

American University of Central Asia

Journalism and Mass Communications

Media coverage of the Libyan Civil War in the Russia and the USA

By

Alexandra Ibragimova

Supervisor: Elena Skochilo

*A thesis submitted to the [Department title] of American University of Central Asia
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Arts*

April, 2012

Bishkek, Kyrgyz Republic

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Abstract.....	III
Acknowledgments.....	IV
Introduction.....	5
CHAPTER I: Libyan War: Russia and the US.....	6
Propaganda, Democracy and Media.....	10
CHAPTER II: State Rhetoric on Libyan War.....	10
CHAPTER III: Limitations.....	16
CHAPTER IV: Literature review	18
Theory of State Propaganda.....	18
CHAPTER V: Methodology.....	31
Chapter VI: Data Collection and Analysis.....	37
Chapter VII: Conclusion.....	48

Abstract

The goal of this paper is to compare the representation of the Libyan Civil war in the mainstream media of two ideologically different countries – the USA and Russia. The theoretical basis is propaganda theory that was firstly introduced by Harold Lasswell (The Theory of Political Propaganda) and Edward Bernays (Propaganda), it was later reintroduced by E. Herman and Naom Chomsky (Manufacturing Consent: the Political Economy of the Mass Media). Propaganda theory will be used to explain the findings of the content analysis. The idea of doing this research arose from the opinion that the USA was negatively determined towards the former government led by Muammar Gaddafi and Russia was much more loyal to the former regime. This case seemed ideal to test propaganda theory in media. It was repeatedly claimed that the NATO alliance's countries might be interested in the Libyan natural resources, Libya is on the first place for oil in Africa and the fourth for gas in the world. The relations between the government and the media is matter of research, in this paper the representation of the Libyan civil war will be observed in the media of two countries through the prism of propaganda theory and the media-government relations will be inevitably embraced by this theory as all the chosen mainstream newspapers are part of business, and economy in turn is related with politics. Lasswell's formula "Who says what in what channel to whom with what effect" and Chomsky and Herman's five general classes of "filters" that determine the type of news that is presented in news media: ownership of the medium, the medium's funding, sourcing of the news, flak, and anti-communist ideology will be tested in this paper. Through the content analysis of the four leading newspapers: The New York Times, Washington Post, Kommersant, Izvestiya, the image of war and Muammar Qaddafi, past and future of Libya, position of the home nation, justification of intervention are to be found out. The paper contributes to propaganda studies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to all those who gave me the possibility to complete this thesis.

I am deeply indebted to my supervisor Prof. Elena Skochilo from the American University in Central Asia whose help, stimulating suggestions and encouragement helped me in all the time of research for and writing of this thesis.

My fellow students and friends supported me in my research work. I want to thank them for all their help, support, interest and valuable hints. I am obliged to Elina Karakulova and Alina Murzaeva.

Especially, I would like to give my special thanks to my parents whose patient love enabled me to complete this work

Introduction

The idea for the research came from an observation of the recent media coverage of the Libyan war, which suggested that media of different states tend to present events and describe situations often through the prism and the view angle of their governments, despite internationally acknowledged standards of impartial and free media. The work attempts to study this phenomenon using some of the arguments of state propaganda theory. The research looks into how the media in modern democratic societies, such as Russia and the US, reported on the Libyan civil war of February-November, 2011. The mainstream newspapers from Russia and the US – states that tended to oppose each other regarding their policies on Libya - are taken as a subject of investigation. The research question is to what extent key press in Russia and the US sided with the official position of their respective countries? In other words, to what extent state rhetoric on war dominated in the mainstream media in Russia and the US?

This paper will analyze press coverage of the Libyan war (17.02.2011-30.10.2011) from the two countries – Russia and the US - which took rather antagonistic positions regarding events in that country and international intervention. The task will be to see whether there is a correlation between state rhetoric, in the form of official speeches, and press coverage in the selected newspapers. For the sake of feasibility of the study, these newspapers were selected for quantitative and qualitative content analysis – The New York Times, The Washington Post, Izvestia, Kommersant.

The selected papers will be tested against some aspects of the state propaganda theory, which is not as applicable today, as it could be in 20s and 30s of the 20th century. However, it would be intellectually rewarding to see whether in today's information era with globalized news, international standards of journalism, emphasis on impartiality and independence, deep Internet penetration – whether with all these factors present now, we could still trace elements of state propaganda or firm agenda setting in the independent press.

The research makes contribution to the field of propaganda studies; it discloses the correlation between the state rhetoric and the content of the mainstream media, the research tests sustainability of propaganda theory in modern democratic society. It adds to the study of media-government relations and discourse on globalization.

The work is divided into four sections – Background, Literature Review, Methodology, Data Analysis and Conclusion.

In the Background section, Libyan War: Russia and the US, the history of Libyan war is given. It discusses premises of the situation that emerged. Background section includes chronology of events.

Literature review is about propaganda theory. Starting from the birth of the theory, it shows how the theory emerged in 1920s and provides glance into the theory's history and development. Then there are different approaches to the theory presented. As well as preceding studies that were conducted on the basis of propaganda theory are discussed.

Methodology section explains how the research will be conducted. What methods of research are conceived as a way of finding an answer for the research question.

CHAPTER I: Libyan War: Russia and the US

This section allows the reader to understand the topic as well as premises for emergence of the research question. The main point is that Russia and the US treated the situation in Libya differently and the state officials of both countries regularly made contrasting allegations during the whole period of the war. There is no wonder, Russian-Libyan relations were much warmer since the time Col. Muammar Qaddafi came to power 43 years ago in 1969. The US-Libya relations deteriorated since then. Col. Muammar Qaddafi in a bloodless coup overthrew the King and declared Libyan Jamahiriya, close ally of the USSR. Although Russia criticized NATO bombings it also suggested that Col. Qaddafi lost legitimacy and must leave. The USA

blessed bombings and convicted Qaddafi in the crimes against humanity. This section also allows to understand premises for the rhetoric on the situation in Libya.

The chosen different countries are Russia and the USA. These countries are chosen because they voted differently in the UN Security Council on Resolution 1973 also because Russia is not a member of the NATO, it did not take part in the Libyan war and had friendly relations and economic ties with Libya. The USA reestablished diplomatic relations only in 2006, which were preceded by economic sanctions imposed by the US and Libyan membership in the "Axis of Evil".

The uprisings in Libya started on the 16th of February in 2011. The reason for uprisings was arrest of human rights activist Fathi Terbil. In six days Benghazi, the second largest city in Libya, went under control of rebels. In nine days, the third largest city, Misurata, went under control of rebels. Later Adjabia, Ras-Lanuf, and other towns were seized by rebels (however control over them changed). On the 26th of February the UN took Resolution 1970, which called Muammar Qaddafi for responsibility to the International Court and frozen 30 billion of Qaddafi's assets. National Transitional Council, formed on the 27th of February, declared itself the only legitimate representative of the Libyan people. Hillary Clinton took part in the negotiations with the Libyan opposition, regarding them as interlocutor of people. On the 10th of March France recognized National Transitional Council (NTC) as new legal Libyan government. On the 17th of March the UN Security Council took Resolution 1973, it declared no-flight zone over Libya and allowed to take all necessary measures to protect the Libyan people. On the 19th of March US, French and British air forces bombed Qaddafi's troops. On the 31st of March control over operation went to NATO. In the beginning of April Qaddafi's forces took control over the country and the US distanced itself from military participation giving the commanding to NATO, in the end of April NATO Britain and France sent their military experts to Libya. On the 27th of June the International Court gave order for arrest of

Saif al-Islam and chief of intelligence service. On the 1st of July frozen assets of Qaddafi were given to NTC. On the 11th of August rebels seized key oil port Marsa-el-Brega, and week later - Ez-Zavia. On the 21st of October Qaddafi was killed and NTC declared end of the civil war. Russia warned against military intervention, Russian officials during the war made continuous claims about the violations of Resolution 1973, and expressed fears of the operation to turn into ground operation and replicate those ones in Iraq and Afghanistan. In the middle of July the US recognized NTC. In the end of August Russia changed the Libyan flag in the embassy and recognized NTC. On the 21st of October Muammar Qaddafi was killed, presumably in the cross-fire. Russia declared NATO's violations of Resolution 1973, claimed that death of Qaddafi was violation of International Law, Geneva Convention.

The USA officials stated that democracy must have been achieved at any cost and that the revolt must lead a country towards a new political system. Qaddafi, Libyan ex-leader of revolution, said that in Libya there was 'straight democracy'. Russian UN representative as well as the President stated that the situation in Libya must be resolved peacefully, Russia abstained from voting for the Resolution 1973 . The two countries exchanged not friendly messages towards each other, officials from the Russian questioned the NATO on the violations of Resolution 1973.

The situation in Libya was discussed both in the Russian State Duma and in the US Congress. Both in Russia and the US the Presidents took decision to vote in the UN Security Council, and the US President Obama authorized military intervention (19.03.2011).

Both in the US Congress and Russian Duma there were disagreements with the decision of their Presidents, however they did not prevent decisions of them on how to behave in the situation in Libya in the beginning. Only in two weeks after the first bombings, when the members of the Congress severely condemned the US participation and Obama's decision to intervene. Similarly in Russia, President Medvedev condemned the bombing saying that the

resolution must have been implemented in ‘the spirit and letter’ of the law, this allegation contradicted with what he said earlier.

The US intervention of 21.03.2011 into Libya was actively discussed in the television (FOX, 2012), followed by country’s alienation from participation in the war. However the Presidents in both countries lead the executive branch of the federal government and are the commanders-in-chief. In the situation with Libya the President Obama was for military intervention, the President Medvedev was for peaceful regulation of the conflict however he did not say anything against Resolution 1973 and bombing when it was passed. Some members of the US Congress was against the US participation in the military operation against Libyan government and many members of the Russian Duma was against Resolution 1973. The US withdrew from participation in bombing in two weeks and the President Medvedev, probably after realizing how unpopular his decision on Libya condemned the violations of the Resolution 1973 in April and stated that the NATO exceeded mandate that was given to it by the UN.

