=.14, Cramer’s V=.13: The New York Times) indicates a non-significant relationship between the period of publication and the "type of item" for articles published in The New York Times.
Front page stories can be further differentiated into headlines, lead stories, and other stories. "Headlines" are normally on the top of the front page of a newspaper. These headlines usually connected with a brief news story. "Lead stories" are stories carried on the top of the front page of a newspaper. The lead stories do not necessarily provide the paper’s headlines.

Applying these criteria to the front pages in the three newspapers, I find reasonable percentages of headline and lead stories, as shown in Table 5-5. The New York Times should have the lead over the other two newspapers. After all, the conflict is very important to the security of the United States.

However, there were no statistically significant differences among the newspapers in the proportion of either headlines or lead stories (Table 5-5). In The Times, the Libyan news stories produced the highest percent of "lead stories," and the smallest percentages of "headlines." In contrast, in The Globe and Mail the conflict made "Headlines" more often than in the other papers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement</th>
<th>New York Times N=420</th>
<th>Globe &amp; Mail N=277</th>
<th>The Times N=357</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headline</td>
<td>1.4 %</td>
<td>3.2 %</td>
<td>.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead story</td>
<td>5.2 %</td>
<td>5.4 %</td>
<td>7.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other front page stories</td>
<td>8.9 %</td>
<td>6.9 %</td>
<td>10.1 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 7.69 Sig .1033 Cramer's V .06

"Headline" or "lead story" status expresses the high salience accorded a story by the editor. It can be expected that the salience of the Libyan story varied between periods. The literature on Western media coverage of Third World issues suggests that
Libya should be most important to the Western papers during the conflictual and dramatic event itself, be less important during the period of tension preceding the raid, and disappear from the front page quickly after the "event".

All three papers show a very similar pattern of front-page coverage during the three periods, when the categories "lead story" and "headlines" were combined. During the raid period, as expected, the highest front page coverage occurred, but coverage was much lower in the post-raid period than in the pre-raid period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement</th>
<th>New York Times</th>
<th>Globe &amp; Mail</th>
<th>The Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre raid</td>
<td>Raid</td>
<td>Post raid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre raid</td>
<td>Post raid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raid</td>
<td>Post raid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of lead and headline</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, this may confirm the notion that Western journalists are dealing only with conflict news. During the raid period both The Globe and Mail and The Times had a small lead in the percentages of lead stories and headlines in combination (Table 5-6). But the Libyan crisis did not come as surprise for newspapers readers: there were only small increases in headline and lead stories from the pre-raid to the raid period, compared to the dramatic decrease in the post-raid period.

In summary, the greatest amount of coverage of the conflict comes from the American newspaper, The New York Times. Also, the most coverage of the American-Libyan conflict occurred during the raid period. All three Western newspapers were very similar in their coverage.
5.1.2. Question Two

What were the news sources, where did stories originate, how important were wire services, and what were the areas of interest reflected in these stories?

According to the literature, there are often no permanent Western news offices in Third World countries such as Libya. Accordingly, papers like the three Western newspapers have to gather news stories through special correspondents or rely on wire services, when events require coverage. In addition, the Canadian newspaper, The Globe and Mail, will probably depend on American wire services. Based on the literature, most of the news stories related to the Third World are likely to originate from the Western countries, and to be obtained from Western countries rather than in this case from Libya. Also, the interest of three newspapers will probably focus as much on related events in Western countries as on Libya and Arab countries.

There is considerable variation in the sources used by the three Western newspapers, as Table 5-7 shows. The most frequent source of news stories, as we expected, was special correspondents. The New York Times made the best use of its special correspondents by dispatching them to Libya where the conflict occurred. Again, The Times stands in the second position in gathering news about the conflict from special correspondents.

The Globe and Mail, on the other hand, used wire services most, frequently getting almost half of its stories from this source. This may be because The Globe and Mail does not have enough special correspondents in the area of the conflict, but relied most heavily on AP and Reuter. In addition, The Globe and Mail relied on

1 If a newspaper cited more than one wire service for a story, only the first source mentioned was coded.
"other sources" (letters to the editor and The New York Times Service) considerably more than the other two newspapers did. In general, The Globe and Mail depends on foreign sources, especially on American media.

One unexpected finding was that The Times obtained the highest number of its items from "local staff," rather than from any source in the field. This can perhaps be explained through the Sunday edition, with its emphasis on feature stories. The result is likely to be that The Times' coverage will represent its staff's viewpoints, rather than Libyan or other Arab perspectives.

Table 5-7
Source of item by newspaper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPI</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuter</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Press</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFP</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASS</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Wire services</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Correspondents</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Staff</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Times Services</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other sources</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 354.84  Sig .0000  Cramer's V .41
In any international conflict, the main countries involved become the prime focus in media coverage. Since Libya was the target for the American raid, it should be the prime area of interest in the three Western newspapers. Both America, as a superpower and source of the raid, and Great Britain, from where the flights were launched, should receive the next most attention. Consequently, Libya should receive the most coverage in The New York Times. The importance of Libya is perhaps increased by its unique political system and its radical revolutionary policy in Africa and the Middle East.

The findings on the Libyan-American conflict, as shown in Table 5-8, do not confirm these expectations. Instead, they support the widely held view that most news stories related to the Third World originate from the Western countries. All three newspapers originated a greater number of news stories from the U.S, and from their own countries, than from Arab countries including Libya.

In each paper the greatest number of news stories related to the conflict originated from the paper’s own country. The reason could be that these newspapers are published for readers in their own countries, and their own nations’ news sources are most accessible to the home papers. The result is that the Western newspapers often deal with news from the Third World from the perspective of their own countries. A comparison of the percentages of news stories originating from Western countries and stories originating from Libya and Arab countries confirms this statement. The three newspapers published almost three times as many news stories originating from Western countries as they did stories from Libya and Arab countries. For example, in The New York Times, 66.3% of the news stories originated from the Western countries, while stories published from all Arab countries (including Libya)
accounted for only 17.8% of stories. The Globe and Mail published 66.9% from Western countries and 19.7% from Arab countries; The Times, 62.9% from the Western countries and 19.3% from Arab countries. In each paper, the largest percentage of these news stories related to the conflict originated from its own country: in The New York Times, 45% of the stories related to Libyan originated from the U.S., in The Globe and Mail, 30% originated from Canada, and in The Times, 38% originated from the U.K.

The three newspapers also published very similar percentages of material originating in Libya. Perhaps this was because special correspondents in Libya reported on the same events that took place in Tripoli, and none of the correspondents looked for news stories from other than Libyan government sources, or the papers all used the same wire stories.

