American University in Cairo

AUC Knowledge Fountain

Theses and Dissertations

6-1-2012

The role of the American corporate media in U.S. policy: framing Hezbollah

Benjamin Long

Follow this and additional works at: https://fount.aucegypt.edu/etds

Recommended Citation

APA Citation
Long, B. (2012). *The role of the American corporate media in U.S. policy: framing Hezbollah* [Master's thesis, the American University in Cairo]. AUC Knowledge Fountain.
https://fount.aucegypt.edu/etds/1051

MLA Citation
Long, Benjamin. *The role of the American corporate media in U.S. policy: framing Hezbollah*. 2012. American University in Cairo, Master's thesis. *AUC Knowledge Fountain*.
https://fount.aucegypt.edu/etds/1051

The American University in Cairo

School of Humanities and Social Sciences

The Role of The American Corporate Media in U.S. Policy:
Framing Hezbollah

A Thesis Submitted to

The Department of Political Science

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts

By
Benjamin Long

Under the supervision of **Dr. Walid Kazziha**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

The American corporate media has proven to play a significant role in U.S.

policy formation. Operating as a member of the power elite, as defined by C. Wright

Mills, the corporate media serve the crucial functions of creating, implementing, and

maintaining politically motivated policies sought to serve the parochial interests of

the power elite. Disrupting a critical element of democracy – providing the public

with the information needed for intelligent discharge of ones political

responsibilities – the corporate media, filtered by a "guided-market system,"

operate to "inculcate and defend the economic, social, and political agenda of

privileged groups that dominate the domestic society and the state."[1]

Developing this "guided-market system" within their Propaganda Model

(PM), Noam Chomsky and Edward Herman have provided an abundance of data

displaying this function of the corporate media. The PM is utilized in this thesis,

testing the corporate media's role in sustaining and maintaining U.S. policy toward

the Shi'a organization, Hezbollah. This thesis argues that the current policy toward

Hezbollah, defined by it's designation on the U.S. State Department Foreign Terrorist

Organization (FTO) list, is outdated, yet maintained by the corporate media serving

the interests of the power elite.

The PM states that where there is consensus among the power elite, the

corporate media will offer its unconditional support for its chosen policy by creating

narrow parameters for debate, or the bounds of "thinkable thought," and

---

[1] Herman and Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent (2011 Kindle ed.*), 298.

marginalizing any and all voices of dissent. The "left" or "liberal" boundary of debate will be set by what is perceived to be the "liberal" media. This thesis conducted a content analysis of the "liberal" corporate media outlet, the *New York Times,* and its coverage of Hezbollah. Further, in order to argue that the current policy is outdated, yet maintained by the corporate media serving the interests of the power elite, this thesis included a historical analysis of Hezbollah, an investigation into the political nature of the FTO designation process, and the interests of the power elite that guides the outdated policy.

The findings demonstrated that the *New York Times* consistently supported the current policy and never questioned its validity. Further, the *Times* remained silent on all voices of dissent, marking out the left, liberal parameter. This thesis proved that the current U.S. policy toward Hezbollah is outdated, yet maintained by the corporate media operating as a significant member of the power elite.

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

To criticize one's country is to do it a service and pay it a compliment.
- J. William Fulbright, *The Arrogance of Power*

I. Introduction

Since the U.S. entrance into WWI, the American corporate media has proven

to be a useful, political instrument. Multiple studies have displayed its ability to set

the agenda for presidential elections,[2] demonize an enemy state while boasting their

own moral principles,[3] and justify American support towards numerous dictators

around the world.[4] The corporate media functions to justify numerous politically

driven policies. This ability of the corporate media has been observed through

numerous methods.[5] Working as a member of the power elite the corporate media

has developed a process that allows it to filter news "fit to print" in efforts to

support specific policies. This process is also called systematic propaganda.

Propaganda campaigns have been used in the U.S. since Woodrow Wilson

implemented the Creel Commission to turn a "pacifist population into a hysterical,

---

[2] See Maxwell McCombs and Donald Shaw, "The Agenda Setting Function of the Mass Media," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 316, no. 2, (1972); and their updated research in Maxwell McCombs, "A Look at Agenda-Setting: Past, Present, and Future," Journalism Studies 6, no. 4, (2005).
[3] See Robert Entman, *Projections of Power: Framing News, Public Opinion, and U.S. Foreign Policy*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003).
[4] Noam Chomsky and Herman Edwards, *Manufacturing Consent*: *The Political Economy of the Mass Media,* (New York: Pantheon Books, 2002).
[5] Including Agenda-Setting in McCombs, "Agenda Setting"; Framing in Entman, *Power Projections*; and Indexing in W. Lance Bennet, *When the Press Fails* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007).

war-mongering population."[6] Warning that following public opinion would create a

"morbid derangement of the true functions of power" and produce policies "deadly

to the very survival of the state as a free society,"[7] Walter Lippmann argued that in a

properly functioning democracy, or what he called a "progressive democracy," there

are two classes. This consists of a small class of elites that can understand the

common interests that "elude the general public," and what he termed the

"bewildering herd," or everyone else. In this view, the bewildered herd can "rage,

trample and destroy things", and as a result he deemed it necessary to "tame"[8] the

herd. As a member of the power elite, the corporate media is able to tame the herd

by fixing the parameters of debate to assure the management of public opinion.

Lippmann claimed propaganda to be "a regular organ of popular

government"[9] in 1955, and the studies discussed in this thesis provide ample

support that this "organ" continues to pump. Employing various tactics, one of the

best-proven strategies is the creation of "dangerous enemies" that are "threatening"

the national interests of the United States. Succeeding former constructed threats –

the "Godless Communists," the "Yellow Hordes," and the "extreme" Arab nationalists

- the "Green Peril", or "a cancer spreading around the globe, undermining the

legitimacy of western values and threatening the national security of the United

---

[6] Noam Chomsky, *Media Control: The Spectacular Achievements of Propaganda Campaigns* (New York: Seven Stories Press, 1997), 8.
[7] Walter Lippman, *Essays in the Public Philosophy* (Boston: Little Brown, 1955), 26-27.
[8] Chomsky, *Media Control*, 12.
[9] Walter Lippman, *Essays in the Public Philosophy* (Boston: Little Brown, 1955), 26-27.