In fact there are always many internal problems for every government and the governments of the countries are reluctant to intervene into the conflicts of other countries. There are hundreds of examples when the international community did unify in order to take measures to help other countries with similar situations (Indonesian dictator Suharto suppressed mass protests, Bahrein and Syrian protesters were shot, protests in Tibet, China, regularly put down). Libya is known to be rich in natural resources and there is sustainable discourse about the connection between oil and military interventions (Hartshorn,1968).

Propaganda, Democracy and Media

For every decision head of states always sought support. Mass media is a medium of communication, the way of getting this support from masses. Every politician first of all seeks to look good in media, and perhaps influence media, as media is a cause of people's support.

Propaganda is very difficult to detect. Could millions of Germans in 1930s be insane and chose Hitler, i.e. words voice of people is voice of God, as a leader? German and Soviet propaganda are the most famous successes of propaganda. Anti-Komintern in Nazi Germany, The Reich Propaganda Ministry, ideological work and enlightenment of masses in the USSR under the CPSS, United States Informational Agency (until 1999) these organizations were responsible for ideological and informational work.

Mass media is said to be the fourth estate. It is stage of dialogue between government, business and people. The media ideally must let every voice to be heard, not only the strongest ones. When propaganda penetrates media it becomes dangerous for as it forgets the voices of significant minority. For both countries the positions of the President, the Foreign-Minister/State-Secretary, UN representative were taken as they represent voices of the most powerful elite.

CHAPTER II: STATE RHETORIC ON LIBYAN WAR

In this Chapter, I am going to take official speeches by selected Russian and the US officials on Libyan War, to identify key differences in the positions of the two states.

The allegations of the President, D. Medvedev, foreign minister, Mr. Lavrov, Russia UN representative, Mr. Churkin and prime-minister, V. Putin, were taken. In Russia there was a dissent on the situation on Libya. Mr. Putin and Mr. Churkin criticized UN Security Council

Resolution 1973, they suggested that Russia must have used right of veto. However Mr. Medvedev was responsible for Russia to abstain in voting.

The allegations of the President are taken because he is head of the state and has more authority than others. Prime minister's speeches are taken because he was one of the most influential figures in Russia according to various surveys.

Russian foreign minister and UN representative's opinions are taken as the situation in the world with respect to Russia is ingenuously their field of work.

Mr. Obama's opinion is taken because he is head of executive branch and commander-in-chief, he solely took decision on first bombings in Libya.

US State-Secretary's position is almost identical to those one of foreign minister in Russia in terms of authority.

Russian President, Mr. Medvedev: "Consolidation of international efforts so that by the means of negotiations to end the conflict in Libya. Russian Federation, from the beginning wanted that the settlement of internal problems in Libya would be conducted peacefully. We thoroughly followed the situation and unconditionally condemned the actions of the Libyan management and the leader of the Libyan revolution with respect to its people. Governed by this considerations Russia supported Security Council's Resolution 1970 and missed Resolution 1973. Just for the protection of population and avoidance of conflict to escalate and deaths of civilians" (Medvedev, 2011).

The President's position was not very firm. He understood that Resolution 1973 meant military operation and numerous members of State Duma as well and heads of executive branches preferred to use the right of veto. However Mr. Medvedev wanted to stay neutral, preferring not prevent the western countries from intervention and deteriorate relations with the strongest ones.

Prime-Minister, Mr. Putin, 'Libya has the biggest oil-resources and the fourth biggest gas resources in Africa. The question rises is not it the oil that interests people who operate there?' (Putin, 2011)

Mr. Putin expressed what many parliamentarians said. He wondered, why Libya was a particular matter of concern while there were many other countries in the world with dictatorship regimes.

Russian President disagreed with his prime-minister when the latter said that the UN Security Council Resolution 1973 was crusade.

Russian UN representative glanced to the resolution from the angle of legislation. He underlined that the best for Libyan people was peace rather than change of government or the US-style democratic society. What is heard in the opinions of all Russian officials is that the priority and the best benefit for people is peace.

Russian UN representative, Mr. Churkin, 'Governed by this basic principle (provision of security for civilians) and common humanitarian values with coauthors of other Security Council members Russia did not prevent from adoption of resolution. However we are convinced that the shortest way to reliable security of civilians and long-term stabilization of the situation in Libya is immediate end of fire.' 'Unfortunately, work on these documents did not correspond to existing practice in the Security Council. Concrete and logical questions raised by Russia and other Security Council members on how no-flight zone would be provided, what would be the rules and limits of using force were left unanswered per se'. (Society, 2011)

The contrasting view is presented by the US officials, which can be summarized as democracy at any cost. The question is why the US does not bother so much about suppression of demonstrations in other countries?

The US President, Mr. Obama, 'To brush aside America's responsibility as a leader and, more profoundly, our responsibilities to our fellow human beings under such circumstances would have been a betrayal of who we are. Some nations may be able to turn a blind eye to atrocities in other countries. The United States of America is different. And as President, I refused to wait for the images of slaughter and mass graves before taking action.' (Obama, 2011)

State-Secretary agreed with the President, underlining how terrible was killing the protesters, not giving credit that protesters were not peaceful. They were determined to overthrow the government using force.

The US State-Secretary, Mrs. Hillary, "As the Chairman said, we have joined the Libyan people in demanding that Colonel Gaddafi must go now, without further violence and bloodshed, and we are working to translate the world's outrage into action and results.

Marathon diplomacy at the United Nations and with our allies has yielded quick, aggressive steps to pressure and isolate Libya's leaders. We welcome yesterday's decision to suspend Libya from the Human Rights Council, as I had urged a day earlier. Our combatant commands are positioning assets to prepare to support these critical civilian missions, and we are taking no option off the table, so long as the Libyan government continues to turn its guns on its own people." (Telegraph, 2011)

The same allegation was made by US UN representative but with more dramatic rhetoric.

Moreover, she expressed defiance and contempt to the Libyan leader in her speech in the UN Security Council.

The US representative in the UN, Ms. Rice, "It would be wrong of us to sit here with a road map. There's a serious institutional building challenge that exists in Libya, but in Libya as elsewhere in the region we believe there are universal rights that need to be acknowledged and respected. We will continue to be very supportive of their efforts to achieve the universal rights and the freedoms and the opportunities that they are seeking.' 'When he (Gaddafi) can laugh in

talking to American and international journalists while he is slaughtering his own people. It only underscores how unfit he is to lead and how disconnected he from reality. It makes all the more important the urgent steps that we have taken on over the course of the last week on national basis as well as the steps that we have taken collectively throughout the UN and the Security Council and we are going to continue to keep the pressure on.' (Madison, 2011)

Russia abstained from voting for the UN Security Council Resolution 1973 because the Resolution did not state ways in which it would have been realized and the limits of using force. "Western countries refused to discuss this question with us. This point was later revealed to be the cause of force abuse. NATO roughly violated its credentials in Libya. We discuss this question with the alliance as some say that operation in Libya is a model for the future. It must be seriously discussed from the point of view of the international law", said Russian Foreign Minister, S. Lavrov. (ITARTASS, 2011) He also added that according to the resolution the objects of operation must had been aviation and air defense if they constituted threat.

"Embargo for provision of weapons was broken. Libya's neighbors did not hide that they made supplies. France publicly confessed that it made supplies. During the certain time there were special forces," said Mr. Lavrov.

The death of the leader of Libyan revolution Muammar Qaddafi caused another set of different reactions and evaluations from officials of the two governments. Actions of NATO that preceded the death of Qaddafi are in need of legal assessment, alleged Russian foreign minister. He mentioned violations of international law, Geneva Convention. Russian President reacted neutrally. Mr. Obama said, "This marks the end of a long and painful chapter for the people of Libya." Said President Obama on death of the former Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi. My purpose is not to investigate this historical background event but to see to what extent state rhetoric was represented in key media outlets. The rhetoric on Libya developed from both sides, Russia and the US. The question of this thesis is to what extent key press in

Russia and US sided with the official position of their countries? In other words, to what extent state rhetoric on war dominated in the mainstream media in Russia and the US?

What was covered by the US and Russian media, how was it different and why? The US attitude in the face of the government towards the events in Libya were different from those of the Russian government, they led to the difference in the UN Security Council voting. Russia, in contrary to the US, sustained from voting for military intervention however it supported the Resolution 1970.

The field of interest is analysis of press content on the subject, of their correlation to government position: what is said about Libyan uprisings, leader of the Libyan Revolution, Col. Moammar Gaddafi, NATO's military operation, 'Odyssey. Sunrise', oil and gas, deaths of civilians in the beginning of the war and the end of it. The study contributes to research of the status quo of the press in democratic society. The study adds to the content analysis of the press, it also makes comparative analysis of different media. If the hypothesis is not proved than the theory of propaganda in democratic society is not sustainable. As the assumption is how the press in the democratic society, if there is not the same rhetoric in newspapers as in the speeches of the President, official rhetoric. What is the correlation between the democratic society and freedom of press and the politics that is forwarded by the country and press? Content analysis is expected to reveal connections within the propaganda theory and build further theoretical assumptions. The research will also contribute to the numerous studies of media coverage of the wars.

And as the rhetoric, tonality, of messages is different hence the hypothesis is that the rhetoric of newspapers' of the respectful countries will be different. The assumption is based on the on the observation, the propaganda was used to explain this phenomenon. The theory that states that media is objected to five filters: ownership, advertising, sourcing, flak, believe in the miracle of market (Herman, 2003). These five filters work by the 'independent action of many

individuals and organizations, and these frequently but not always have common view of issues and interests' (Chomsky N., 1988).

Russian official state rhetoric as portrayed in expression of official positions of the state officials can be characterized as restrained and reserved. Russia neither persisted Resolution 1973, nor supported it, and underlines that peace is the highest priority. The US rhetoric was indignant, it was just anger, manifested in the speeches of officials.