It could be that the greater availability of Western officials rather than The Third World leaders to the Western press is the main reason for the Western press’s emphasis on the West. Table, 5-9 shows that Western officials received more coverage than Libyans or Arabs. The tendency of the Western press is to use government spokespersons as one primary sources of information during conflicts. The consequence may be that the Western press follows Western officials in classifying or labelling groups that operate against Western interests as terrorist groups.

In terms of the area of interest covered in news stories, The New York Times will probably pay more attention than The Times to North America, while attention to the Middle East and Far East should be equal, because all three newspapers will report the same news.
Table 5-8  
Country of origin of news story, by newspaper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Arab Countries</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.K</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Germany</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other places</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 411.59 Sig .0000  Cramer’s V .46

Table 5-9  
Arab leaders, Western leaders, International leaders mentioned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qaddafi</th>
<th>48.8% *</th>
<th>Reagan</th>
<th>32.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Libyans</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>Thatcher</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Arabs</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>Mitterand</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Western</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* all entries are % of all stories which mention the leader named. Percentages sum to more than 100% since articles can mention more than one leader.

Table 5-10 shows that Libya was the primary area of interest for all papers. The Times printed the largest percentage of news stories (over 60%) focusing on Arab countries as the prime area of interest. The two other newspapers did not differ in this regard (around 50%). The Times had the lead in news stories with Western Europe as the prime area of interest, while the North American newspapers published almost
equal percentages of stories with North American countries as the prime area of interest.

The New York Times did not, as I expected, have many more stories on North America. Rather, as well as reporting on Libya and America, The New York Times focused on Western European countries. Western European nations were involved in the Libyan-American conflict in several ways. Italy has a strong economic relationship with Libya, and therefore opposed U.S. military action in Libya. Other Western countries, such as Greece, also have strong political and economic ties with Libya. On the other hand, Belgium represents the American government in Tripoli. Similarly, Spain provided rescue cover for the American F-111 aircraft when they returned from the raid. The Globe and Mail published several articles about Spain and its response to the crisis. For example, on April 11, 1986, The Globe and Mail printed under the title "Madrid recalls envoy after threats" that "Spain yesterday recalled its Ambassador to Libya for consultation on reported threats by Qaddafi, the Libyan leader, to attack countries harbouring U.S. military bases, the foreign minister said." Furthermore, The Globe and Mail, on May 12, 1986 published a story about Spain’s reaction under the title "Spain claims Libya backing terrorist attacks".

Thus, there were some differences in coverage of the Libyan-American conflict among the three newspapers. The New York Times used special correspondents, while The Times relied on its local staff; both papers used wire services less frequently than The Globe and Mail. The Globe and Mail relied much more heavily on wire services, especially "AP" and "Reuter." The New York Times published the highest number of news stories related to the conflict, as well as the largest number of news stories.
originating from the U.S.A. Each paper covered its own country more than the other two papers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The New York Times</th>
<th>The Globe &amp; Mail</th>
<th>The Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Arab countries</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Arab</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>52.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>62.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total North America</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Germany</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.K</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Western Countries</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total West E.</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East, &amp; Far East or other African Countries</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Europe</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 203.93    Sig .0000    Cramer's V .31
Each of the three newspapers printed a similar high number of news stories originating in Libya; but while the two North-American papers focused their non Arab coverage on the United States, The Times concentrated on Great Britain.

5.1.3. Question Three

How was the military activity and the conflict portrayed for a radical Arab country such as Libya? How much information and coverage was there about the Gulf of Sidra and the disputed areas?

Another aspect of Western newspapers’ coverage of the Libyan-American conflict dealt with the military conflict. The pre-raid period saw activity by the U.S. Sixth Fleet, and the raid itself was of course a military activity. The threat of armed conflict is likely be mentioned widely by the three newspapers in the pre-raid and raid periods, as long as there were military exercises, defence, and training. The New York Times, a paper from a country involved directly in this conflict, may have the lead in this regard. During the post-raid period, the three Western newspapers will probably be much less interested in the Libyan events, since Western coverage of Third World events tends to be crisis-oriented and shortlived. The three newspapers will have equal coverage of actual armed conflict during the raid period.

Table 5-11 shows coverage of the military matters between Libya and the U.S.A. including, the threat of armed conflict. The New York Times mentioned the threat the most during all three periods. This reflects the importance of this conflict to the U.S government, and its relationship to its national security. Repeatedly, The Globe and Mail takes the second position in the pre-raid period, which maybe as a result of the friendship and neighbourly feelings between Canada and America.
The Times published the most articles regarding exercises of the Sixth Fleet, training, defence, and weapons, during the raid. In general, the three newspapers mentioned the military activity to a great extent during the pre-raid period.

It is worth noting that The New York Times spent only 47% of its raid coverage on armed conflict, compared to 91% in The Globe and Mail and 63% in The Times. This suggests that coverage was more restricted to military affairs in the non-U.S. papers, while The New York Times spent more time on political analysis of the stories.

Table 5-11 reveals the high percentage of coverage of military activity during the pre-raid period. This may suggests a role of the press in preparing the American people and in testing their willingness to accept any further military action against Libya. By publicizing Libya’s quick victory, in the incident of March 24, 1986 in the Gulf of Sidra, the American media may have helped to inspire anger and the need to retaliate. After this incident The New York Times headlined one of its news stories on March 28, 1986 "Qaddafi expected to claim victory." The next day, The New York Times followed up with the headline "Qaddafi claiming victory by Libya."

Table 5-11 also confirms the notion that the Western media tend to focus on crises, coups and disaster news. As this table shows, none of the three Western newspapers continued coverage of Libyan events after the raid. In the post-raid period, the three Western newspapers recorded very low percentages of news stories related to armed conflict.
Table 5-11
Coverage related to military affairs, by newspaper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>New York Times</th>
<th>Globe &amp; Mail</th>
<th>The Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre raid</td>
<td>Raid</td>
<td>Post raid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Armed conflict *</td>
<td>39.7 %</td>
<td>47.1 %</td>
<td>5.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat of * armed actual</td>
<td>53.2 %</td>
<td>14.3 %</td>
<td>8.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons, military, training, exercise, defence</td>
<td>68.3 %</td>
<td>10.8 %</td>
<td>1.4 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant differences between the three newspapers in mentioning this topic.

Table 5-12
Percent of stories on Libya-USSR relationship which mention arms, by newspaper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The New York Times</th>
<th>The Globe &amp; Mail</th>
<th>The Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=54</td>
<td>n=32</td>
<td>n=40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Arms Mentioned</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 1.26  Sig .5326  Cramer's V .10

The focus on the military aspect of the crisis is also visible in the considerable emphasis on arms in the western press coverage of the Libyan-Soviet relationship (Table 5-12). The arms perspective was most often taken by The New York Times (in 29% of stories on Soviet-Libyan relations), followed by The Times (25%) and The Globe and Mail (18.8%).