States,"[10] was conveniently created after the emergence of political Islam in the

1960's. The 1973 Arab-Israeli war, the 1973 OPEC oil boycott, and the 1978–79

Iranian revolution and ensuing hostage crisis, were filtered through the American

corporate media, furnishing the perception of an Islamic/Arab threat, or "the return

of Islam."[11] During the 1990's the "bewildering herd" witnessed, through the

corporate media prism, self proclaimed Muslims committing a string of politically

motivated violent acts - 1993 World Trade Center bombing, the 1996 Khobr Towers

attack, the 1998 U.S. embassy bombings in Kenya and Tanzania, and the 2000

bombing of the U.S.S. Cole – which offered tangible data to sustain this perception.

Even though FBI sources report that most terrorists attacks committed against

Americans in the 1980's and 90's were carried out by Puerto Ricans (76), followed

by Jewish groups (16), right-wing groups (6), and then Muslims (5),[12] these events

were delivered by the corporate media in neatly packaged frames, utilized by

competing politicians, profiting CEO's, and budget-conscious military leaders, to

manufacture the "Islamic/Arab threat" as the propaganda theme of the 1990's.[13]

Former American Diplomat William Fisher recently warned of "an

uninformed and unreasoning Islamophobia that is rapidly becoming implanted in

our national genetics."[14] This phobia, aided by the corporate media, has, and is,

[10] Leon Hadar, "What Green Peril?," *Foreign Affairs* 72, No. 2, (Spring, 1993): 27-42.
[11] Edward Said, *Covering Islam: How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1981), x.
[12] Federal Bureau of Investigation. Terrorist Research and Analytical Section. 1995.
[13] Other examples in Andrea Lueg, "The Perception of Islam in Western Debate," in *The Next Threat: Western Perceptions of Islam*, ed. Hippler, Jochan, and Andrea Lueg. (Colorado: Pluto Press, 1995), 7, 15-16.
[14] Quoted in Peter Singer, "America, Islam, and the 9-11 War," *Current History* (December, 2006): 416.

circulating throughout society, producing a redundant discourse within the public sphere, official government statements, and elite corporate circles. It has constructed a constraining climate for progressive U.S. foreign policy makers who are trying to break through an unsustainable status quo and adapt to the changing dynamics of global politics, while also enabling others to justify, maintain, and extend existing U.S. policies.

Although complemented by think tanks and Hollywood directors, the medium of the corporate media establishes the boundaries of thought, or the opposing sides of debate, placing the idea of dialogue with Islamic political organizations such as Hamas or Hezbollah outside of the parameters. Yet, the political landscape is always changing, and these organizations continue to expand in power and influence. This thesis will focus on the Lebanese Shiite movement, Hezbollah. Given their social, political, and military strength, Hezbollah is a proactive force within global politics. It continues to gain popularity among large portions of the Lebanese population, expand its political role within the Lebanese political system, and increase its military capabilities in efforts to deter future domestic or international resistance. Hezbollah is unique in its structure and requires further research for one to properly engage it.

Formed in 1982 with the primary goal of resisting the 1978 Israeli invasion of Lebanon, Hezbollah has emerged as a powerful player in regional and global politics. Throughout the past two decades, Hezbollah has made notable developments, gaining recognition and legitimacy from numerous world leaders. Unlike its fractured, unorganized nature of the 80's and early 90's, Hezbollah now possesses a

sophisticated military, an array of social services, and considerable political clout in the Lebanese political system and the surrounding region.[15] Although Hezbollah has transformed into a significant political organization, efforts to engage it diplomatically are hampered because the U.S. government identifies it as a Foreign Terrorist Organization (FTO).

In the 2011 State Department publication, *Country Reports on Terrorism*,[16] Hezbollah's inclusion on the FTO list is justified by the 1983 bombing of the U.S. embassy and marine barracks, the 1985 high jacking of TWA flight 847, it's suspected role in the 1992 bombing of the Israeli Embassy in Argentina, and the 1994 bombing of the Asociacion Mutual Israelita Argentina (AMIA) building in Buenos Aires. Putting aside the fact that the Argentina Embassy and AMIA bombings were never proved to involve Hezbollah, the only sound evidence used to designate Hezbollah dates back twenty-six years. Although notable U.S. officials have requested Hezbollah be removed from the list,[17] the corporate media has marginalized their dissent, maintaining the narrow, constructed boundaries of debate.

Examining Hezbollah's development and political power, the Shi'a organization demands further study. Moreover, the dubious nature of its FTO

---

[15] See chapter 4 for a detailed description of Hezbollah's development during the past three decades.

[16] United States State Department, Office of the Coordination for Counterterrorism. *Country Reports on Terrorism 2010*. August 18, 2011.

[17] On June 8, 2010, Ryan Crocker, former U.S. Ambassador to Iraq, called for direct talks with Hezbollah officials before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. John Brennan, former Deputy National Security Advisor for Homeland Security, called for dialogue in his published study in the July 2008 edition of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.

designation also demands an examination of the role played by the corporate media. Hezbollah is a powerful social and political force with a potent military force, and will continue to be a significant part of the Middle East's political future. Consequently, the current U.S. policy must be debated outside of the media's constructed limits.

Hezbollah's continued designation on the FTO list invites an investigation of the designating process, or more specifically, the politicized nature of the process. After a 2004 amendment on the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (AEDPA), Congress applied numerous restrictions to the judicial branch's ability to review FTO designations, thus awarding the executive branch, specifically the Secretary of State, a tremendous amount of power in determining who is designated and who is not.[18] This centralized power coupled with the vague designation criteria,[19] and lack of accountability, offers the executive branch the ability to advance a political agenda and blacklist groups based on the current political climate.[20]

Observing that the FTO list is re-evaluated every two years, how is Hezbollah's designation justified? Why do members of Congress continue to claim Hezbollah is an active terrorist organization? When the latest evidence dates back

---

[18] See "S. 2845--108th Congress: Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004." GovTrack.us (database of federal legislation). 2004. January 12, 2012 <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bill.xpd?bill=s108-2845>
[19] For example, a group can be designated for a one-time use of a "dangerous device" by one member of the organization for the whole organization to be designated. See 8 U.S.C.S. § 1182(a)(3)(B)(iii)-(iv) (LexisNexis 2008).
[20] For more examples see Julie B. Shapiro, "The Politization of the Designation of Foreign Terrorist Organizations: The Effect of the Separation of Powers" *Cardoza Public Law, Policy and Ethics Journal,* (Spring 2008).

twenty-six years, how is the perception that Hezbollah is still a foreign terrorist organization of global reach maintained? What role does the American corporate media possess in justifying Hezbollah's continued designation?