CHAPTER III: LIMITATIONS

It is important to note, that the current study attempts neither scientifically accurate representation, not an exhaustive conclusion. Rather, it attempts to study certain media and political trends more systematically and provide some specific guidance for more thorough further research. For the feasibility of this study we took four newspapers, which were selected based on factors of popularity, trust, readability and financial independence from the government. Two leading newspapers from each country – the Kommersant and Izvestia from Russia, and the Washington Post (WP) with the New York Times (NYT) from the US – will be analyzed for content regarding the Libyan War from the beginning of the opposition uprisings till the end of October, the official end of the Libyan Civil War. Representation of such aspects as legitimacy of the NATO military operation, portrayal of Muammar Qaddafi, process of the civil war will be analyzed from the chosen newspapers – this is not the whole list.

In this paper the official positions of the governments were taken in the form of speeches by the key political figures and checked against their representation in the selected newspapers. This approach will help to trace a correlation and test some of the aspects of state propaganda theory.

Only official speeches during the conflict were taken to answer the research question. Another limitation or obstacle to this work has been the fact that Libya is not an easy case in terms of

clear state positions or clear state rhetoric, unlike the wars in Iraq or Georgia, where the US and Russian government had more univocal and fervent positions. The US condemned the Libyan government's actions, so did Russia. Russian elites had contradictions in the government on the position on Libya: President, Mr. Medvedev, showed neutral side to the Resolution 1973 (which led Russia to be abstainer in voting for it) and condemned prime-minister's allegations. Prime-Minister, Mr. Putin, said that Resolution 1973 was 'defective and detrimental' and the intrusion of the UN Security Council was 'crusade'. The US withdrew from participation in the military actions as soon as the 4th of April (Resolution 1973 declaring no-flight zones and taking all necessary means to protect civilians was adopted on the 17th of March). Another difference related to the relations with the leader of Libyan Revolution, Muammar Qaddafi, Russia recognized the new government later than the USA. In addition US had sent their representatives in March, stating that they saw the opposition as interlocutors of the will of Libyan people and supported the opposition financially during the unrest, they transferred Qaddafi's frozen money to the members of the National Transitional Council (NTC). However, the rhetoric of both states were not as dramatically different as it first seems. The limitations are that there was not approval for military operation in the US Congress and there was a dissent among the elites in Russia (the President Medvedev removed from office the Russian ambassador to Libya and rejected prime-minister's, Mr. Putin, allegations that military operation in Libya was deficient and reminded crusade). Based on that, it could be suggested that the same scattered or diverse positions were reflected in the newspapers in the two countries.

The other limitation is that newspapers are not the main source of information for the majority of citizens, many surveys showed that television is more popular media than the press today. It obviously means that the effects are of smaller scale. The press does not have capability for live discussions like television. People who read news can get more profound knowledge on the situation. The readers of the mainstream press are predominately the elites.

There is a lack of theoretical clearance in this research. Propaganda theory is regarded too philosophically, it is not highlighted the best way possible and reminds homogeneous substance of the three: framing, agenda-setting and propaganda. At the same time framing theory and agenda-setting theory are essential sub-theories of propaganda theory, propaganda is impossible without framing and agenda-setting. Framing theory as "the process by which a source defines the essential problem underlying a particular social or political issue and outlines a set of considerations purportedly relevant to that issue" (Nelson T.E., 1997)

The final part is analysis and reflection on data received, summarizing it and making propositions for future research

CHAPTER IV: Literature review

In this Chapter we will touch upon key theoretical aspects of media studies on propaganda to extract some of the arguments that could be still applied and tested today. We will also look into normative aspects of media performance in democracy. Having accounts on both – this work will try to resolve the paradox that one could observe in media performance of the two states during the Libyan Civil War – Russia and the US. We are consciously avoiding literature on international relations, studies on media systems in Russia and the US, because both of these countries declare and position themselves as democracies. Therefore, only normative approach will be taken in evaluating press performance in these countries for the selected case study.

Theory of State Propaganda Today

Today, we are free and have plenty of sources of information. The media today are newspapers, television, internet blogs and social networks. Through the media we get information about what is happening around the world. This the primary media functions that justifies its existence.

Communication is a process of transmitting and getting information, a process of exchanging information between people or media and people or people and media. One of the fields of psychology of communication that concerns this research is representations, narratives and discourse analysis.

Propaganda theory is claimed to be dead, it is not so obvious as even thirty years ago. We clearly see propaganda of glamour and advertising. The media is free and it aims to be as objective, independent and self-sustained as possible, because adhering such values will grant it trust and recognition of people.

However it is suggested that journalists are tent to be persuaded by politicians, policy and decision makers on the basis of laws of communication, maintenance of personal contacts and friendly relations with them, eventually one may be easily inclined at presenting the subject matter with same attitudes especially when it is the matter of concern of the informant to take decision on an issue. The relations, personal or international are very flexible, vital and amenable field. The influence of one person over another person or group of people by usage of persuasion techniques of communication is rhetoric.

Rhetoric according to Plato is the art of enchanting the soul, the art of winning the soul by discourse, Aristotle said that rhetoric is "the faculty of discovering in any particular case all of the available means of persuasion". Gerard A. Hauser stated, "Rhetoric is an instrumental use of language. One person engages another person in an exchange of symbols to accomplish some goal. It is not communication for communication's sake. Rhetoric is communication that attempts to coordinate social action. For this reason, rhetorical communication is explicitly pragmatic. Its goal is to influence human choices on specific matters that require immediate attention." (G.A., 2007)

Having the powerful issue is not enough for a politician; ability to present it is what the rhetoric is about. Propaganda is said to be a subset of rhetoric. If propaganda appeals more to

the moral issues than rhetoric make an accent on appealing about political or economical issues, for example, propaganda initially was aimed at persuading people to accept the Catholic faith, rhetoric was born in Ancient Greece, where sophists and public speakers tried to persuade people to take their side in a sociopolitical or economic matter.

Narrative and metaphors are part of propaganda. Here, I am going to give some examples from literature on how propaganda messages have been coined, packaged and promoted into masses in 30s, 40s and now. These examples of how propaganda is formed in modern society were suggested by Lakoff (Lakoff G., 1996). Narratives create easy conditions to continuously telling the story, they are very close to stereotypes, and facilitate need for thinking and forming attitudes. Discourse analysis is an analysis of what is discussed in the media. Representations, of a group of people, men, women, disabled people, non-democratic countries are investigated, are important to be studied because they are proved to form our attitudes, in other words they create image of a subject in our minds. Various studies have shown that representation of women in the media as weak and dependent influenced their role in the society, the expression “face of Caucasian nationality” was banned in Russian media because it created humiliating image and caused negative attitude.

When you accept a particular narrative, you ignore or hide realities that contradict it. To look backwards again into the previous researches, for instance Lakoff (Lakoff G., 1996), suggested the first rescue narrative appeared during the first Gulf War where Saddam was a Villain (inherently evil beyond reason) and the United States was the Hero (the rescuer) and the coalition members were the Helpers. The same narrative arose in the Iraq War. First there was a self defense narrative: Saddam was threatening the United States with weapons of mass destruction (WMD). The United States were both Victim and Hero. The Helpers were the Coalition of the Willing. When no WMDs were found, the rationale for war shifted to a rescue narrative. The Villain was Saddam Hussein. His Villainy was oppression: spying on, torturing,

killing even raping his own citizens, while taking Iraq's profits for himself. The United States was the Hero, bringing democracy to the people of Iraq and freeing them of torture, rape, corruption and killing. Once Saddam was defeated, a new Villain was found: the insurgents - Iraqis who are engaged in a civil war, or who want the United States to leave.

Another narrative appeared during the Cold war is that the communist countries were to be feared and the Soviet narrative about the evil American capitalism is still have taste in the mouths of Russian people. The counterargument to these theoretical assumptions is that mass communication today is not single-sided anymore. National newspapers exist in online form where people can write comments and discuss the articles. TV stations, personal blogs and such services as youtube often have videos that people can watch and exchange comments. So, public forum, the main requirement for democracy is available as never before and people may easily overcome any stereotypes by discussion and seeing counterarguments.

Propaganda theory encompasses everything that is said, shown, written in the informational space. It argues that people are guided by feelings, thoughts that are influenced by the messages we receive. Theory of propaganda says that these channels are controlled by someone, who has certain interests, and that the messages we receive are aimed at persuading us.

The theory is opposed by the specter of different media theories. Theory of limited effects suggests perspective from the different angle to media effects, it argues that media has only limited effects into people. Limited effects media theory states media reinforce existing social trends and only rarely initiate social change.

Moderate effects theory suggests that active audience uses media content to create meaningful experience.

Harold Lippmann (H. L. , 1922) suggested that the society, audience of media, is incapable of taking the best decision. It is easily manipulated and does not understand what is good for it. Lippmann stated that the majority of people is blind and there is significant difference between “the world outside and the pictures in our head” and journalism with its disposition to sensationalism only aggravates the situation. He developed this idea in 1922, in the middle of two World Wars. Hence he suggested establishment of governmental department that will analyze information and be responsible for transferring it to other state bodies.

Behaviorists Richard Laitinen and Richard Rakos provide the definition of modern propaganda, “the control of behavior by media manipulation”. They argue that propaganda is facilitated by the three factors – “audience, enmeshed and engulfed in a hurried lifestyle, less well-informed, and less politically involved,... the use of sophisticated polling and survey procedures, whose results are used to increase their influence,... (and) the incorporation of media companies and mega conglomerates.” (Baran S.J., 2011)

Chomsky (Chomsky N., 1988) supports this view and suggests that propaganda model can be applied to any state it is only needed to see how the society functions. How is the power distributed? Who makes the main decisions? Who decides what's going to be produced, consumed, and distributed? Who is going to be in the political world? Who makes the decisions that are going to affect people's lives? Whether policies and the shaping of information reflect the distribution of power? It requires deep glance into the interrelation of the organizations, their goals and activities so as the way of interacting with media.