Some of the arguments have suggested that the dispute over the Gulf of Sidra was the main problem between Libya and America. The conflict had dramatically increased after several incidents near the Libyan coast; the last one was before the
American raid on Libyan cities. In 1973, Libya extended the limits of its territorial waters to 32°-30 degrees, which meant that the entire Gulf of Sidra would become part of Libya. The United States denounced this declaration and continued to consider this area as international waters. I hypothesize that the three Western newspapers will focus on this issue, especially in the pre-raid period, because of its importance to the interests of America. For the same reason I expect that the American newspaper, The New York Times, will have more coverage over that issue in the three periods than the other two newspapers.

Table 5-13 shows some significant differences in how the three Western newspapers present the American-Libyan political relationship, with reference to the dispute in the Gulf of Sidra. As expected, The New York Times had the highest overall percentage of mentions of the dispute. This reflects the importance of the Gulf in the perception of the editors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>New York Times n=408</th>
<th>Globe and Mail n=236</th>
<th>The Times n=328</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire coverage</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Raid *</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raid</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Raid</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Differences in % between period are sig at .0001 for all three newspapers.

It is apparent that the Gulf of Sidra received full coverage especially during the pre-raid period. The New York Times printed the highest percentage of news stories about the Gulf, followed by The Times. This may be attributed to two events
which took place. First is the March 24th incident between American and Libyan aircraft, when Libya said it shot down two American jets. Second is the West Berlin night club bombing.

To sum up, The Globe and Mail printed the most news stories related to the actual armed conflict between Libya and America, in the raid period. The New York Times, on the other hand, had the lead in the pre-raid period in actual armed conflict and threat, and weapons, military exercise, and defence categories.

Overall, the dispute over the Gulf of Sidra received strong coverage in the pre-raid period from the three Western newspapers. The New York Times, as we expected, had the lead, followed by The Times, in publishing high percentages of news stories related to this issue.

5.1.4. Question Four

What was the stance or "bias" of the coverage, anti-Libyan, pro-Libyan, or neutral? Was the bias related to sources, and did it change over time?

According to the literature, Libya was accused by the West of worldwide plots, and of being an enemy of the West for a long time. Since the 1969 revolution, Libya had nationalized all the Western oil companies and banks. Furthermore, Libya has been accused of creating coups and unrest in its Arab neighbours and in African states, and of working to reduce Western influence, and American influence in particular, in the Middle East and Africa. In addition, many Third World countries claim that the Western media destroy the images of their political leaders and political systems by publishing negative news stories.
I hypothesize that all three newspapers will portray Libya negatively, but particularly The New York Times, by publishing negative stories on Qaddafi, in personal and political terms.

This expectation is only partially borne out. Two-thirds of the coverage is non-judgemental or neutral on facts and topics which are not negatively or positively valued. Among the "biassed" stories, only a very small proportion (1.0%) is pro-Libyan, while 31% (or thirty times as many) were coded as anti-Libyans.

**Table 5-14**

**Newspaper biases by newspaper**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>The New York Times N=420</th>
<th>The Globe &amp; Mail N=277</th>
<th>The Times N=357</th>
<th>Total N=1054</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 23.38  Sig .0001  Cramer’s V .1

The examination of newspaper biases in Table 5-14 indicates significant differences among the three Western newspapers. Expectedly, The Globe and Mail printed the least negative evaluation of Libya, and The Times published the second highest percentage of negative stories. On the other hand, The New York Times as paper from a participant country in the conflict printed the most anti-Libyan and the lowest percentage of neutral stories, followed by The Times. The stories coded as pro-Libyan are those news stories that depict positive aspects of Libya, or those that delineate the other side of Libya; these include letters to the editor which describe the Libyan people as agreeable people and tell how they offered to protect foreigners during the raid.
As result of freedom of the press in Western society, the press does not always have to follow the political ideology of the government. In other words, the press does not always portray Libya as the U.S. government may feel it should. In fact, the understanding which journalists in the West, and especially those of elite papers, have of their profession, often makes journalists worry of following the government's position. Consequently, negative stories are outnumbered by neutral ones by (2:3) in The New York Times and by even more (1:2) in The Times and The Globe and Mail (1:4).

Stories were also examined for specific adjectives used to describe Libya as a country and its leader Qaddafi. Mostly negative descriptors were used for Libya and its political leader. Examples for these descriptors are: madman, mad dog, crazy, outlaw country (see appendix A). Table 5-15 shows that the total number of positive and negative descriptors for Qaddafi in personal and political terms is much lower than I expected: 46 personal, and 38 political. Of the 46 personal descriptors, 39 were negative, with only 7 personal positive descriptors. Of the 38 political descriptors used to label Qaddafi, 33 were negative, and 5 were positive. The total number of positive and negative descriptors used to describe the Libyan revolutionary political system is even lower (19); of these 15 were negative and 4 were positive. Given the generally neutral stance of 67% of the stories, it is not surprising that few openly evaluative adjectives were found. One of the possible reason is that these newspapers would regard explicit labelling as unprofessional; instead, the anti-Libyan slant is created by other techniques. For example, news stories about Libya and her leader often connected them with negatively viewed topics like terrorism.
Some interesting and unexpected findings appeared, in that all three Western newspapers published only small numbers of personal and political adjectives referring to Qaddafi and Libya.

Terrorism and hijacking have become the dominant news relating to Libya and the Middle East in the last five years. Most of the Western media believe Libya was behind many of these terrorist operations. Therefore, it was expected that The New York Times would publish the most news stories about Libya’s connection with the terrorists. Table 5-16 reveals the percentage of articles on the Libyan-American political relationship which mention terrorism and hijacking. The results show no significant differences among the three newspapers. All three papers draw the relationship between Libyan foreign policy and terrorism and hijacking. The three newspapers portrayed Libya and its political system as sponsoring terrorism and adopting it as a main instrument in its foreign policies. This maybe be attributed to the finding in Table 5-8 that all three newspapers get their news related to the conflict from Western countries, rather than from Libya.