II. Research Questions

This thesis analyzes the role of the American corporate media in U.S. policy towards the Islamic political organization of Hezbollah. Specifically, it asks: If evidence supports that Hezbollah has evolved away from a U.S. defined Foreign Terrorist Organization (FTO), causing the current U.S. policy towards Hezbollah to be ineffective, why does the policy continue in the face of substantial challenges? Further, what are the political forces working together to maintain its designation, and how does the American corporate media play a role in reproducing the needed perception to justify the designation?

Using the Propaganda Model (PM), published by Noam Chomsky and Edward Herman in their book *Manufacturing Consent,*[21] this analysis explores the intricate operations between the corporate and government elite, or the power elite, and it's ability to utilize the corporate media to serve it's interests. Through an investigation of the political nature of the FTO designation process, this thesis argues that Hezbollah's current designation is inaccurate, yet maintained by the corporate media, which is operating as a significant member of the power elite. The power elite, defined by C. Wright Mills, operating in order to sustain and enhance their elite position, has a tremendous stake in the weapon manufacturing industry. Although

---

[21] Noam Chomsky and Edward Herman, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1988).

the power elites need for Hezbollah to remain on the FTO list includes other variables, this thesis will focus on the profitable weapons industry and the corporate medias role in sustaining their high profits.

III. Outline & Methodology

Utilizing Power Elite theory and the Propaganda Model, chapter 2 explores the elite forces working together to sustain and enhance their elite position. This chapter begins by defining the fundamentals of power elite theory. Adding substantial support to Mills' theoretical assumptions, this chapter then outlines the Propaganda Model and its specific analysis of the role of the corporate media. This model will be utilized to explain how the power elite operates in order to filter out raw information fit to print in efforts to support an elite led government policy. Specifically, this chapter analyzes how the corporate media operates as a member of the power elite in its efforts to maintain Hezbollah's designation, further villainizing them as a current threat.

Investigating the power elite's interest in Hezbollah's designation, chapter 3 explores the corporate and government connections at the elite level, specifically within the weapons industry. This analysis involves an examination of the major weapons manufacturers in the U.S., their involvement in and benefit from the Hezbollah-Israel conflict, and the close interlocking relationships between these corporate elites and top tier government officials. Investigating the interests at stake for Hezbollah's designation, this chapter demonstrates the established policy line that the power elite pursues, thus the policy line that the corporate media

supports. Operating as a member of the power elite, the PM explains that any corporate media giant will follow and support the policy line when there is consensus among the power elite. The chosen corporate media outlet for this thesis is *The New York Times*.

Before applying the PM to *The New York Times* and its coverage of Hezbollah, chapter 4 conducts a brief historical analysis of the Shi'a organizations' development over the past three decades. Utilizing various primary and secondary sources, this chapter explains the development of Hezbollah and its initial goals, its resistance operations against Israel, its controversial entry into Lebanese politics, and its development into a significant political organization encompassing an array of social services and an effective military. This review provides a basis to investigate the accuracy of its FTO designation.

Next, chapter 5 examines the FTO designation process, the criteria for designation, and the political nature of the process. This analysis requires an examination of government documents and previous cases in order to lay bare the politicized nature of the FTO list. Once definitions are defined and the designation criteria are examined, this chapter then observes the accuracy of Hezbollah's FTO designation utilizing the historical overview in the previous chapter. Being listed on the FTO list, Hezbollah is labeled as a current, dangerous, "terrorist" threat. This analysis tests the validity of that label.

Chapter 6 applies the PM to the corporate media outlet, *The New York Times,* and its reporting regarding Hezbollah. This analysis focuses on *The New York Times* online newspaper. This media outlet was selected for three reasons. First, it was

chosen due to its highly regarded status within the U.S. Describing its influential

reach, one author stated:

> Its contents influence other newspapers, wire services, news magazines, television and radio news. In international affairs, *The New York Times* is a premier member of the elite press and plays an influential role in informing American leaders and interested members of the citizenry on international affairs.[22]

Noam Chomsky described the *Times* as "the most important newspaper in the

United States, and one could argue the most important newspaper in the world. It

plays an enormous role in shaping the perception of the current world," to the

extent that it "creates history. That is, history is what appears in *The New York*

Times archives; the place where people will go to find out what happened is *The New*

York Times."[23] The *Times* is the third highest viewed paper in the U.S.,[24] and its

online version is the most popular American newspaper website, receiving 30

million viewers per month.[25] Second, *The New York Times* covers more foreign

news than any other American newspaper.[26] Because Hezbollah resides and

operates in a foreign country, analyzing a newspaper that offers more coverage of

---

[22] Quoted in Olga V. Malinkina and Douglas McLeod, "From Afghanistan to Chechnya: News Coverage by Izvestia and The New York Times," *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 77, no. 1 (2000): 37-49.

[23] Quoted in an Interview with Noam Chomsky, "Excerpts From Manufacturing Consent," 1992. http://www.chomsky.info/interviews/1992----02.htm

[24] James Hamilton found that *The New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and *U.S. Today* accounted for 41% of viewership out of the top 100 papers in James Hamilton, *All the News That's Fit to Sell: how the market transforms information into news*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press 2004).

[25] Russell Adams, "New York Times Prepares Plan to Charge for Online Reading," *The Wall Street Journal*. January 24, 2011. Accessed September 18, 2011. http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704213404576100033883758352.html

[26] Howard J. Wiarda, *American Foreign Policy: Actors and Processes* (Amherst, MA, HarperCollins, 1996) 78.

foreign news benefits the quality of the data under analysis. Third, the PM explains

that the corporate media defines the parameters of debate, or what Chomsky calls

"thinkable thought." Further, Chomsky explains that the "liberal" news outlets serve

the crucial function of setting the "left" boundary of debate. The *Times* is widely

recognized as one of the largest, most popular newspapers accepted as having a

liberal bias.[27] Therefore, the *Times* can be observed as setting the left, or liberal

boundary for "thinkable thought." Meaning, whatever is reported out of the *Times* is

the furthest someone can go before being outside the box of "thinkable thought."

This paper's analysis of the *Times* examines how the company operates within

the boundaries established by the power elite, being guided by the five filters of the

PM. Further, this analysis observes the way in which these filters guide the *Times*

framing of its reporting regarding Hezbollah. It's hypothesized in this thesis that

these frames will be a part of the systematic propaganda, stemming from the power

elite, in efforts to uphold Hezbollah's FTO designation. This analysis studies the

media frames regarding Hezbollah, and examines if there is a false perception being

projected by the *Times* of Hezbollah, satisfying the above hypothesis.