Although it was revealed that consumerism, the devil of modern developed society, was deliberately created, and George W. Bush won the elections over Al Gore grace to media (Monitor, 2003), and Edward Bernays was a man who taught American women to smoke publicly (E., 1928), and many other achievements of propaganda, propaganda in democratic

society, where people have freedom of speech and press often seems to be unrealistic, old fashioned and conspiracy.

Despite some solid evidence supporting arguments of the propaganda theory, such as studies on consumerism (B., Towards a science of propaganda, 1987), George W. Bush victory in his promotion of war in Iraq (Monitor, 2003), and promotion of women's smoking by ads of Edward Bernays, there is also substantial amount of research data refuting this theory. (E., 1928)

It includes limited effects media theory. People often resist hegemonic ideas and provided other interpretations of social world. (pp. 16-17; Baran S.J., 2011)

Since the end of the First World War and firm development of mass communication research, the researches thoroughly investigated media coverage during wartime (J., 2010). Media is diary of society.

Propaganda theory emerged in 1928, proposed by Harold Lasswell. The theory took roots from freudism and behaviorism.

Propaganda theory was emerged when media theorists glanced at how society functioned. It was very pessimistic view of the world. The events of that time, the end of the First World War and the beginning of the Second World War, produced a special regard that people in the world.

Influence of globalization, media-government relations, framing and agenda-setting, propaganda in the press can be inferred from studying media content. This paper studies some aspects of state propaganda in the media. Looking back into history, it could be said that many researchers provided solid evidences for propaganda theory, such as the cases of both World Wars, The Red Scary, Communism ideology in USSR, consumerism (which was later revealed to be deliberate efforts of propagandists (B., Towards a science of propaganda, 1987), skinny body images and glamour today.

The word propaganda literally means (faith) to be disseminated from the Latin propago - to disseminate. It was originated in 1622 to name Congregatio de propaganda fide, catholic missionary organization. The organization spreader leaflets and booklets, arranged meetings, organized lectures, informed and aimed to persuade people to accept catholic faith (reference). Propaganda theory was the first systematic theory of mass communication. It was suggested by Harold Lasswell in 1927 after the First World War, when American population was driven into war because of the propaganda campaign launched by Edward Bernays, famous public relations specialist.

The theory took roots in psychology, in particularly Freud's and behaviorism streaming. Lasswell (1922) wrote that propaganda theory is about management of collective attitudes by usage of significant symbols. The symbols are chosen and granted with emotional meanings, so whenever people see those symbols again they feel the 'standard' (once cultivated) emotions. Harold Lasswell, pioneer researcher of the media, studied the media work during the First World War and was the first to suggest the theory of propaganda in the treatise *The Theory of Political Propaganda*:

The elevated eyebrow, the clenched fist, the sharp voice, the pungent phrase, have their references established within the web of a particular culture. Such significant symbols are paraphernalia employed in expressing the attitudes, and they are also capable of being employed to reaffirm or redefine attitudes. Thus, significant symbols have both an expressive and a propagandist function in public life. (D. L. H., 1927)

Propaganda differs from education in the subject of teaching, if education is about letter-forming, spelling or how to play the piano then propaganda means 'creation of valuational dispositions or attitudes' (D. L. H., 1927). Propaganda is very similar to public relations. Edward Bernays, one of the founding father of public relations, wrote a book with a title

Propaganda in 1928. In this book he argued that manipulation of public minds is an essential part of democracy:

"The conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organized habits and opinions of the masses is an important element in democratic society. Those who manipulate this unseen mechanism of society constitute an invisible government which is the true ruling power of our country. ...We are governed, our minds are molded, our tastes formed, our ideas suggested, largely by men we have never heard of. This is a logical result of the way in which our democratic society is organized. Vast numbers of human beings must cooperate in this manner if they are to live together as a smoothly functioning society. ...In almost every act of our daily lives, whether in the sphere of politics or business, in our social conduct or our ethical thinking, we are dominated by the relatively small number of persons...who understand the mental processes and social patterns of the masses. It is they who pull the wires which control the public mind."
(E., 1928)

Another media theorist, Walter Lippman, who was a columnist in the New York Times himself, proposed a theory of mass media and public where he presented evidences of why there should be an elite that would coordinate the work of media because the average man does not know about politics and economics and cannot differentiate between good and evil just as a politician does not know how to be a carpenter. Walter Lippmann and Charles Merz did one of the first study on media coverage in 1920, "A Test of the News". It stated that the New York Times reportage of the Bolshevik revolution from the Czar's abdication in March 1917 to March 1920 "was nothing short of a disaster", Lippman added that the coverage of Russia was "a case of seeing not what wash but what men wished to see", "hope and fear in the minds of reporters and editors".

Propaganda theory that was supported and developed as late as 1988 by N. Chomsky and Hermann argues that the elite uses media as a tool of political propaganda. And that

propaganda has variable effects. The theory of propaganda suggested that media is objected to five filters: ownership, advertising, sourcing, flak, believe in the miracle of market. These five filters work by the 'independent action of many individuals and organizations, and these frequently but not always have common view of issues and interests'. The theory of propaganda by Chomsky was opposed by Daniel Hallin, 'journalistic professionalism today contradicts presentation of propaganda'.

The key point of propaganda theory is that the media is targeted at persuading its audience in the rightness of the position of elites, media does not challenge the authorities because the governmental institutions and businesses have common interests. Propaganda aims at

Researches proved that there was a positive correlation between media coverage and state rhetoric. It was investigated to what extent media in different countries were influenced by the NATO propaganda on Milosevitch during war in Kosovo. The study inferred that in a discourse dominated by propaganda there, features of representing the conflict in polarized way - as a struggle between the 'good guys and bad guys' were observed in Kosovo conflict. NATO and its member states claimed to represent the 'world community' and their interest in peace and humanitarian values. (Nohrstedt S. A., 2011)

As framing theory is a part of propaganda theory, it is embraced by propaganda the literature on framing helped constructing the image of correlation of state and media rhetoric. So it was concluded that country of media has considerable impact on the media content (Vliegenthart R., 2010).

The study on media coverage of the Gulf war concluded that that media coverage of foreign policy was largely passive rather than independent. The study shows that the media take cues about newsworthiness of stories from the official actors in Washington: Congress and the President. And if the Congress is reluctant to challenge the President the media will not do it either, unless there is the debate in the government. The authors conclude, hence, that

journalists gave President Bush a free pass on war powers during the critical early months of policy formation. Those who believe the decision to go to war should be shared constitutional power, and who oppose leaving this decision to the discretion of the executive, cannot expect the media to guarantee the robust public debate that this question surely deserves (Lewis D., 2002).

Zaller noticed that media reflected the views of elites, if there is a dissent in the elites than there is a dissent in media and contrary if there is consent among elites there will be no dissent in media (D. H. , 1997).

Naom Chomsky and Edward Herman suggested that 'the media are also constrained by the dominant ideology... mainstream media commonly frame news and allow debate only within the parameters of elite perspectives' (Herman, 2003). Although war is essential part of culture there is always disapproval and desire to get rid of it and minimize its occurrences.

The international relations is amenable and vital issue for every country. The counter-terrorism and military intrusions of the United States and NATO alliance continue to exist and contradict the principal UN mission of preserving peace in the world: bombing Kosovo, destroying Sudan's pharmaceutical supply house and bombing Afghanistan, and Libyan cities in 1986, military intervention in Libya in 2011, war in Nicaragua, complicated relationships with Saddam Hussein, Indonesian dictator Suharto, and etc. The US does not always consider the United Nations to be the highest authority, as it happened with Kosovo and Iraq.

Naom Chomsky adheres positive answer to the question: Is mass media a part of the government machine that simply gives the government opinion and thinks the same way with the government? In one of the interviews by David Barsamian, US to World: Get Out of the Way, Chomsky explains the reasons for American aggressiveness, he repeats why he thinks the media is a part of propaganda and examples many cases of media's failures to fulfill its impartial role, Wall Street Journal's article that lamented about missed opportunity of the

scientific experiment on the effects of application of the Agent Orange (dioxin) on people, because there were two identical districts where the dioxin was used and not. Chomsky says that in democratic society media should not be hypnotized by the government, to write such an article, should not the media tell the atrocities of Vietnam and that millions of people died there, suffered from cancer and hundreds of thousands children born dead or with severe abnormalities.

Chomsky rethinks theory of propaganda, that was introduced by Harold Lasswell. He also states that media is not independent and that there are five general classes of "filters" that determine the type of news that is presented in news media: ownership of the medium, the medium's funding, sourcing of the news, flak, and anti-communist ideology (or believe in miracle of the market). Daniel Hallin, well-known media researcher, opposing Chomsky acknowledges that 'the administration was able more often than not to prevail in the battle to determine the dominant frame of television coverage,' 'the broad patterns in the framing the story can be accounted for almost entirely by the evolution of policy and elite debate in Washington,' and 'coherent statements of alternative visions of the world order and U.S. policy rarely appeared in the news'. (Chomsky N., 1988)

Chomsky objects to Hallin, 'this is exactly what the propaganda model would forecast. And if a majority of the public opposed the elite view, what kind of 'professionalism' allows a virtually complete suppression of the issues as the majority perceives them' (Chomsky N., 1988).

Chomsky reminisces multiple violations of international law by the US, the WTO verdict on Cuba, the decision of the International Court of Justice about Nicaragua, ignoring the UN Security Council's discussion on bombing Iraq in 1999 and states that the US always did it in sake of defense against never-existent armed attack, which is the use of force according to the UN Charter, in addition there is often happening illegal support of Isreal and the Indonesian dictator, Suharto. Naom Chomsky explains that the violations are done for the sake of profit

and benefit of state interests, 'americanism'. And the media is weapon of propaganda of this policy. One of the latest military involvement of the US was the Libyan civil war. The question is what do the US and Russian leading newspapers say about the events in Libya in comparison with what their government allege?