Libyan leader Qaddafi has been accused of sponsoring terrorists and offering them training and protection. All three newspapers set their agendas in similar ways in portraying Qaddafi. An examination of Table 5-17 shows how Qaddafi was portrayed by the three Western newspapers. When they mentioned his name, they connected it with terrorism 2 out of 5 times. Overall, all three papers mentioned terrorism and hijacking about equally often, as we expected, but the two North American newspapers did so more often than did The Times, personalizing the connection with the Libyan leader.
### Table 5-15
Descriptors of Qaddafi and Libya, by newspaper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>New York Times N=420</th>
<th>Globe &amp; Mail N=277</th>
<th>The Times N=357</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Qaddafi personal positive</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Qaddafi personal negative</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Qaddafi political positive</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Qaddafi political negative</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya total positive</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya total negative</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5-16
Terrorism references, by newspaper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References to terrorism and hijacking</th>
<th>New York Times</th>
<th>Globe &amp; Mail</th>
<th>The Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In stories on U.S.-Libyan relationship %</td>
<td>408 *</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In all other stories</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News stories, total</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 2.45  Sig .1168 (NYT)*
1.29  .2544 (G&M)
1.02  .3106 (LT )

*For an explanation to the Table presentation, see Table 5-4.
Table 5-17
References to both Qaddafi and terrorism and hijacking, by newspaper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference to terrorism</th>
<th>New York Times</th>
<th>Globe &amp; Mail</th>
<th>The Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stories on Qaddafi</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other stories</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All stories</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 18.23  Sig .0000  (NYT) 4  *
  4.82         .0281  (G&M)
   .10         .7458  (LT )

*For an explanation to the Table presentation, see Table 5-4.

In summary, there were significant differences among the three Western newspapers in how they portrayed Libya and its political system. The Globe and Mail printed the most neutral news stories, while The New York Times published the highest percentages of anti-Libyan stories as expected. Overall, the majority of stories was neutral, but where evaluations were made, the bias was predominately negative, both in overall story bias and in the specific adjectives used to describe Libya and Qaddafi. The negative slant is clearly related to the close connection which the papers frequently make between Libya, her leader, and terrorism.

5.1.5. Question Five

How much coverage was there of non-conflictual matters of Libyan policy, such as social issues, domestic politics and economic matters?

This section deals with the internal politics in Libya and how the three Western newspapers covered the elements of internal politics, such as social issues and domestic
and economic matters. Libya, as a developing country, has big achievements in all fields. These accomplishments in agriculture and industry gained wide attention in Libya. On the other hand, no Western newspaper covers the events of the Third World as regularly as it does news from the developed World. Accordingly, the expectations are that the three papers will pay less attention to internal Libyan politics. All three newspapers will focus on issues other than domestic Libyan politics. In domestic politics, all three papers will focus on the Libyan leader, and perhaps on revolutionary committees and ideology. These issues are the main keys in Libyan internal politics. The papers are expected to focus much more heavily on "economic sanctions" and "oil and energy." On the other hand, less attention will be paid to internal developments in Libya, such as agricultural and industrial development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>The New York Times</th>
<th>The Globe &amp; Mail</th>
<th>The Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and welfare</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other social services</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total social issues</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-18 shows that overall little attention was paid to the social issues in Libya. This disregard of the social service sector may be due to overriding interest in the military confrontation. All the attention of the correspondents was concentrated on the development of the political and military confrontation and its effect on the region.
In addition, the table indicates no differences among the three newspapers in this regard.

Table 5-19 shows that all three newspapers also paid little attention to domestic politics in Libya. This finding is somewhat surprising, since it was assumed that ideological hostility is part of the reason for the anti-Libyan positions taken by the Western papers. The New York Times paid slightly more attention to the Libyan leader and to the revolutionary committees than did the other newspapers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>The New York Times</th>
<th>The Globe &amp; Mail</th>
<th>The Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader of the revolution</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolutionary committees</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General people congress and General people committee</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other domestic</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total domestic politics</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-20, in contrast, reports the coverage of economic matters, which are apparently seen as much more important than social issues and domestic politics. The three newspapers gave their main attention to the key issues in economic matters, as expected. For example, "oil," the main natural resource in Libya, is also involved in the controversy in OPEC. The controversy is over the continuing operation of the American oil companies in Libya. The second category of interest is "sanctions" against
Libya because of its revolutionary politics in the Middle East and Africa. The sanctions against Libya, started by the United States in an attempt to put pressure on Libya to change its radical policy, were adopted by some of the European Economic Community members as well. The New York Times mentioned the category of sanctions twice as often as did The Times and The Globe and Mail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>The New York Times</th>
<th>The Globe &amp; Mail</th>
<th>The Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oil and Energy *</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and Commerce</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and Banking</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial development</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture extra</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctions *</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another economic matters</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Economic matters</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant differences between newspapers in mentioned this topic (.05 level).

In summary, all three Western newspapers paid little attention to social services, domestic politics, and economic matters other than "oil" and "sanctions". The lack of attention to these issues may be due to the over-riding importance of the military confrontation between Libya and America. The coverage of the three issue areas is
summarized in Table 5-21. There are few significant differences in the issue coverage of the three papers: the agenda is set very similarly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>New York Times</th>
<th>Globe &amp; Mail</th>
<th>The Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic matters</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic politics</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social services</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.6. Question Six

What was the coverage of the international reaction to the bombing? Which areas of the world were covered in this regard?

With reference to the literature, it can be argued that Western media (like all media) work in and for their societies and their interests. Both the American and British governments were directly involved in the conflict, albeit with significant differences. Accordingly, both American and British governments are likely to have the highest number of mentions with respect to their reactions to the conflict in the three Western newspapers. All three newspapers are expected to cover extensively the Western reaction in general and the American reaction in particular. The New York Times will have more U.S. coverage than The Globe and Mail, and The Globe more than The Times, as The Times will focus on British reactions. In contrast, less coverage is likely of reactions from Eastern bloc and other nations.

Table 5-22 shows the coverage of reactions to the conflict by the elite newspapers. As expected, all three Western papers concentrated heavily on the American views towards the conflict. These percentages were expected, because
America was the main Western country involved in the conflict. Contrary to my hypothesis, The Times published the most articles on American reaction to the crisis, followed by The Globe and Mail with The New York Times a distant third. This reflected the importance of this affair for both the British and Canadian governments, and their friendship with the United States.

The second highest percentages of reactions over the conflict were from the area labelled as "others" in the three newspapers. "Others" consists of some Western countries and the rest of the World, including Libya and other Arab countries. For example, The New York Times, on March 26, 1986, reported the reaction of the Greek government: "Greece said that it regarded provocations and confrontations in the Eastern Mediterranean as a danger to peace. A spokesman for the government of Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou issued the brief statement of concern over clashes between Libyan and American forces."

Similarly, The New York Times, on April 2, 1986, published the reaction of the Israeli Prime Minister, who called the U.S. actions against Libya a "great move."