This thesis argues that the current U.S. policy towards Hezbollah is outdated

and must be re-evaluated. Further, this thesis argues that Hezbollah's FTO

designation, utilized as a political instrument and maintained by the corporate

---

[27] See *BBC*, "Findings on 9/11 split US press," June 17, 2004, accessed September 23, 2011; *The Sunday Times*, "History, but not as America knows its", February 6, 2005; Also, According to a 2007 survey by Rasmussen Reports of public perceptions of major media outlets, 40% believe *The New York Times* has a liberal slant and 11% believe it has a conservative slant, and in December 2004 a University of California, Los Angeles study gave *The New York Times* a score of 73.7 on a 100 point scale, with 0 being most conservative and 100 being most liberal.

media operating as a member of the power elite, needs to be removed. Hezbollah is

a significant political organization with far reaching regional influence, and must be

engaged without the hindrances of its FTO designation. The current U.S. policy

towards Hezbollah eliminates all diplomatic options of engagement. Hezbollah

proved that it cannot be deterred by force in the 2006 war with Israel, thus the U.S.

must remove the FTO designation, allowing for alternative options to be pursued.

I. The Power Elite

Elite theory and the concept of the power elite are well established in the

disciplines of political science, sociology, and economics.[28] Throughout the latter

part of the 20th century, elite theory expanded into sub-theories, producing a range

of definitions and varying models.[29] Despite the differences, all elite theorists agree

on one thing: the powerful position of a small group of individuals or groups who

either shape, or take decisions that affect, national outcomes. Thus, all actors

occupying key positions in the "political, economic, military, governmental, cultural,

and administrative institutions and organizations are considered members of the

elite because they affect the national outcomes."[30] When defining the elite, this

study utilizes C. Wright Mills' Power Elite Model defined in his book *The Power Elite*:

> The power elites are composed of men whose positions enable them to
> transcend the ordinary environments of ordinary men and women; they are in
> positions to make decisions having major consequences. Whether they do or
> do not make such decisions is less important than the fact that they do occupy
> such pivotal positions: their failure to act, their failure to make decisions, is
> itself an act that is often of greater consequence than the decisions they do
> make, for they are in command of the major hierarchies and organizations of
> modern society. They run the big corporations [including the corporate
> media]. They run the machinery of the state and claim its prerogatives. They
> direct the military establishment. They occupy the strategic command posts of

---

[28] See for example, Balbus, 1971; Burch, 1981; Domhoff, 1983, 1990; Dye & Zeigler, 1990; Etzioni-Halevi, 1992; Field & Higley, 1973, 1980; Higley & Burton, 1989; Higley & Moore, 1981; Hunter, 1953, 1959; Jones, 1987; Lindblom, 1990; Macpherson, 1987; Mills, 1956; Mosca, 1939; Parenti, 1988; Prewitt & Stone, 1973; Schumpeter, 1942/1976.

[29] Including the Consensus Elite model, Plural Elite Model, Ruling Class Elite Model, and the Power Elite Model, all of which are cited in the previous note.

[30] Ali Farazmand, "The Elite Question," *Administration and Society* 31, no. 321, (1999).

the social structure, in which are now centered the effective means of the power and the wealth and the celebrity which they enjoy. The power elite are not solitary rulers. Advisors and consultants, spokesmen and opinion makers, are often the captains of their higher thought and decision. Immediately below the elite are the professional politicians of the middle levels of power, in the Congress and in the pressure groups, as well as among the new and old upper classes of town and city and region.[31]

Unlike other elite models,[32] Mills' definition of the power elite concept is precise and comprehensive, including not only the macro-elites, but also the micro-elites who manage the organizations and institutions controlled by the power elite.

United by shared objectives, interests, values, wealth and social backgrounds, the uppermost elites include the top business elites, such as the board of directors, the top military commanders, and the executive cabinet members. Although the former is considered to be the most powerful actor in the circle, there is extensive positional overlap, interlock, and interchanges among these uppermost elites. This group sets the broad parameters and boundaries of the political and governmental system, where the secondary-level of non-inner circle elites interact and function. The second group includes the operational decision makers and implementers who work at the direction of the uppermost elites. Subject to sanctions or possible removal of membership, they must function within the boundaries constructed by the first group.[33]

The power elites operate in order to further their shared interests. These interests are driven by their overriding rationale and goal of maintaining and

---

[31] C. Wright Mills, *The Power Elite*, (Oxford University Press, 1956), 3-4.
[32] See note 30.
[33] Farazmand, "The Elite Question".

14

enhancing themselves.[34] These shared interests can sometimes run contrary to the overall national interests, or at least the opinion of mass society. Mills explains the second group of people, everyone who is not in the power elite, by sketching out the differences in public society and mass society. He distinguishes these two groups in terms of the characteristic forms of communication found in each. Public society operates in the form of a conversation between equals where "virtually as many people express opinions as receive them" and "communications are so organized that there is a chance immediately and effectively to answer any opinion expressed in public."[35] In mass society, communication is a broadcast that delivers one unanswerable voice to millions of quiet and attentive listeners. There is little or no scope for individuals to answer back to the messages they receive, and there is certainly no way that the inhabitants of a mass society can translate their opinions into politically effective action.[36]

Within a liberal-democratic society, such as the U.S., the viability of the power elite depends on the support it receives from the masses. The masses must be managed in order for the power elite to remain the power elite. This requires the crucial functions of coercion and manipulation. Utilizing their control over the established institutions and organizations, the corporate media, functioning as a member of the power elite, will operate in order to control the opinion of the masses. This process is further explained by the PM.

---

[34] Ibid.
[35] Mills, *The Power Elite*, 298.
[36] Ibid., 300.