Harold Lasswell's model of communication states: 'Who says what in what channel to whom with what effect?' 'Who' stands for communicator, and it is associated with control analysis: Who owns this newspaper? What are their aims? What are their political allegiances? Do they attempt to set the editorial policy? Are they subject to any kind of legal constraints? How does the editor decide what to put in the paper? 'What' means the message. 'What channel' refers to the medium. 'Whom' is for audience, message recipient. 'With what effect' is what is the goal of the message. (H. L. , 2010)

Lasswell suggested the formula and Chomsky offered the answers to the questions Who? What? To Whom? What channel? With what effect?

Being concerned with the mass media, Lasswell was particularly concerned with the messages present in the media. This relates content research.

Content research is applied to questions of representation, it will often be a matter of counting the number of occurrences of a particular representation and comparing that with some kind of 'objective' measure, such as official statistics. The channel is what carries the message. Messages can be sent in channels corresponding to our five senses. This use of the word 'channel' is similar to the use of the word medium when we talk about communication. The words are sometimes used interchangeably. However, strictly speaking, we often use the word medium to refer to a combination of different channels. Television for example uses both the auditory channel (sound) and visual channel (sight). (H. L. , 2010)

The subject of interest of this research paper is the representation of the Libyan civil war in the US and the Russian newspapers, analysis and reflection on what the media of these two countries say about the war in another country, which their governments treat differently. The theory of propaganda is to be a lens to look at the representation of the war.

Hence, the Libyan Civil war will be investigated within the frameworks of the propaganda theory. How did the media in democratic country report a conflict in which leading democratic states claimed the moral right to create peace by bombs? Four mainstream newspapers will be taken for content analysis, two newspapers per country.

The paper adds empirical knowledge to propaganda studies and verifies E.Herman and Chomsky's 'five filters' and Harold Lasswell's formula. It reflects on the political parallelism; that is, the degree and nature of the links between the media and political parties or, more broadly, the extent to which the media system reflects the major political divisions in society (Hallin D., 2004), the research of media coverage, the media as the reflection of reality and its correspondence to the society's needs.

'No serious media analyst would argue that journalism anywhere in the world is literally neutral.' (Hallin D., 2004).

Ellul (1973) introduced "propaganda of integration" used to promote acceptance and support among its citizens for the state system, he argues that integration propaganda is important because no modern society can exist without it. Ellul adds that propaganda presents in the main channels of communication - newspapers, television, movies, textbooks, political speeches and etc. It is subtle and omnipresent. Ellul argues that propaganda is part of any society.

Silverstain (B., JSTOR, 1987) suggested that there must be special discipline for analyzing propaganda. In 1930 in the US there was Institute for Propaganda Analysis. He does not doubt

that propaganda has place in modern democratic society and proves why propaganda must not be neglected.

Herman (1984) research on the coverage of the New York Times of the elections in El Salvador and Nicaragua in 1984 between February, 1 and March, 30 showed that freedom of press was mentioned as an important issue in six of eight articles in coverage of Nicaraguan elections while it was not mentioned at all in coverage of El Salvadoran elections. In fact, freedom of press was clearly more restricted in El Salvador than Nicaragua.

Another study done by Herman (1982) showed differences in the number of times the Soviet dissidents were mentioned in the New York Times with the number of times of those who were fighting against the countries allied with the United States between January, 1976 and July, 1981: Anatoly Scharansky - 138, Andrei Sakharov - 223 and Archbishop Camara of Brazil - 4, Heri Akhmadi of Indonesia - 0.

CHAPTER V: METHODOLOGY

In this chapter I am going to write about the research methods that were chosen in finding the answer to the research question.

The research question is to what extent state rhetoric on war dominated in the mainstream media in Russia and the US?

Selected newspapers are The New York Times (NYT), The Washington Post (WP), Izvestia and Kommersant. Online versions of these newspapers are used as source of research, including closed archives. The data of Nielsen/Net Ratings, comScore, TNS Media Intelligence were used to help with a choice of the newspapers. Online versions of these newspapers are equivalent with their print versions. The archives of newspapers are publicly available, except for the NYT (the subscription for the symbolical payment of 99 cents is needed).

The New York Times is considered to be the most influential social and political newspaper and is officially financially independent, and it reflects point of view of the liberals of the north-eastern states. It was founded in 1851. The web page is visited by 19 million people every month and print version circulation is 1.1 - 1.6 million copies daily. It is daily newspaper. NYT is privately owned, the owner is The New York Times Company. This company owns several newspapers.

The Washington Post is the second most popular social and political US newspaper. It was founded in 1877. Its website is read by 10 million people in average, and it is one of the leading US newspaper. Its print version circulation is 507,465 (846,019 - Sunday) copies daily. The newspaper is well-known for reporting about the negative aspects of the White house policies and actions. This newspaper published information that provoked the Watergate scandal, the largest scandal in the US history. Washington Post is privately owned, the owner is The Washington Post Company. The company owns newspapers, magazines, educational services, television, electronic media.

According to research done by the leading company in the sphere of media monitoring in 2010, 'TNS Media Intelligence', the Izvestia is a one of the most cited newspaper in Russia in the air of the central television and radio. It is also one of the key sources of business and political news in the country. It has been published since 1917. The circulation is 148 672 copies daily, the newspaper is daily.

The newspaper is owned by National Media Group. The Kommersant is the leading Russian social and political newspaper. The newspaper is daily. It takes leading positions in various influential media ratings. The newspaper was founded in 1989. It belongs to Alisher Usmanov, Russian media magnate. The number of its audience exceeds one million people.

As propaganda is difficult to detect, it is a matter of analyzing patterns. The first part of research includes reading coverage of the Libyan civil war in all newspapers and identifying

probably appearing patterns, making the list of headlines for every month and identify are there any significant patterns present. This inductive method will help make correlations with propaganda theory. The observations are to be recorded.

The most suitable method of research for this study was chosen to be content analysis. Both qualitative and quantitative content analysis is operated.

Content analysis is to be performed in two parts. The first part is quantitative content analysis. The word Libya is put into the search engine. The word Qaddafi is put into the search engine. The search is refined for dates, from 17.02.2011 till 31.10.2011 and category - articles. Only newspaper articles are taken, those that also appear in print version. The number of articles is to be recorded and put into a table. This gives a total amount of articles there are in the newspapers on the subject.

Only those articles that appeared in print versions are chosen, as print newspapers are considered to represent agenda and bulletin of society.

Then the two key words are put into the search engine, the date range stays the same. The key words are: "Qaddafi dictator", "Qaddafi tyrant", "Libyan despot". These phrases are the most demonstrative and representative in discourse about personality of Muammar Qaddafi. The results are recorded in table. The comparison of these results with the total amount of articles on the subject matter points at the number of articles that have this side of Qaddafi's portrayal, their predominance in comparison with other newspapers show overall attitude of newspaper.

The other set of words are put into the search engine. The articles are checked not to be repeating each other. The results are compared with the total number of articles and are recorded into the table.

The second part of research is qualitative content analysis defined as: a research method for subjective interpretation of the content of text data through the systematic classification

process of coding and identifying themes or patterns; an approach of empirical, methodological controlled analysis of texts within their context of communication, following content analytic rules and step by step models, without rash quantification; any qualitative data reduction and sense-making effort that takes a volume of qualitative material and attempts to identify core consistencies and meanings. (Zhang Y, 2008)

The patterns are:

- The beginning of uprising

All articles from 17.02.2011 till 17.02.2011 are to be reviewed and the number of quotations of rebels and loyalists is to be recorded.

- Legitimacy of NATO actions:

all articles after 17.03.2011 are to be reviewed and the themes that question legitimacy of NATO actions are to be counted. For example, supply of weapons by France, no-flight zone did not mean intensive bombing in civilian areas (university, Qaddafi's residence, etc.), murder of Moammar Qaddafi violated Geneva Convention.

- Libyan future after Moammar Qaddafi.

all articles are to be reviewed and the themes that view future of Libya pessimistically, the themes that view Moammar Qaddafi's rule as better alternative to the civil war are to be counted.

- Death of Qaddafi

all articles after 20.10.2011 are to be reviewed. Death of Moammar Qaddafi for many people represented symbol of victory over the past dictatorship and tyranny. It was a significant event, which was tragic for some and cheerful for others.

In the next part of research the key words: [Obama, Libya]; [Qaddafi, Libya]; [Clinton, Libya]; [Clinton, Qaddafi]; [Rice, Libya]; [Rice, Qaddafi]; [Qaddafi, Obama], [Qaddafi, USA] are put into the search engine of WP and NYT. The articles retrieved are to be checked for not repeating each other. The results are to be counted and recorded into the table. These results in comparison with the total number of articles show how often the newspapers made references to the state officials.

The similar procedure was done with the Russian newspapers. The sets of key words differed: [Qaddafi, Medvedev], [Libya, Medvedev], [Lavrov, Qaddafi], [Lavrov, Libya], [Churkin, Qaddafi], [Churkin, Libya]. The articles are to be checked not to replicate each other and counted, the results are to be recorded into a table.

Replicating the study of Herman (1982), the number of times the newspaper mentions code words indicates the attention paid. If the subject is not mentioned than it is not considered to be worth speaking of, like we refuse to talk with the person we despise.

Also the number of quotations of the government officials are to be counted in all articles in the above mentioned data range. The number of quotations show how often did the press referred to the government officials. The numerous content of quoting officials points at the observation that the official state rhetoric dominate in the press. All government officials quotes are to be counted.

Quantitative research will show where the audience attention is attempted to be attracted.

The next part of research focuses on the qualitative content analysis, themes that bear certain meanings are to be searched and counted in the set amount of articles.

Ten articles from every month from March till October 2011 were chosen randomly in every online newspaper. The articles that contained code words: [Qaddafi, Obama], [Libya, Obama],

[Clinton, Qaddafi], [Rice, Libya], [Clinton, Libya] were chosen from the American newspapers.