The reactions of the Libyan government were reported in The New York Times on April 8, 1986, when it carried Qaddafi's statement that the "U.S. attack would bring response." The Globe and Mail, on April 16, 1986, carried the reaction of the Canadian government to the crisis. The Globe said, "The Canadian government deplores the killing of innocent civilians in the air attack on Libya by the United States, Prime Minister Brian Mulroney said."

The British government gave important assistance to America in its raid on Libyan cities, by allowing American planes to use its military bases for the raid. This has to be seen in the context of continuing support by Libya for the IRA, and of the
killing of a policewoman, Yvonne Fletcher, in 1984 in front of the Libyan People’s Bureau in London, by an unknown gunman. The British government accused Libya of that action, while Libya denied it. This led the British government to break its diplomatic ties with Tripoli.

Table 5-22
Coverage of international reactions to U.S.A. action in Libya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>New York Times</th>
<th>Globe &amp; Mail</th>
<th>The Times of London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>America’s reaction *</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.K.’s reaction *</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France’s reaction *</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.S.R.’s reaction</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China’s reaction</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN’s reaction</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others *</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant differences between the three newspapers in mentioning this topic (.05 level).
** % sum to more than 100, because more than one can be mentioned per story.

The Western countries’ reactions differed greatly from Moscow’s reaction to the American-Libyan interaction. It is apparent from Table 5-22 that the Western papers stressed Western governments’ reactions more than the Soviet Union’s response. Due to the focus on Western reactions, and the minimal mention of Moscow’s reaction, the newspapers clearly emphasized support of the U.S.A, rather than giving voice to critical points of view.

Regarding the United Nations Security Council’s reaction, all three newspapers had equally low coverage of the debate in the UN over the conflict.
Muslims around the world demonstrated against the American raid on Libyan cities. The raid was widely condemned in Arab Muslim countries such as the Sudan, Libya itself, and in Muslim countries around the world. There were demonstrations in their major cities and at United States bases, denouncing America and the U.K for their involvement in the raid. The raid was also widely criticized by members of the non-aligned nations meeting in New Delhi, and by some members of the UN Security Council. Relatively little of this reaction found its way into the three Western newspapers.

One example of the disregard for Muslim views concerns the issue of an Islamic "holy war" against the U.S. While this issue is highly emotionally charged for the Muslim world, Table 5-23 shows that it was virtually ignored in the Western press (and the Western world). In addition, the Western newspapers published similarly low percentages in all three periods. Only rarely was the "holy war" mentioned prominently in the Western papers, as it was on March 26, 1986, when The Globe and Mail headlined a story about Libya "Libya threatens to take 'holy war' against U.S. beyond battleground."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References to:</th>
<th>The New York Times</th>
<th>The Globe and Mail</th>
<th>The Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre raid</td>
<td>raid</td>
<td>post raid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy War</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The coverage of Libya's relation with the Western nations was examined for the degree of confrontation reported in the stories. Political confrontation is a dispute over regional national or international affairs. In most cases, report of confrontation covered criticism launched by opposing parties against the policy of a government regarding certain issues. Internationally, political confrontation usually meant that political tension between the countries involved escalated. Internal political confrontation happened in England when the opposing parties criticized Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's support for the American policy toward Libya. International examples of confrontation include the withdrawal of ambassadors, break-off of the diplomatic ties or exchanges of accusations as well as the cut of economic aid.

Regarding this issue, I expect all three Western newspapers will report news of the confrontation widely, i.e. a high percentage of the stories will be coded "confrontational". In particular, The Times will report the most confrontational topics, especially Britain's role in supporting the U.S.A over Libya and the controversy in the British parliament regarding this issue.

Table 5-24 shows significant differences among the three newspapers in reporting political confrontation over the conflict between Libya and America. First of all, a comparison between the columns reflects the differences between papers. Interestingly, The New York Times always shows the lowest percentage of confrontations news in its coverage of the relationship between Libya and various Western countries. On the other hand, The Times always reported the highest percentage of confrontation except for the Libya-Britain relationship, on which The Globe and Mail reported relatively more confrontation.
Secondly, comparisons can be made between rows reflecting differences in the relative level of confrontation in the coverage of different nations’ relationships with Libya. Several observations are possible in this regard, and they present puzzles. First, the lowest level of confrontation was present in the coverage of Libya-United States relationship in all three papers. The percentage of confrontational coverage was about half as high as for the remaining countries in The New York Times and The Globe and Mail, and about two thirds as high in The Times.

Secondly, the levels of confrontation in the relationship of Libya with various other nation (beside U.S.) are not significantly different in The New York Times; they are fairly similar in The Globe and Mail (low 45%, high 55%), but they differ more in The Times, the only paper published in one of the other countries coded. The Times reporting on the British-Libyan relationship is only marginally more confrontational than the U.S-Libya connection (38% versus 46%). In contrast, the level of confrontational coding for the other three relations in The Times range from 58% to 68% (France-Libya).

In summary, all three Western newspapers had reported extensively on the American reaction to the raid, and provided significant coverage of other Western responses. The Times, not surprisingly, printed the largest percentage of articles on British reaction to the conflict. On the other hand, the three elite Western papers spent very little space on the reaction of the U.S.S.R, other socialist nations as the United Nations. These central to the Arab response were virtually ignored.

The Times always reported the highest percentage of confrontation in its stories, followed by The Globe and Mail. The New York Times coverage always appeared least confrontational, and curiously, the coverage of the Libyan-American relationship
was less confrontational, in all three papers, than that of any other Western-Libya relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References to confrontation in articles on:</th>
<th>The York New Times</th>
<th>The Globe and Mail</th>
<th>The Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American-Libyan political relationship</td>
<td>n=408 ** 16.4%</td>
<td>n=236 26.7%</td>
<td>n=328 37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya-British political relationship</td>
<td>n=79 30.4%</td>
<td>n=41 51.2%</td>
<td>n=156 45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya-West Germany political relationship</td>
<td>n=57 31.6%</td>
<td>n=29 55.2%</td>
<td>n=47 66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya-Italy political relationship</td>
<td>n=66 34.8%</td>
<td>n=31 45.2%</td>
<td>n=60 58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya-French political relationship</td>
<td>n=80 31.3%</td>
<td>n=30 50.0%</td>
<td>n=41 68.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant differences between the three newspapers in Mentioned the topic (.05 level).

** n=408: this number of stories on American-Libyan political relationship. 16.4% to be read as: percentage of the stories on the specific relationship which refer to political confrontation.

5.2. The Hypotheses

This part deals with the previous findings, to determine whether the data support or reject the hypotheses formed earlier.