II. The Propaganda Model

In 1988, Edward Herman and Noam Chomsky published *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*, providing a mechanism for analyzing the extent to which information in the corporate media reflects the interests of corporate and government elites. Throughout the past two decades, the PM has proven to be an accurate framework. Through content analysis of news paper coverage, Chomsky and Herman have utilized this model in the cases of the murdered Polish priest, Jerzy Popieluszko, and other religious victims in Latin America; elections in El Salvador, Guatemala and Nicaragua; the 'KGB-Bulgarian plot' to kill the Pope; and the wars in Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam. The 2002 edition of *Manufacturing Consent* expanded the studies to include mainstream media usage of the term 'genocide' to describe events in East Timor, Iraq, Kosovo and Turkey; plus the coverage of elections in Cambodia, Kenya, Mexico, Russia, Turkey, Uruguay and Yugoslavia. Herman and Chomsky have insisted that recent economic, political and technological transformations – more specifically globalization, the ideological hegemony of 'the market' and the corporate colonization of the new media – have only strengthened the explanatory power of the PM.[37] Chomsky contends that the PM is applicable to a range of issues, and despite neglect, the PM remains one of the most tested models in the social sciences.[38] Chomsky emphasizes:

> …we've studied a great number of cases, from every methodological point of view that we've been able to think of – and they all support the Propaganda Model. And by now there are thousands of pages of similar material confirming the thesis in books and articles by other people too – in fact, I would hazard a guess that the Propaganda Model is one of the best-confirmed

---

[37] Ibid.
[38] Chomsky and Herman, *Manufacturing Consent* (2002), xii.

theses in the social sciences. There has been no serious counter-discussion of it at all, actually, that I'm aware of.[39]

Chomsky and Herman define the power elite as "the government, the leaders of the corporate community, the top media owners and executives and the assorted individuals and groups who are assigned or allowed to take constructive initiatives."[40] Their Propaganda Model (PM) serves as an analytical framework that attempts to explain the performance of the U.S. media in terms of the basic institutional structures and relationships within which it operates. It is their view that, among its other functions, the corporate media serves, and propagandizes on behalf of, the powerful societal interests that control and finance it.[41] Expanding on the functions of the media, they state in the opening paragraph:

> The mass media serve as a system for communicating messages and symbols to the general populace. It is their function to amuse, entertain, inform and inculcate individuals with the values, beliefs and codes of behavior that will integrate them into the institutional structures of the larger society. In a world of concentrated wealth and major conflicts of class interest, to fulfill this role requires systematic propaganda.[42]

A. Elite Consensus

The PM puts forth three hypotheses. First, where there is a consensus amongst the corporate and political elites on a particular issue, this "system" constructs the acceptable language and structure of debate, to the exclusion of rival

---

[39] Noam Chomsky cited in P. Mitchell and J. Schoeffel, *Understanding Power: The Indispensible Chomsky* (New York: New Press, 2002), 18.
[40] Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent*, xii.
[41] Noam Chomsky and Edward Herman, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media* (New York: Pantheon, 2011 Kindle ed.), Kindle Locations 68-70.
[42] Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* (1988), 1.

viewpoints.[43]   Expounding on elite consensus, Herman later explained, "Where the

elite are really concerned and unified, and/or where ordinary citizens are not aware

of their own stake in an issue or are immobilized by effective propaganda, the media

will serve elite interests uncompromisingly."[44]

Where there is dissent, Herman and Chomsky noted that the PM did not work

as efficiently.   They conceded, "The mass media are not a solid monolith on all

issues. Where the powerful are in disagreement, there will be a certain diversity of

tactical judgments on how to attain generally shared aims, reflected in media

debate."[45] Others have furthered this argument stating that where there is dissent

among elites "news media coverage might have the ability to influence executive

policy processes."[46] Gadi Wolfsfeld supported this claim in his policy-media

interaction model, claiming that occasionally the media can play a role in elite policy

formation.[47] But as Chomsky and Herman emphasize, the media never strays away

from the bounds of "thinkable thought."   They explain, "views that challenge

fundamental premises or suggest that the observed modes of exercise of state

power are based on systemic factors will be excluded from the mass media even

when elite controversy over tactics rages fiercely."[48] Similarly to Herman and

Chomsky, Mills explains that factions do exist within the higher circles of the power

---

[43] Andrew Mullen, "Twenty years on: the second-order prediction of the Herman-Chomsky Propaganda Model," *Media, Culture, and Society* 32, no. 673, 2010.
[44] Edward Herman, "The Propaganda Model Revisited," *Monthly Review* 48, July-August (1996).
[45] Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* (1988), xii.
[46] Piers Robinson, "Theorizing the Influence of Media on World Politics 2001," *European Journal of Communication* 16, no. 1, (2001): 523-544.
[47] Gadi Wolfsfeld, *Media and Political Conflict: News from the Middle East*, (Cambridge University Press, 1997).
[48] Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* (1988), xii.

elite, but these factions do not outweigh "the internal discipline and the community of interests that bind the power elite together."[49]

The corporate media produces elite consensus by narrowing the parameters of debate and producing a perception that there are opposing biases within different media outlets.   This perception, a conservative and countering liberal bias, provides the framework of what Chomsky and Herman called "thinkable thought." Chomsky explains that propaganda can only work if there is a conservative and liberal bias. "In fact, if the system functions well, it ought to have a liberal bias, or at least appear to. Because if it appears to have a liberal bias, that will serve to bound thought even more effectively." Chomsky explains further:

> In other words, if the press is indeed adversarial and liberal and all these bad things, then how can I go beyond it? They're already so extreme in their opposition to power that to go beyond it would be to take off from the planet. So therefore it must be that the presuppositions that are accepted in the liberal media are sacrosanct -- can't go beyond them. And a well-functioning system would in fact have a bias of that kind. The media would then serve to say in effect: Thus far and no further.[50]

B. The Five Filters

The second hypothesis in the PM explains that in liberal-democratic regimes such as the U.S., where the mass media function under corporate rather than state control, media coverage is shaped by what is, in effect, a "guided-market system" underpinned by five filters. Herman and Chomsky suggest:

> Money and power are able to filter out the news fit to print, marginalize dissent and allow the government and dominant private interests to get their message across to the public. The essential ingredients of our propaganda

---

[49] Mills, *Power Elite*, 283.
[50] Chomsky Interview, "Excerpts From Manufacturing Consent,"

model, or set of news "filters", fall under the following headings: (1) the size, concentrated ownership, owner wealth and profit orientation of the dominant mass-media firms; (2) advertising as the primary income source of the mass media; (3) the reliance of the media on information provided by governments, business and "experts" funded and approved by these primary sources and agents of power; (4) "flak" as a means of disciplining the media; and (5) "anti-communism" as a national religion and control mechanism. These elements interact with and reinforce one another. The raw material of news must pass through successive filters, leaving only the cleansed residue fit to print. They fix the premise of discourse and interpretation, and the definitions of what is newsworthy in the first place.[51]