Ten articles were chosen from every month from March till October randomly that contained code words: [Qaddafi, Medvedev], [Medvedev, Libya], [Lavrov, Libya], [Lavrov, Qaddafi], [Churkin, Medvedev], [Churkin, Libya] from Izvestia and Kommersant.

The total amount of 40 articles is to be read and analyzed for some qualitative features. The observations for the following themes are to be recorded:

- 1) Portrayal of rebels and uprisings
- 2) Quotations of Libyan people during uprising (17.02.2011 – 31.03.2011)
- 3) Portrayal of Qaddafi
- 4) Rhetoric on the NATO intervention (legitimacy; necessity)
- 5) Future of Libya
- 6) Death of Qaddafi

The quotations of rebels and loyalists used are to be counted for the second sub-section.

Semantics is assumed to be the basics of the process of representation. All texts, however 'realistic' they may seem to be, are constructed representations rather than simply transparent 'reflections', recordings, transcriptions or reproductions of a pre-existing reality. Representations are unavoidably selective, they foreground some things and background other. Realistic approach would then focus on the correspondence of representations to objective reality (in terms of truth, accuracy and distortion), constructivist focus on those realities are being represented and those are being denied (Media Representation, 2010).

Propaganda theory would state that the rhetoric of the government will dominate in media. As the US President called for action, help Libya, it is suggested that the US newspapers will have the same message. The discourse in Russian government over Libya ranged from contentment to condemnation of foreign military intervention, hence according to propaganda theory Russian newspapers will send the same message.

Propaganda is suggested to be observed in identification of stable repeating patterns, through thorough content analysis.

Chapter VI: Data Collection and Analysis

In this chapter the results of data collection are presented and the findings discussed. This chapter provides evidence for conclusion.

The New York Times is well-known for coverage of international issues. Newspaper's coverage of the Libyan war was very intense, there were more than two thousand articles from the middle of February till the end of October last year; meaning that there was not a single day without the NYT updates on Libyan events. The newspaper thoroughly followed the events step by step presenting colorful depictions of what was going on inside Libya.

The newspaper presented numerous scenes of uprisings and battles for the whole period of conflict in Libya.

Russian official state rhetoric as reflected in voting in the UN Security Council can be characterized as restrained and reserved. Russia neither persisted Resolution 1973, nor supported it. The US rhetoric was indignant, it was just anger, manifested in speeches of the officials.

The goal of this paper was to test propaganda theory.

The uprisings in Libya started on the 16th of February in 2011. Ten days later the UN took Resolution 1970, which called Muammar Qaddafi for responsibility to International Court and frozen 30 billion of Qaddafi's assets. In a month UN Security Council took Resolution 1973, it declared no-flight zone over Libya. Hillary Clinton took part in the negotiations with the Libyan opposition, regarding them as interlocutor of people. In the end of March France recognized National Transitional Council (NTC) as new legal Libyan government. Qaddafi and the closest people involved. In the beginning of April Qaddafi's forces took control over the country and the US distanced itself from military participation giving the commanding to NATO, in the end of April NATO Britain and France sent their military experts to Libya. US help NTC to sell oil and transferred Qaddafi's frozen assets to NTC. Russia warned against military intervention, Russian officials during the war made continuous claims about the violations of Resolution 1973, and expressed fears of the operation to turn into ground operation and replicate those ones in Iraq and Afghanistan. In the middle of July the US recognized NTC. In the end of August Russia changed the Libyan flag and recognized NTC. On the 21st of October Muammar Qaddafi was killed, presumably in the cross-fire. Russia declared NATO's violations of Resolution 1973, claimed that death of Qaddafi was violation of International Law, Geneva Convention.

In order to make conclusion it is necessary to deduce whether government rhetoric prevailed in media on reflecting about the above mentioned events.

Newspaper	Total number of articles on the Libyan war	Number of quotes by government officials
The NYT	2510	564
The WP	85	46
Izvestia	502	139
Kommersant	342	108

The results on the number of quotations of government officials' allow to make a conclusion that there is significant number of quotes for both states, which makes the tone of war coverage differ. The following findings partly support the statement in the above mentioned paragraph. Kommersant had 1,9% of articles with negative tone. Izvestia had 15% of articles depicting Qaddafi as dictator and tyrant. There were 20% of articles portraying Qaddafi as dictator in the NYT. The WP gave 26 % of articles showing Qaddafi as dictator and tyrant.

Newspaper	Qaddafi + Libya	Qaddafi tyrant	Qaddafi dictator
The NYT	2510	101	417
The WP	85	6	17
Izvestia	370	8	48
Kommersant	216	1	3

The next set of results show the number of times the names of state officials were mentioned. These findings demonstrate how many times the newspapers gave importance to the utterances of the officials. The officials' names were mentioned in the articles in quotations or indirect speech. The usage of the names of state officials answers to the research question to what extent state rhetoric on Libya war was presented in media. Quotations normally used when the author wants to stress attention or thinks that the quote better express the essence of thought.

Newspaper	Total on Libyan war	Obama + Qaddafi/Libya	Clinton + Qaddafi/Libya	S.Rice+Qaddafi
The NYT	2510	946	290	29
The WP	85	58	32	11

The NYT referred to these state officials in 39% of articles, the WP – mentioned the names of Obama, Clinton and Rice in 44% of articles. The finding lead to conjecture that the share of rhetoric of these state officials is considerable; it also explains the observation that sparkled the research question. As often reference to authorities creates an impression that the media side with their governments. Also fore grounded and back grounded themes allow to make

conclusion on the level of importance of the theme, where the attention of audience is to be attracted.

Newspaper	Qad./Libya+ Medvedev	Qad./Lib.+Putin	Libya/Qaddafi + Lavrov	Libya/Qaddafi+Churkin
Izvestia	45	26	22	1
Kommersant	34	23	15	6

In Russian Izvestia the state officials names were mentioned in 25% of all articles and 33% in Kommersant newspaper.

During the research it was observed that the positions, or opinions, of the officials towards the situation in Libya were not challenged, but served as a observer of the actions of state officials, however it was also noticed that the newspapers presented different points of views. “Obama Condemns Libya amid stalled evacuation” (Cooper H. L. M., 2011), Obama praises Libya’s new leaders (Cooper H. M. N., 2011), Medvedev excluded Russia’s participation in operation against Libya. (Известия, 2011). Kommersant rarely quoted state officials so did the Washington Post, in comparison with Izvestia and the NYT. It can be concluded that media serves and observer of what is going in the government and reflects on the events.

The coverage of the Libyan war in the four chosen newspaper were different in rhetoric, they all created different impression on the situation in Libya and provided various view points. Also style of coverage was different in every newspaper. The NYT put opinions and narrations on the events in Libya into separate articles. The Washington Post coverage of the Libyan war was full of explanations, the article were educative. Russian newspapers’ coverage had plenty of discussions and analytics; Izvestia put many expert opinions and interviews with politicians stressing importance of politics.

Both the Russian and the US newspapers sided with their governments. The US newspapers were much more categorically determined to the former Libyan leader and the necessity of

taking active measures to protect rebels. Russian newspapers stressed attention on the priority of peace in the country.

In the following sections, Portrayal of Uprisings and Quotations of people, of results all articles from 17th of February till the end of March were put into a single body text for every newspapers. So there were four separate ‘stories’ about the beginning of uprisings in Libya. The quotations were put as evidence of conclusion that was made about the coverage of the four chosen newspapers.

1) Portrayal of Uprisings:

The portrayal of uprisings varied significantly. The NYT depicted it as people’s rebellion against dictatorship and put the uprisings in Libya in the same section with those ones in Egypt and Tunisia, the accent was put on the rebellion against tyranny.

In the New York Times the coverage of events was all embracing, almost omnipresent. The uprisings in Libya were presented as something expected (after Egypt and Tunisia) and not surprising. Izvestia wrote that nobody expected Qaddafi’s overthrow. The New York Times gave extensive amount of coverage of the protests, presenting quotes of people tired of the regime.

Also the NYT provided the most full and thorough depiction of uprisings and war tracing. In comparison with the Russian newspapers the coverage of uprisings the NYT took position of the rebels, constantly informing what have the rebels done and what Qaddafi did.

The February headlines had on Qaddafi were: It The Many Qaddafis (D. V. , 2011), Qaddafi’s Crimes and Fantasies (Editorial, 2011), Libya’s Butcher (Editorial, The New York Times, 2011), Wikileaks cables detail Qaddafi family’s exploits (S., 2011), Qaddafi you tube spoof by Isreali gets arab fans (I., 2011). And it calls for actions, Libya convulses:what can be done?

(Editorial, The NYT, 2011) Libya and the responsibility to protect (Cotler I., 2011), Stopping Qaddafi. (Editorial, The NYT, 2011)

Izvestia was more restrained. On the 16th of February, probably in reminiscence of old friendship, the beginning of uprisings, in the newspaper was published with the headline: In Libya there are demonstrations of opposition and supports of Qaddafiⁱ.

Izvestia, on contrary to the NYT, did not switch into personality of Qaddafi. NYT: Qaddafi's grip falters as his forces take on protestsⁱⁱ, Qaddafi's grip tightens as revolt grows, Qaddafi forces violently quell capital protests (ibid.).

Izvestia reported: In Libya there were clashes between police and demonstratorsⁱⁱⁱ, Libyan authorities began large-scale operation of dispersal of demonstrators^{iv}.

Reflecting on the events, Izvestia, added that the demonstrators were not peaceful, they were armed military groups, they burned three tanks and it was impossible to call them peaceful demonstrators.

The rebels were never blamed for being armed military groups in the NYT. On contrary, the newspaper depicted rebels as heroes: "These young men are taking bullets in their chests to confront the tyrant," Mr. Hadi said, speaking by phone from the siege of the security building.