5.2.1. Hypothesis One

Due to the orientation of the Western press, the structures of news gathering will be in terms of Western interests, sources and places of origin of stories, especially during sudden crises. This means that most of the Libyan-American conflict stories will originate from Western countries and focus on Western interests; stories originating from Libya will depend on special correspondents.
The findings from the three Western newspapers supported this hypothesis. The New York Times received the majority of its news stories related to the conflict through special correspondents. The Canadian newspaper, The Globe and Mail, relied for its coverage on "wire services" and its "local staff" rather than on special correspondents. The Times received the majority of its news through local (London) staff, with special correspondents lagging slightly behind local staff.

The three elite papers strongly focused on the Western countries' reaction by concentrating coverage on Western views toward the American-Libyan interaction. In the three Western newspapers, the reactions of the Western governments toward the affair were covered extensively, the Soviet Union's reaction very lightly, and the United Nations' hardly at all. Coverage of Western reaction was not limited to the U.S, Great Britain and Canada, as all papers covered the other West European nations as well.

Thus, the hypothesis received considerable support. The Libyan-American confrontation, and the raid itself were overwhelmingly treated from a Western perspective. All three Western newspapers originated most of their news stories related to the conflict, and many of the stories focused on the West, rather than on Libya or other Arab countries, in their coverage.

5.2.2. Hypothesis Two

Western attention to the Third World is generally low, but can be triggered by dramatic events on which Western attention remains with a narrow and short-lived focus. In the Libyan-American conflict, Western press coverage will focus on military matters, the raid and related topics. As a result of long-held views of Libya as a terrorist state, terrorism will be emphasized, while little attention is given to Libyan internal politics and to economic and social matters not connected to oil.
This hypothesis has received strong support from the findings. The three Western newspapers paid little attention to Libyan internal politics and social issues. The attention of the Western press instead was concentrated on other matters, such as the political and military confrontation between Libya and the U.S.A. All three Western newspapers focused heavily on military issues, especially during the raid. The coverage included discussions of topics like war (the raid), military threats, weapons, arms dealing, training exercise, and defence.

When internal matters were covered, Western newspapers concentrated more on economic matters than on political or social policy. However, they concentrated mainly on the key issues of economic matters related to the conflict, such as "oil and energy", and "sanctions". Included in these topics is coverage of the European Economic community’s response to the American request for sanctions against the Libyan government, and coverage of the controversy over US branch companies continuing their operations in Libya.

5.2.3. Hypothesis Three

The Western press has shown a tendency to portray the Third World, and especially radical countries, negatively. I expect to find evidence for negative coverage in various ways: (a) The overall slant of stories will be overwhelmingly negative; (b) the coverage will label Libya’s political system and her leaders with negative adjectives; and (c) coverage will generally focus on themes with negative connotations, such as international terrorism, association with the Soviet Union etc.

This hypothesis received mixed support. To the extent that evaluation were presented, a negative treatment was evident in all three areas mentioned in the hypothesis. However, the overall impression from two-thirds of the news coverage of Libya and the Libyan-American conflict is a neutral treatment (Table 5-25). This
predominantly neutral coverage does reflect the traditional Western journalistic ideals of neutrality and even handedness (balance) and probably shows a higher level of neutrality than would be exhibited by Western governments, the Western societies at large, or by the media of many other nations.

However, where evaluations are present, reflecting widely held sentiments in their societies, the Western papers largely took an anti-Libyan position (by a margin of 31:1 over positive judgements). Surprisingly, coverage was most neutral during the raid itself; during the armed conflict, the media were concentrating on presenting the details of the events (the "facts"), rather than evaluating the positions.

Surprisingly, the long-term implications of the confrontation do not appear damaging to Libya's image in the West: During the post-raid period coverage of Libya is more neutral and less negative than during the pre-raid period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>Pre-raid n=298</th>
<th>Raid n=588</th>
<th>Post-Raid n=168</th>
<th>Total N=1054</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 17.35  Sig .0016  Crammer’s v .09

Secondly, I examined the labelling used in the press. Personal and political adjectives (negative and positive) were used to describe Libyan leader Qaddafi and the political system in Libya in all three newspapers. In general, Qaddafi as well as Libya received more negative than positive comments. However, the overall number of labelling
Adjectives for both Qaddafi and Libya was very low than I expected (total number of adjectives was 103, in 1054 stories).

In the third area the hypothesis receives support. It appears that the newspapers did portray Qaddafi as sponsoring terrorism and adopting it as a main instrument in achieving his foreign policy; a high proportion of stories relating to Qaddafi also contained references to terrorism.

Similarly, Libya was portrayed as a militaristic state or as a strategic arms store for the Soviet Union.

5.2.4. Hypothesis Four

There will be significant differences with respect to coverage of Libya among the three elite Western newspapers because the three newspapers are representative of the three different Western countries: the U.S. is the main Western country involved in the conflict; the U.K. is the main assistant to the American raid, and Canada is only an observer. Proximity to the main protagonists in the conflict should be have an impact on the coverage.

Examination of the data leads to both confirmation and rejection of the hypothesis. The three Western newspapers did set their news agendas for the American-Libyan conflict differently in many regards. For example, on the variable "the prime area of interest," The Times gave more attention to Libya than did the other newspapers. The Globe and Mail printed the fewest "anti-Libyan" news stories, as Canada was the least involved of the three countries, and The Globe and Mail was the only newspaper that gave its full attention to letters to the editor during and after the raids. The New York Times had a lead over the other newspapers in publishing the most "ant-Libyans" news stories.
The Western newspapers, in their coverage of the dispute over the Gulf of Sidra, show some significant differences. For example, The New York Times had published the most news stories about the dispute over the Gulf of Sidra, especially in the pre-raid period, followed by The Times. About the American-Libyan political relationship, and with reference to the dispute over the Gulf of Sidra, The New York Times shows more attention than the other papers, followed slightly by The Times. While The Times and The Globe and Mail focused more in military matters, The New York Times coverage was more political.

In summary, the previous hypotheses did receive some confirmation. The three elite papers did set their news agendas differently about the political and military confrontation between Libya and the United States. The Times printed the largest percentages of articles about Libya, and made it the prime area of interest.