1. Size, Concentrated Ownership, Owner Wealth, and Profit Orientation

The first filter – the limitation on ownership of media with any substantial outreach by the requisite large size of investment[52]– can be traced back to the 19th century. Debunking the conspiracy accusations leveled against the PM, this filter emerged out of the free market system. The rise in scale of newspaper enterprise and the associated increase in capital costs from the mid-nineteenth century onward, which was based on technological improvements along with the owners' increased stress on reaching large audiences, created the "industrialization of the press."[53] Where the start-up cost of a new paper in New York City in 1851 was $69,000; the public sale of the St. Louis Democrat in 1872 yielded $456,000; and city newspapers were selling from $6 to $18 million in the 1920s.[54] By 1945 it was said, "Even small-newspaper publishing [was] big business ... [and was] no longer a trade

---

[51] Herman and Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* (1988), 2.
[52] Herman and Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* (2002).
[53] Herman and Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* (2011 Kindle Edition), Kindle Locations 1393-1395.
[54] Lee McClung, *The Daily Newspaper in America* (New York: Macmillan, 1937), 166, 173.

one takes up lightly even if he has substantial cash—or takes up at all if he

doesn't."[55]

By 1986 there was 1,500 daily newspapers, 11,000 magazines, 9,000 radio

and 1,500 TV stations, 2,400 book publishers, and seven movie studios in the United

States—over 25,000 media entities in all.[56] Despite the large numbers of media

outlets, Ben Bagdikian explains that the twenty-nine largest media systems account

for over half of the output of newspapers, and most of the sales and audiences in

magazines, broadcasting, books, and movies. He suggests that this "constitutes a

new Private Ministry of Information and Culture" that can set the national agenda.[57]

Today, the media in the United States is even more centralized, comprised of

twenty-four media giants that sit at the top tier of the media system. Chomsky

attributes this increased concentration to the rise of television and the national

networking of this important medium.[58] This compilation includes:

> (1) the three television networks: ABC (through its parent, Capital Cities), CBS, and NBC (through its ultimate parent, General Electric [GE]); (2) the leading newspaper empires: *New York Times, Washington Post, Los Angeles Times* (Times-Mirror), *Wall Street Journal* (Dow Jones), Knight-Ridder, Gannett, Hearst, Scripps-Howard, Newhouse (Advance Publications), and the Tribune Company; (3) the major news and general-interest magazines: *Time, Newsweek* (subsumed under Washington Post), *Readers Digest*, *TV Guide* (Triangle), *and U.S. News & World Report*; (4) a major book publisher (McGraw-Hill); and (5) other cable-TV systems of large and growing

---

[55] Lynn Vance, "Freedom of the Press for Whom," *Virginia Quarterly Review* (Summer 1945), quoted in Survival of a Free, Competitive Press: The Small Newspaper: Democracy's Grass Roots, Report of the Chairman, Senate Small Business Committee, 80th Cong., 1st session, 1947, 54.
[56] Chomsky and Herman, *Manufacturing Consent* (2011 Kindle Edition), Kindle Locations 1407-1408.
[57] Ben Bagdikian, *The Media Monopoly*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1987), xvi.
[58] Herman and Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* (2011 Kindle ed.), Kindle Location 1421).

importance: those of Murdoch, Turner, Cox, General Corp., Taft, Storer, and Group W (Westinghouse).[59]

Many of these systems are prominent in more than one field, and are only arbitrarily placed in a particular category.[60] These twenty-four media companies, which are large, profit seeking corporations, owned and controlled by extremely wealthy people, have become fully integrated into the market. In recent years, the market integration of the media was accelerated by the loosening of rules limiting media concentration, cross-ownership, and control by non-media companies.[61]

Directing these top-tier companies are what Chomsky and Herman call "control groups,"[62] some of which are comprised of families. For seven of the twenty-four companies, the market value of their media properties exceeds a billion dollars. "These control groups obviously have a special stake in the status quo by virtue of their wealth and their strategic position in one of the great institutions of society. And they exercise the power of this strategic position, if only by establishing the general aims of the company and choosing its top management."[63]

These control groups are bound together with the mainstream of the corporate community through boards of directors and social links. Example: NBC and the Group W television and cable systems are owned by GE and Westinghouse, and have a board of directors dominated by corporate and banking executives.

---

[59] Ibid., Kindle Location 1434.
[60] For example, Time, Inc., is very important in cable as well as magazines; McGraw-Hill is a major publisher of magazines; the Tribune Company has become a large force in television as well as newspapers; Hearst is important in magazines as well as newspapers; and Murdoch has significant newspaper interests as well as television and movie holdings. Cited in Ibid., Kindle Locations 1434-1437.
[61] Ibid., Kindle Locations 1450-1451.
[62] Ibid., Kindle Location 1470.
[63] Ibid., Kindle Locations 1466-1469.

Because the stock is distributed so widely, the majority of the boards consist of

outside directors. Among the twenty–four media giants, corporate executives,

bankers, retired bankers, and lawyers, make up two-thirds of the outside

directors.[64]

Another growing trend is media ownership by non-media companies. One of

the most important cases is GE, which owns RCA, which owns the NBC network and

Westinghouse, which owns major television broadcasting stations, a cable network,

and a radio-station network. GE and Westinghouse are also both large corporations

that are heavily involved in weapons production. GE, being heavily involved in the

weapons industry, has investments throughout the world. It has become a highly

centralized organization, and an effective lobbying force with its vast stake in

political decisions.[65] As if owning its own media outlets were not enough, GE has

gone even further to insure the correct messages are conveyed, donating large

amounts of money to the right-wing think tank, American Enterprise Institute.[66]

The "guided market" system, coupled with required government licenses and

franchises, has created a legal dependency, causing the corporate media giants and

government officials to cultivate political relationships. Fifteen of the ninety-five

outside directors of the ten largest media companies are former government

officials. Another study, focused on newspapers, found that of the 290 board

members from the top major American newspapers, 36 had held high-level

---

[64] Ibid., Kindle Location 1476.
[65] See Thomas B. Edsall, "Bringing Good Things to GE: Firm's Political Savvy Scores in Washington," *Washington Post*, April 13, 1985.
[66] Herman and Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* (2011 Kindle ed.), Kindle Location 1525.

positions in the federal government.[67] Besides the legal control the government has

over the media, general government policy support, such as business taxes, interests

rates, and labor policies, is desired by many of the multinational corporations. GE

and Westinghouse both prefer a favorable political climate for their overseas sales,

and *Readers Digest*, *Time*, and movie syndication sellers prefer diplomatic support

for their rights to penetrate foreign cultures with U.S. commercial and value

messages.[68]

The first filter, ownership, is extremely powerful. In sum, the corporate

media are profit-seeking companies who hold membership within the power elite.

They share common interests with other major corporations, banks, and

government officials, and they are legally dependent on the government. Further,

this potent filter has created close connections between the corporate elites and

government officials, or those within the power elite.