Although the NYT mentioned that the demonstrators had clashes with police, they also called them peaceful demonstrators.

"Libyan officials have stated their commitment to protecting and safeguarding the right of peaceful protest," Mr. Crowley said in a statement. (US condemns use of lethal force in Libya)

On Friday night, Mr. Obama spoke to King Hamad bin Isa al-Khalifa of Bahrain, leaning on the government to show restraint, especially against peaceful protesters, and pressing for meaningful reform (US condemns use of lethal force in Libya)"It looks like they have been

given a green light to kill these people,” one witness said (Muammar el-Qaddafi Orders brutal crackdown in libya).

Kommersant reflected on Libyan situation philosophically, Jamahiriya-like man^v (28.02.2011), Anti-governmental frenzy (19.02.2011), Muammar Qaddafi has nothing to lose^{vi} (25.02.2011). No headline was there about causalities or brutal crackdown on the demonstrates.

In the Washington Post the coverage was more humane, less businesslike. It paid attention to people's feeling (e.g. published the letter of leader of the rebels who explained reasons of the rebellion). However, the WP's headlines, similarly to those ones of the NYT, indicated the atrocities in Libya, Atrocities in Libya (22.02.2011), Libyan regime launches brutal crackdown (22.02.2011), Was US right to bring Qaddafi 'in from the cold'? (25.02.2011).

The WP presented analytical glances as all newspapers did, The Mideast seismic shift (24.02.2011).

2) Quotations of Libyan people during uprisings

Twenty randomly chosen articles with suitable headlines, which described the uprisings, in February and March were investigated for the number of quotations, the results were put into the table below.

Newspaper	Rebels	Loyalists	Neutral
The NYT	28	5	3
The WP	15	8	15
Izvestia	1	0	1
Kommersant	1	0	1

The NYT quoted rebels more than people who were against riots or those who were loyal to Qaddafi. The NYT and the WP did not put any quote of the people who liked Qaddafi.

The Washington Post put quotes of people that described what was happening (Neutral), how they felt. It also provided many quotes of aggressively determined son of Qaddafi, Saif al-Islam (Loyalists).

In the WP unrest is shown very character like for revolutions. It coincided with what Mr. Obama and Mrs. Clinton said on the situation in Libya. "We are having random drive by shootings in the streets," wrote the resident in Tripoli, messaging via Skype. "Ambulances are shot and left to burn in the streets. Injured left to die. Air raids are getting closer to our neighborhood.

"It's terrible, terrible. I can't live my life. I can't live my day. There is no peace of mind anymore," she said. "I can't even cook."

"They're talking to me as if nothing's going on, like 'Oh yeah, everything's fine,' " said Adam Ahmed, a Libyan American student at George Mason University who has helped organize rallies in front of the White House. "You can hear it in their voice that they're flat-out lying, and I don't blame them at all. It's really scary. I've never thought of Libya as a war zone, but now the whole country's a graveyard." (T., 2011)

[Amid uprisings back home, D.C. area Libyans look for ways to organize, help]

"Please pray for us," he wrote.

[Gaddafi loyalists launch attacks against civilians as conflict in Libya escalates]

Kommersant and Izvestia used the quotes of Reuters information agency.

3) Rhetoric on the NATO intervention:

Reflections on the NATO bombing appeared after the 20th of March. Izvestia presented opinions, in quotations, of those who were terrified with deaths of civilians (NATO and Libya needs mediators^{vii}).

The NYT gave an article among others, depicting mother who was crying about the death of her child but denying that it was the NATO's fault instead saying that Qaddafi was Dracula and killed everyone who spoke. (Libyans offer credible case of death by airstrikes, 30.03.2011).

Despite the above emotionally colorful article, the NYT also gave facts on the NATO hits of civilians. 'NATO acknowledged Sunday that an errant missile had destroyed a civilian home in the Libyan capital in the early morning, saying it may have killed civilians. It was the alliance's first such admission in the three-month-long campaign of airstrikes against the military forces of Col. Muammar el-Qaddafi'. (NATO admits missile hit a civilian home in Tripoli).

'The episode was NATO's second admission of a mistaken strike in two days. On Saturday, it acknowledged inadvertently hitting a rebel convoy of tanks and military vehicles moving around the front near the eastern oil port of Brega. That strike was at least NATO's third to accidentally hit rebels.'^{viii}

The WP depicted the whole disaster of bombings more emotionally than the NYT.

There were no factual distortions in any of the newspapers. The difference is that some articles are more emotionally powerful.

4) Future of Libya:

All newspapers had articles where the concern was expressed about the future of Libya. There was a sustainable discourse in the Russian newspapers that it was better not to intervene and that the future of Libya is probably not better than the times of Qaddafi's regime. There was not significant difference between the Russian and the US media's speculations on the future of Libya.

Both the NYT and the WP provided analysis of facts in the situation in Libya and the interrelation in its complicated social and political trends. The NYT reported, “Probably the greatest insurance that Libya will not descend into Somalia-like chaos is its oil. The oil – once production fully resumes – can buy social consent during a rocky transition period and offers insurance that Western powers cannot afford to sit by and watch such an important oil exporter disintegrate.”^{ix}

Kommersant critically glanced at the future of Libya, ‘New authorities are planning to follow laws of Shariat... Whatever people say about Qaddafi, he controlled Islamic radicals. Now in the Mediterranean region there is to be Islamic state, which can influence the neighbors, -alleged the expert of Kommersant – And I do not imagine how the US and Europe will react on it’^x. Izvestia proposed the similar view point.

5) Portrayal of Qaddafi:

All the four newspapers acknowledged about the evil sides of Col. Muammar Qaddafi . The portrayal of Qaddafi differed in the both of Russian newspapers from those ones in the American newspapers that Izvestia and Kommersant also provided sympathetic attitudes for Qaddafi.

They NYT and the WP prevailing view of the former Libyan leader was that he was to be feared because he would kill the rebels and they did not have the way back: either to fight till the end or to be killed by Qaddafi.

“They’re not going to go back to their homes,” said Issa Abed al-Majid Mansour, an exiled opposition leader in Oslo. “If they do, he’ll finish them off. They know the regime very well. There’s no to way to go back now. Never, never.” (The WP)

Mr. Lugar continued, “The question is, will, as in the case of the Libyans, the protesters simply be shot?” (US Condemns use of lethal force in Libya, The WP)

“This is not Ben Ali or Mubarak,” he added, referring to the deposed leaders of Tunisia and Egypt. “This man has no sense of humanity.” (Qaddafi's Grip falters as his forces take on protesters, The NYT)

Colonel Qaddafi’s menacing speech to the country on Tuesday — when he vowed to hunt down opponents “house by house” — increased their determination “100 percent,” the resident said.(In Libya's Capital, Qaddafi Masses Forces, The NYT)

It called Colonel Qaddafi one of several red lines in the country. “Those who try to cross or come near these lines are suicidal and playing with fire,” it added. (same)

Also the newspaper did not forget past US-Libyan relations:

“It is a totally legitimate concern, given Qaddafi’s past behavior,” said Tom Malinowski, head of the Washington office of Human Rights Watch. “But the more they signal that their chief concern is for the safety of their people, the more the incentive for the Qaddafi government to hold hostages.”(US condemns Libyan clashes but makes no threats, The NYT).

Kommersant: Everyone who was in Libya knew that Qaddafi was not a tyrant, and the level of live there was higher than in many developed countries. Real dictators are in the countries of Latin America. Everything that we are watching, - is the redistribution of the spheres of influence, where the main player is the USA^{xi}.

6) Death of Qaddafi:

Death of Muammar Qaddafi was a victory over evil for some and cause of regret for others. The US government never had friendly relations with Col. Qaddafi, hardly ever they were established in 2006 when Libya was excluded from “Axis of Evil”. Senator Lindsey Graham recounted on the US foreign policy in 2011, “We should have a policy of urging our friends to better and replacing our enemies”.

The NYT deduced: Col. Muammar el-Qaddafi of Libya died as he lived — violently. We sympathize with the Libyans who suffered for so long at the hands of the ruthless dictator and are glad he can no longer hurt them.^{xii}

After Qaddafi's death Washington Post provided an article with thorough biography of Muammar Qaddafi. 'For more than 40 years, Col. Moammar Gaddafi was the eccentric, unpredictable and brutal face of Libya, an oil-rich country that became an international pariah. Defiant to the last, he was killed Thursday in Sirte, his home town, eight months after he vowed to die rather than concede defeat to a popular uprising.'

All newspapers mentioned Col. Qaddafi 'iron fist', also that he was dictator. Only Russian newspapers were not so categorically in their view, Qaddafi was also given respect for his character and personal qualities and sometimes treated with sympathy. Death of Qaddafi also evoked warm reminiscence in Russian media and victorious mood in the American media.

The conclusion on the depiction of Qaddafi's death provides a base for the following statement, the rhetoric of the government was present mainstream media in both in Russia and the US.

Chapter VII: Conclusion

This section is dedicated to the reflection on the findings of the research and the research question.

The research question was to what extent state rhetoric on war dominated in the mainstream media in Russia and the US?

The conclusion is that state rhetoric dominated mainstream media in both countries, Russia

and the US.

The difference in portrayal of the uprisings, NATO intervention, death of Qaddafi, and future of Libya was not crucially different in the four chosen newspapers. What distinguished the newspapers of Russia and the US in representation of the uprisings or death of Moammar Qaddafi or his portrayal is that both the press of two countries among other views presented the attitudes of their countries.

So, in Russian media there were sympathetic and warm moods towards former leader of Libya presented among other views. However, in the US media none of the sympathetic attitude towards former government were not observed. It can be linked with that the US government did not felt liking towards Qaddafi's regime.

Russian media glanced at Qaddafi in more humane manner, giving him credit for positive qualities and denouncing negative. It was not observed neither in the NYT nor in the WP.