The New York Times received most of its news about the conflict through special correspondents. The other two newspapers received their news through local staff and wire services. The internal politics of Libya received little attention, as expected, except on the main conflict-related issues in economic matters such as "oil" and "sanctions". Thus, on many of the issues discussed the three Western papers appeared relatively similar, for example on their overall slant, the pattern of attention on the "story", and the amount of coverage. However, a true measure of the degree of similarity should only be provided by comparison with the treatment of this "story" in non-Western media.
CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

6.1. Review of the Study: Coverage and Implications

The following is a discussion of the main findings of this study about Western press coverage of the American-Libyan conflict of 1986. The findings are based on an empirical study of three elite Western newspapers: The New York Times, from the United States; The Times, from Great Britain; and The Globe and Mail, from Canada. This study was an extensive one; 1054 items were analyzed which appeared in the four months period from February 15th to June 30th, 1986. The first question that might be raised regarding the portrayal of Libya in the three Western newspapers is: How did the three Western newspapers report on Libya and its people, political leaders, and political system? Some major conclusions about the coverage are discussed below, based on the analysis in the previous chapters.

Several similarities between the three newspapers are apparent, though the relative proportions of items devoted to different topics differ somewhat. Coverage was primarily oriented toward conflict and was military oriented. The New York Times, which had the most stories in the pre-raid period, printed more stories related to military activity.

Coverage focused primarily on Libyan political and economic ties with the Western countries. The newspapers paid little attention to Libya’s internal politics and its Arab political relationships, as well as to Arab reactions to the American-Libyan interaction.
Further, coverage of economic matters was focused on key resources such as oil, which is seen as important and as a future weapon for Libya. One might conclude that the Libyan threat was based in military and economic components, along with Libya’s radical revolutionary political changes. These findings agree with the conclusions of study by a UNESCO team regarding foreign news in Western media:

foreign news is mostly political news and associated topics of economics, military and diplomatic activity. Disruptive events do get heavy coverage...Bad news does attract readers and is generally considered newsworthy by journalists (UNESCO, 1985:80).

In general, coverage was surprisingly often neutral. In the one third of stories which contained bias, it was primarily anti-Libya, and The New York Times was more "anti-Libyan" than the other two papers. The anti-Libyan balance of the evaluations is not a surprise, as Libya represents revolutionary ideas in the Middle East and Africa. Most of the anti-Libyan attitudes in the press reports were focused on Qaddafi personally, on his revolutionary policy, and on Libya’s connection with terrorism. This is partly the result of Western media reports, which paint the Libyan leader as one of the most dangerous threats to world stability. Amoretti suggests why Libya, as a result of its radical policy, is portrayed negatively in Western media. "Libya is portrayed as an example of what is considered an 'irrationality' which seems destined to spread throughout the Third World and the Moslem countries in particular" (Amoretti, 1985:193).

There are individual differences among the three newspapers in portraying Libya. For example, The New York Times published slight more positive evaluations of the Libyan-American conflict than the other two newspapers, and The Globe and Mail, followed by The Times, gave the most neutral coverage to Libya and its leader.
Other significant differences are that *The Globe and Mail* obtained most of its news through the wire services and its local staff rather than special correspondents on which *The New York Times* depended heavily. On the other hand, *The Times* received the majority of its news through local staff. Furthermore, *The Times* picked Libya as the prime area of interest more than did the other two newspapers.

Regarding the source of news, coverage was Western originated and Western oriented. This confirms that Western media continue to deal with news of the Third World from their own countries, using their own views. However, one can argue that this is natural behaviour for the functioning of the press. Everywhere around the world the press reflects to a large extent what their societies and their governments feel toward political issues, especially in international and bilateral affairs.

Perhaps due to such shared cultural values, as well as common reliance on the same wire services, the editors of all three newspapers appear to be in agreement as to the types of news to print. Items dealing with internal politics, economic matters, and descriptions used for Libya and Qaddafi had very similar frequencies in the three papers. This similarity in the proportions of different kinds of news coverage generally seems to indicate the awareness of editors in all three elite Western newspapers of the desirability of reporting a particular balance of various types of news.

Despite these similarities, however, there were differences between the papers in items related to conflict news. This is indicated by significant differences in coverage of conflict through special correspondents and local staff, place of origin of news stories, and the placement of stories in the newspapers.

*The New York Times* published more news stories related to the conflict than did the other newspapers, *The Times* and *The Globe and Mail*. This supports the
obvious hypothesis that media from countries involved in a conflict will have more coverage of the crisis than media from countries not directly involved.

6.2. Principal Contributions of the Study

This study covered the period between February 15th and June 30th, 1986 in a quantitative manner with a view to determining the quality of commentary related to the conflict. None of the previous studies on the English-language Western press coverage of the Libyan-American conflict were quantitative studies. The study period chosen made it possible to observe the coverage over three time periods: before, during, and after the American raids on Libyan cities.

This study analyzed the coverage of the Libyan political relationship with the United States in particular and Western countries in general. This relationship was viewed, firstly, through the most controversial topic, terrorism, and, secondly, through the political and military confrontation between Libya and America.

The main finding in this study is the confirmation of the continuing Western newspaper coverage of Third World countries from a Western perspective. Coverage of Libyan affairs was Western oriented in terms of where the news stories originated, their news sources, their geographic and topical focus.

To a remarkable degree, the coverage in the Western press was determined to be neutral (two-thirds). However, the general tenor of the evaluations (one third) of Libyan affairs and relation with Libya was found to be anti-Libyan. However, the anti-Libyan sentiments were not created in an obvious manner: the Western press does not simply cover Third World countries or their political leaders by using many negatively charged words. Qaddafi or Libya were labelled in negative words, but not nearly as
often as was expected. Only a small number of political and personal descriptors were used to describe Qaddafi and Libya.

However, as shown in Chapter Five, the Western press covered military aspects of the raid in great detail while neglecting internal achievements of Libya. Libyan economic, social, internal politics, her industrial and agricultural developments were all but ignored. This may create the impression among readers of these newspapers that Libya is largely a terrorist country and there is no development within the country on a more positive note.

6.3. Implications for Future Studies

Finally, although this research of elite Western press coverage of the American-Libyan conflict has brought to light some significant results, other studies should compare these three elite Western newspapers with samplings of Arab and other media, such as:

1) Newspapers from what are called moderate Arab states (friendly to the West);
2) Newspapers from other radical Arab countries;
3) Newspapers from Libya; and
4) Elite papers from East Bloc and non-Arab Third World countries.

The rationale behind choosing a wide range of newspapers is to examine differences between them in presenting the American-Libyan conflict. All these papers have different perspectives, but would be generally expected to present views shared by their societies and their governments toward international crises.

Differences within the Arab world would become visible, as some views would be radical, such as those of Libyan and other radical Arab newspapers. On the other
hand, moderate Arab newspapers may be more ambiguous in covering the Libyan-American conflict. Since Libya is part of the Arab world, these newspapers might reflect a feeling of brotherhood which motivates them to stand on the side of Libya. Yet, if they did so, they might embarrass their moderate governments, and put their nations’ friendly relationships with the West in jeopardy.