2. The Advertising License To Do Business

With the birth of advertising, papers that relied solely on sales for revenue

either pursued the ad-based system or ceased to exist. When it comes to

advertising, the "free market does not yield a neutral system in which final buyer

choice decides."[69] The media companies that "present patrons [advertisers] with

---

[67] Peter Dreier, "The Position of the Press in the U.S. Power Structure," *Social Problems*, (February 1992): 303.
[68] Herman and Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* (2011 Kindle ed.), Kindle Location 1549.
[69] Ibid., Kindle Locations 1568-1569.

the greatest opportunities to make a profit through their publics will receive support while those that cannot compete on this score will not survive."[70]

The profitability of advertisement has led the large media corporations to create specialized teams charged with convincing advertisers that their programs will meet their customer's needs. The demands of the advertisers must be met for the general welfare of these media outlets. To put this in perspective, an audience gain or loss of one percentage point in the Neilson ratings translates into a change in advertising revenue from $80 - $100 million a year.[71] This type of demand has created close relationships between media owners and advertisers. And this close relationship, or "continual interaction of producers and primary patrons [advertisers], plays a dominant part in setting the general boundary conditions for day-to-day production activity."[72]

The advertising company usually has the upper hand in negotiations, meaning it usually gets to choose the media outlet, not vise-versa. When choosing, media that is perceived as "fringe" or "radical" suffers from political discrimination. Advertisers will avoid those outlets that it perceives as an ideological enemy or damaging to its interests. For example, in 1985, after airing the documentary "Hungry for Profit," which contained material critical of corporations' activities in the Third World, the Public-television station WNET lost its corporate funding from Gulf + Western. The chief of Gulf + Western complained to the station that the

---

[70] Joseph Turow, *Media Industries: The Production of News and Entertainment* (New York: Longman, 1984): 52.
[71] Herman and Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* (2011 Kindle ed.), Kindle Location 1611.
[72] Turow, *Media Industries*, 51.

program was "virulently anti-business if not anti-American," and that the station's carrying the program was not the behavior of a "friend" of the corporation.[73]

Advertisers choose programs with similar principles. The majority of the time, according to Chomsky and Herman, these principles are culturally and politically conservative.[74] Proctor and Gamble instructed their ad agency that "There will be no material on any of our programs which could in any way further the concept of business as cold, ruthless, and lacking in all sentiment or spiritual motivation."[75] The corporate communications manager for GE, the company who owns NBC-TV, stated: "We insist on a program environment that reinforces our corporate messages."[76]

Advertisers are also looking for media outlets that do not interfere with the "buying mood." Seeking to "lightly entertain," they will avoid media outlets that dwell on serious complexities and disturbing controversies that may disrupt the primary purpose of program purchases – the dissemination of a selling message.[77] Instead of focusing the public's attention on documentaries like "Selling of the Pentagon," the sponsor dollars will be attracted to "A birds eye view of Scotland," "An Essay on Hotels, and "Mr. Rooney Goes to Dinner"—a CBS program on "how Americans eat when they dine out, where they go and why."[78]

---

[73] Herman and Chomsky, Manufacturing Consent (2011 Kindle ed.), Kindle Locations 1623-1624.

[74] Ibid., Kindle Locations 1627-1628.

[75] Bagdikian, *Media Monopoly*, 160.

[76] Ibid.

[77] Herman and Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* (2011 Kindle ed.), Kindle Location 1642.

[78] Erik Barnouw, *The Sponsor*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972): 134.

Within the current ad-based system, the advertiser holds the bargaining power. Utilizing this advantageous position, the advertiser is able to filter news that supports the "buying mood," or a mood that is more in line with its politics and principles.

3. Sourcing Corporate Media

Economic necessity and reciprocity of interests pull the corporate media and government elites into a symbiotic relationship.[79] The media have numerous demands and strict deadlines to meet, and access to the quick, reliable, raw material of news is crucial. In efforts to operate efficiently, their resources must be concentrated in important, "news-happening" areas. Obtaining much of their information from news conferences, a majority of their time in the U.S. is spent at the White House, the Pentagon, and the State Department, or business corporations and trade groups which are also seen as credible, reliable sources. These bureaucracies are able to distribute easily accessible information in high volume. Also, the media knows that the audience regards government and corporate sources as acceptable and reliable authorities.

> Newsworkers are predisposed to treat bureaucratic accounts as factual because news personnel participate in upholding a normative order of authorized knowers in the society. Reporters operate with the attitude that officials ought to know what it is their job to know…. In particular, a newsworker will recognize an official's claim to knowledge not merely as a claim, but as a credible, competent piece of knowledge. This amounts to a

---

[79] Herman and Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* (2011 Kindle ed.), Kindle Locations 1659-1660.

moral division of labor: officials have and give the facts; reporters merely get them.[80]

Corporate media is also trying to convince its audience that they are a news provider free of bias. They are consistently reminding their audience that they are "objective" in their reporting. This argument is supported when they use material from government and corporate sources that are portrayed as accurate.[81]

Large government and corporate bureaucracies have extremely large public-information operations that work closely with corporate media. For example, the Pentagon's public information service includes thousands of employees and a yearly budget that operates in the hundreds of millions.[82] During a rare occasion in 1979 and 1980, the U.S. Air Force made known its vast public-information outreach.

> 140 newspapers producing 690,000 copies per week, Airman magazine monthly circulation of 125,000, 34 radio and 17 TV stations, primarily overseas, 45,000 headquarters and unit news releases 615,000 hometown news releases 6,600 interviews with news media 3,200 news conferences 500 news media orientation flights 50 meetings with editorial boards 11,000 speeches.[83]

Although this information is unattainable today, one other report in 1987 revealed that the Air Force increased their newspapers to 277 in 1987, compared to 140 in 1979.[84] There is no reason to believe this pattern has not continued.

---

[80] Mark Fishman, *Manufacturing the News,* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1980): 143.
[81] Gaye Tuchman, "Objectivity as Strategic Ritual: An Examination of Newsmen's Notions of Objectivity," *American Journal of Sociology* 77, no. 2 (1972), 662–64.
[82] Herman and Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* (2011 Kindle ed.), Kindle Location 1683.
[83] States Air Force, "Fact Sheet: The United States Air Force Information Program" (March 1979); "News Releases: 600,000 in a Year," Air Force Times, April 28, 1980.
[84] An Associated Press report on "Newspapers Mustered as Air Force Defends B1B," published in the Washington Post, April 3, 1987, cited by Chomsky and Herman in ibid.