The ideological differences are seen in the coverage of the death of Qaddafi and future of Libya. There was a bold message in the American newspapers that supported the war for the sake of democracy and the Russian media that vowed for peace as a primary priority. The content analysis shows that in the total amount of articles with words 'Qaddafi dictator' and 'Qaddafi tyrant', the number of American newspapers' articles with these word expressions exceeded the number of Russian newspapers with the same message.

So as the number of quotes by rebels prevailed in the NYT and WP.

There was a sustainable trend in American newspapers in quoting rebels more often, portraying Qaddafi as dictator and tyrant and creating an overall image that he definitely was a monster. The US newspapers had twice more articles with key words 'Qaddafi dictator/tyrant' than Russia newspapers did. Fore grounding of theme is an indicator of what is considered to be worth of attention.

As Russian government had friendly relations with Qaddafi, even if it stated that Qaddafi lost his legitimacy after bombing of demonstrators, the rhetoric of government officials about friend in need was less aggressive or hostile.

Russian Foreign Minister regularly made allegations on the violations of UN Security Council resolution and International Law. However, these allegations on the violations of the International law are often observed in relations of Russia and the western countries.

In the positions of the two countries there are different values at stake and different ideological approaches.

Qaddafi's state was strict one-man rule, but people were provided almost with everything needed, the level of live in Libya was higher than in Russia. There were numerous political institutions in Libya. The war is definitely crime, however corruption under Qaddafi's regime seemed to reach its apogee.

According to the results of Reuters/Ipsos sixty percent of Americans supported military operation against Libya. It leads to the thoughts that the US media simply shared the opinion of people and where is the influence of state propaganda?

Many scholars claimed that the reason for the 'Arab Spring' was that people saw another world outside the borders of their countries through media, Internet and television. And probably they were seduced by those western world values that dominated the informational space today (that was the reason of sympathy of the western countries towards the rebels). Neither Libyans, nor Tunis or Egypt, have not been restricted to get access to the world wide web.

The conjecture that supports the above stated idea is similar to Libya country, Turkmenistan under Turkmen Bashi. The country is rich of natural resources, the government provided all commodities to people. However Turkmen Bashi locked

international informational flow, which probably safely preserved him from uprisings.

As the Russian deputy claimed after the death of Qaddafi, 'It can be said that the single-polar world in the planet is built'. The subject matter is relevant to discourse on globalization.

The goal of this paper was two compare the US and Russian mainstream newspapers' coverage of the Libyan civil war. (TVchannel, 2011)

The interest arose after observations that media is not neutral: ideology, attitudes, organizational pressures, other elites make frames for media coverage; Russian and US relations with Libya are different; Naom Chomsky's propaganda theory, "propaganda model can be applied to any state; it is only needed to see how the society functions. How is the power distributed? Who makes the main decisions? Who decides what's going to be produced, consumed and distributed? Who is going to be in the political world? Who makes the decisions that are going to affect people's lives? Whether policies and the shaping of information reflect the distribution of power?" (Chomsky N., 1988)

The firm line of democratic ideals to be the highest value was observed to exist in the US media in case of the Libyan civil war. The Russian media proposed another value, that peace is the highest value. It can be inferred that propaganda of state ideology is present in media and media is disseminating this ideology.

The research of media content, other findings, supported theory of propaganda.

What is to be done to improve the role of media? Silverstein (1987) suggests that there must be a discipline like propaganda analysis. It allows to reflect on media content, and aid make observations on its functioning. (B., Towards a science of propaganda, 1987)

Lasswell, Lippmann were advocates of technocratic control. They argued that journalists are impossible to be trusted to communicate efficiently, for the sake of the nature of their job in conditions of market economy, thus there is a special body to guard the media and make sure that it satisfies needs of the society.

Dewey proposed public education as a mean to cope with propaganda and was the founder of recently emerged media literacy discipline, how to think critically about media content and for what purpose to use the media. He argued that newspapers needed to do more than simple being bulletins of what is going around. (Baran S.J., 2011)

Many surveys and polls point at the decrease of interest in the last time for print media. This phenomenon is partly explained with the fact that people prefer television. "News from flat Earth"(Davies, 2008) suggests another perspective, media is not fulfilling its role. The author states that newspapers presents information from press releases and press conferences, they are suppressed with time and investigative journalism is not supported (Chomsky expressed the same idea).

The connection between media owners, corporations and government is that they have common interests and these common interests is market.

If the universal human rights values is the source that a journalist must accept as a guideline than neither ideology and cultural level nor foreign policy and pressure from outside will not influence the assessment of the events. This is to be a postulate of journalistic professionalism. If this postulate is to be followed than the coverage of events will be the same in the press of both in the US and Russia. However propaganda theory suggests that media is not free from bias, it is subjected to the pressure from outside and ideology. In the scale of society this judgement is submitted every day.

The results of the study showed that ideology of the state dints on the media coverage.

The further research suggests to answer such question as whether the media serves only as observer of what state officials do and say, in other words writes about their agenda and does

print media challenge the government? Another question on further study on propaganda theory is what kind of messages have the greatest impact on the audience? The answer to this question would be an inductive approach on media effects (deductive approach is asking audience).

Further research needs to be done to show the implications of propaganda and effects on audience.

Works cited:

- B., S. (1987, March). *JSTOR*. Retrieved March 26, 2012, from JSTOR: www.jstor.org
- B., S. (1987). Towards a science of propaganda. *Political Psychology* , 49-59.
- Baran S.J., D. D. (2011). Mass Communication Theory. In D. D. Baran S.J, *Mass Communication Theory* (pp. 93-94). Stamford: Cengage Learning.
- Chomsky N., H. E. (1988). *Manufacturing Consent*: . New York: Pantheon Books.
- Cooper H., L. M. (2011, February 23). *The New York Times*. Retrieved January 20, 2012, from The New York Times: www.nyt.com
- Cooper H., M. N. (2011, September 20). *The New York Times*. Retrieved November 2011, 20, from The New York Times: www.nyt.com
- D., H. (1997). Media and War. In C. J., *International Media Research: A Critical Survey* (pp. 239-260). London: Routledge.
- D., L. H. (1927). The theory of political propaganda. *The American Political Science Review* , 627-631.
- E., B. (1928). *Propaganda*. New York: H. Liveright.
- G.A., H. (2007). *Philosophy and Rethoric in Dialogue: Redrawing Their Intellectual Scope*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- H., L. (2010, December 23). *All About Communication Theories*. Retrieved December 11, 2011, from Communication Theory: <http://communicationtheory.org>
- H., L. (1922). *Public Opinion*. Minnesota: Filiquarian Publishing, LLC.
- Hallin D., M. P. (2004). *Comparing Media Systems: Three Models of Media and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hartshorn, J. (1968, April). Oil and the Middle East. *The World Today* , pp. 151-157.
- Herman. (2003, December 9). *Chomsky.info*. Retrieved March 10, 2012, from Chomsky.info: <http://www.chomsky.info>
- J., C. (2010). *International Media Research: A Critical Survey*. London: Routledge.
- Lakoff G., J. M. (1996). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lewis D., R. R. (2002). The President, the Press, and the War-Making Power: An Analysis of Media Coverage Prior to the Persian Gulf War. *Wiley-Blackwell* , 559-571.
- Media Representation*. (2010, September 28). Retrieved March 22, 2012, from Media Representation: <http://www.aber.ac.uk/media/Modules/MC30820/represent.html>
- Medvedev. (2011, March 2011). *tvtorrent.ru*. Retrieved February 16, 2012, from TB- торрент: <http://tvtorrent.ru>

Monitor, M. (2003, November). *George Bush Postwar Blues*. Retrieved February 11, 2012, from Media Monitor: <http://www.cmpa.com>

Nohrstedt S. A., K.-W. S. (2011). From the Persian Gulf to Kosovo - War Journalism and Propaganda. *European Journal of Communication* , 383-404.

Obama, B. (2011, March 28). *PBS NEWSHOUR*. Retrieved 3 13, 2012, from PBS NEWSHOUR: www.pbs.com

TVchannel, K. T. (2011, March 23). *KPRF TV*. Retrieved February 22, 2012, from L. Kalashnikov - About the situation in Libya: <http://kprf.tv>

V., P. (2011, April 27). *Newstube*. Retrieved November 29, 2011, from Newstube: <http://www.newstube.ru>

Vliegthart R., S. H. (2010). Framing the Iraq War: A cross-National Comparison of Newspaper Framing in Four Western Countries. *Journalistice* , 60-137.

Zhang Y, W. B. (2008, November 22). *UNC School of Information and Library Science*. Retrieved November 29, 2011, from UNC School of Information and Library Science: http://ils.unc.edu/~yanz/Content_analysis.pdf

Известия. (2011, March 21). Retrieved March 13, 2012, from Известия: www.izvestia.ru

-
- ⁱ Известия. В Ливии проходят демонстрации оппозиции и сторонников режим Каддафи. February 16,2011
- ⁱⁱ The New York Times. Kirkpatrick B.D.,El-Naggar M. Qaddafi's grip falters as his forces take on protests. February 21,2011
- ⁱⁱⁱ Известия. В Ливии произошли столкновения демонстрантов с полицией . February 17, 2011
- ^{iv} Известия. Власти Ливии начали масштабную операцию по разгону демонстрантов February 21, 2011
- ^{vv} Коммерсант.Джамахириительный человек. February 28,2011
- ^{vi} Коммерсант.Муаммару Каддафи почти нечего терять . February 25, 2011
- ^{vii} Коммерсант. НАТО и Ливии нужны посредники. 22.03.2011
- ^{viii} The New York Times. Kirkpatrick. D. NATO Admits Missile Hit a Civilian Home in Tripoli. June 19,2011
- ^{ix} The New York Times. MacFarquhar N.The Vacuum After Qaddafi. February 27, 2011.
- ^x Коммерсант. Забродина Е . Ливия покончила со светским прошлым. October 25, 2011
- ^{xi} Коммерсант. Рохмтров М. Кто следующий? Прямая речь. October 21, 2011
- ^{xii}