East Bloc elite newspapers may reflect the continuing struggle between West and East. The differences of views and ideas politically, ideologically, and economically among these newspapers could result in an interesting study. It is quite possible that East Bloc papers do not see the Arab World from an Arab perspective either, but from a Soviet (Polish etc.) point of view.

Non-Arab Third World papers could reflect:

1- anti-U.S (First World) views, if the Libyan-American conflict is seen in terms of Third World solidarity; or

2- More differentiated views (like moderate Arabs)¼, if the Libyan-American conflict is also seen as a struggle between radical and moderate forces.

In addition, an examination of East bloc and Third World papers would allow an examination of the question whether East bloc and Third World nations give the Libyan-American conflict the same, lower, or greater importance as Western papers. Also, since Western papers use largely Western wire services, do Eastern wire services and Third World news sources give a different agenda? A more systematic examination of these questions could only be achieved with the inclusion of non-Western news media.
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Appendix A

Negative and Positive Descriptors used by the three Newspapers for Libya and her Political Leader Qaddafi
(1) The New York Times

(A) Negative descriptors, used for the Libyan Leader Qaddafi (personal) (total N=21)

- Dishonour
- Flaky character
- Menace
- Madman
- Flaky
- Mad dog
- Worrisome rogue
- Erratic
- Crazy
- Bully
- Suspect
- Barbarian
- Posturing
- Abominable
- Strong man
- Shrewd

(B) Positive descriptors used for the Libyan Leader Qaddafi (personal) (total N=2)

- Devoted Moslem
- Ascetic Leader

(C) Negative descriptors used for the Libyan Leader Qaddafi (political) (total N=16)

- Dictator
- Acting as Soviet surrogate
- Mad dog of the Middle East
- Out of control
- Posturing
- Unpredictable
- Repository
- Organized Murder
- Terrorist
- String Puller
- Dangerous
- Strong man
- Uncontrollable
- expansionist

(D) Positive descriptors used for the Libyan Leader Qaddafi (political) (total N=2)

- Hero
- Ascetic Leader

(E) Negative descriptors used for Libya and its political system (total N=8)

- Outlaw country
- Weak
- Police State
- Terrorist centre
- Libya is a Soviet
- Client
- State of Terrorism

(F) Positive descriptors used for Libya and its political system (total N=1)

- Freedom Loving
(2) **The Globe and Mail**

(A) Negative descriptors used for the Libyan Leader Qaddafi (personal) (total N=8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Erratic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madman</td>
<td>Mad dog</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) Positive descriptors used for the Libyan Leader Qaddafi (personal) (total N=3)

| Wise man   |
| Gentleman  |
| Blameless victim |

(C) Negative descriptors used for the Libyan Leader Qaddafi (political) (total N=10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dictator</th>
<th>Enigmatic Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hitler</td>
<td>Mad Dog of the Middle East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictatorship of Qaddafi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(D) Positive descriptors used for the Libyan Leader Qaddafi (political) (total N=2)

| Proud patriot for his country and Arab countries |
| Revolutionary |

(E) Negative descriptors used for Libya and its political system (total N=2)

| Culprit |
| Terrorism of Libya |

(F) Positive descriptors used for Libya and its political system (total N=1)

| Glory |
(3) **The Times** (London)

(A) Negative descriptors used for the Libyan Leader Qaddafi (personal) (total N=17)

Reckless Adventurer
Bogeyman Useless
Irrational Madman
Dog Murder
Malignancy Unpredictable
Dangerous Abominable
Idiot

(B) Positive descriptors used for the Libyan Leader Qaddafi (personal) (total N=2)

Dedicated
Revolutionary

(C) Negative descriptors used for the Libyan Leader Qaddafi (political) (total N=7)

Dictator
Inspirer and impresario of terror
Mad dog of the Middle East
Unpopular
Malignancy

(D) Positive descriptors used for the Libyan Leader Qaddafi (political) (total N=1)

Revolutionary

(E) Negative descriptors used for Libya and its political system (total N=5)

State of terrorism
State sponsored terrorism
Libya is a haven for terrorist
Culprit
Sent terrorist

(F) Positive descriptors used for Libya and its political system (total N=2)

Glory
Rhetorical
Appendix B

Codebook
Story Title: ____________________________________________

____________________________________________________ Coder ______

**Newspapers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Col #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York Times</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Times (London)</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Globe &amp; Mail</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running ID</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>- -</th>
<th>4-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>6-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) **Origin of the story**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab Countries</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Germany</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### (2) Sources of Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPI</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuter</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tass</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New York Times</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Correspondent</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Staff</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Press</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other newspaper</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (3) The prime area of interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Arab</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Germany</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other East Europe</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other West Europe</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Middle East, Far East or other African countries</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(4) **Type of Item**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Item</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>News First page</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News inside pages</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader Letter</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoon</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo or Chart if alone</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following themes under discussion should be coded as code "1" equal mention and code "0" equal not mention.

(5) **International relationship**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libya -- U.S.A.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya -- U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya -- U.K.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya -- W. G.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya -- France</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya -- Italy</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya -- Chad</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya -- Egypt</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya -- FLO</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya -- Other Arab Countries</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya -- Canada</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya -- Other Western Countries</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya -- Others</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(6) Economic Matters

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oil / Energy</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade / Commerce</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial / Banking</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial develop</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture /Extra</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctions</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Other</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7) Military/ Defense / War/ Confrontation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peace talk / protest</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armed conflict actual</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed conflict threat</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Holy War</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons, Military training, Exercise preparedness</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary dispute Gulf of Sidra (Sirte)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms dealing</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism. Hijack Kidnapping</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political confrontation</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolution Movement, Rebels</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(8) Social Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health, Welfare</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(9) Domestic politics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader of the revolution</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General People's Congress and General People's Committee</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolutionary Committee</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(10) Person and personal characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qaddafi</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reagan</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcher</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitterand</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other western</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Libyan</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Arab</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(11) Reaction to U.S.A.-Libya interactions

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(12) Overall slant of story code "1" equal "pro-Libya". Code "2" equal "neutral". And code "3" equal "anti-Libya".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story under study</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(13) Placement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headline</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Descriptors:

(a) Qaddafi

1. __________+/-
2. __________+/-
3. __________+/-
4. __________+/-
5. __________+/-

Personal  Total positive

Total Negative

Political Total Negative

Total Positive

Descriptors:

(b) Libya

1. __________+/-
2. __________+/-
3. __________+/-
4. __________+/-
5. __________+/-

Total Positive

Total Negative

Comments: ____________________________________________

_____________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________
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