The public information services for the government and other large corporations work diligently to ensure that the corporate media continue to receive its information from them. They provide facilities for media organizations to gather; give journalists advance copies of speeches and forthcoming reports; schedule press conferences at hours well-geared to news deadlines; write press releases in usable language; and carefully organize their press conferences and "photo opportunity" sessions.[85] These conveniences help reduce the costs associated with news production, thus offering the media organizations higher profits.

Throughout this symbiotic relationship, routine contacts are established, and cooperative media are awarded privileged access. This type of relationship gives the power elite the ability to use awards or threats in efforts to influence how a story is filtered. Within this relationship, the corporate media may feel obligated to support the administration's policy so that the close relationship between the journalist and their source is not disturbed. Judith Miller was awarded access to the highest of officials within the Bush administration, consistently supporting the 2003 Iraq invasion and never expressing dissent.[86]

The most consequential outcome of this relationship is the government's ability to "manage" or manipulate a story into a certain frame.[87] The most efficient way for the government to carry out this task is to flood the media with stories, or "facts." Stephen Vaughn traces this process back to the Committee of Public

---

[85] Herman and Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* (2011 Kindle ed.), Kindle Location 1734.
[86] Boyd-Barrett, Oliver, "Judith Miller, *The New York Times*, and the Propaganda Model," *Journalism Studies 5,* no. 4, (2004): 435-449.
[87] See Mark Hertsgaard, "How Reagan Seduced Us: Inside the President's Propaganda Factory," *Village Voice*, September 18, 1984.

Information, established to coordinate effective propaganda during World War I, which "discovered in 1917–18 that one of the best means of controlling news was flooding news channels with 'facts,' or what amounted to official information."[88]

Numerous studies have catalogued the amount of governmental sources on which the corporate media depends. Leon Sigal showed that nearly three-quarters of the front-page stories in the *Washington Post* and *The New York Times* depended on official sources.[89] Mian Hanan revealed how *The New York Times* coverage of the 2003 Iraq war was highly influenced by governmental sources. Observing 168 front page news stories that dealt with the war, "U.S. official sources" were quoted 320 times (60.7%), "Iraqi sources" 36 times (6.8%), and "bureau/staff/correspondents sources" 164 times (31.1%).[90] Sandra Dickson concluded in her study of media coverage over the 1989 U.S. invasion of Panama "there is a heavy reliance on government sources and themes" and "the mainstream media often serves to sustain the U.S. government line in foreign policy crises."[91]

Corporate media not only utilizes official sources to sell its story, but it is also keen on bringing in "experts." To further validate "factual" information, many "experts" will be put on the payroll and placed in specific think tanks, thus providing

---

[88] Stephen Vaughn, *Holding Fast the Inner Lines* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980), 194.

[89] Leon Sigal, *Reporters and Officials: The Organization and Politics of Newsmaking* (D.C. Heath, 1973), 48.

[90] Hanan Mian, "War in Iraq: Comparative Coverage of the *Toronto Star* and the *New York Times,*" *Canadian Journal of Media Studies* 3 no. 1 (2003): 19.

[91] Sandra Dickson, "Understand Media Bias: The Press and the U.S. Invasion of Panama," *Journalism Quarterly* 71, no. 4 (1994): 809.

the media with a highly respectable unofficial source to counter the official source.[92]

By having the "expert" and the official source debating each other, the boundaries

are established.

Throughout the past three decades, the "experts" on terrorism have been in

abundance. During the 1980's, the majority of the terrorism "experts" appearing on

the popular "McNeil-Lehrer News Hour," were current government officials (54%)

and employees from conservative think tanks (15%).[93] The media themselves have

also provided "experts" on terrorism including John Barron and Claire Sterling, who

were household names as authorities on the KGB and terrorism because the

Reader's Digest had funded, published, and publicized their work, and the Soviet

defector Arkady Shevchenko, who became an expert on Soviet arms and intelligence

because Time, ABC-TV, and *The New York Times* chose to feature him (despite his

badly tarnished credentials).[94] By featuring these "experts" on their programs or in

their text, these media outlets confirm their expertise and authority on the given

subject.

Throughout the past decade Brian Crozier has been a regular "expert" on

terrorism, yet he "characterized violence by non-state actors as 'terrorism' and

---

[92] Bruce Owen and Ronald Braeutigam, *The Regulation Game: Strategic Use of the Administrative Process* (Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger, 1978), 7.
[93] Herman and Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* (2011 Kindle ed.), Kindle Location 1789.
[94] On Sterling's qualifications as an expert, see Edward Herman and Frank Brodhead, *The Rise and Fall of The Bulgarian Connection* (New York: Sheridan Square Publications, 1986), 125–46; on Shevchenko, see Edward J. Epstein, "The Invention of Arkady Shevchenko, Supermole: The Spy Who Came In to Be Sold," *New Republic*, July 15–22, (1985).

violence by states as 'counterterrorism'."[95] This elementary theory demonstrates he

is not an "expert". Recently, the *Times* produced an article citing an "expert" stating

the Oslo massacre was carried out by an Islamic terror group. The article stated:

> A terror group, Ansar al-Jihad al-Alami, or the Helpers of the Global Jihad,
> issued a statement claiming responsibility for the attack, according to Will
> McCants, a terrorism analyst at C.N.A., a research institute that studies
> terrorism.

Shortly after the release of this article it was revealed that one Norwegien carried

out the massacre, and Will McCants was not an expert.[96]

Another popular source offering "factual" information are former radicals

who have reformed their "wicked ways" and now "see the light." During the

McCarthy era, defectors and ex-Communists fiercely competed with one another to

tell first hand accounts of the "evil empire."[97] More recently, numerous reports have

confirmed that Kamal Saleem and Walid Shoebat, who claim to have been former

terrorists and are now speaking throughout the U.S. in efforts to convince

Americans that Islam is dangerous, are frauds.[98]

The corporate media relies on government sources in order to stay

profitable, and the government relies on the corporate media to convey its desired

message.

---

[95] David Miller and Tom Mills, "The Terror Experts and the Mainstream Media,"
Critical Studies on Terrorism, Vol 2. No. 3, December 2009, 414-437
[96] Doherty, Benjamin, "How a clueless "terrorism expert" set media suspicion n
Muslims after Oslo horror," *The Electronic Intifada,* July 23, 2011, accessed
November 10, 2011, http://electronicintifada.net/blog/benjamin-doherty/how-
clueless-terrorism-expert-set-media-suspicion-muslims-after-oslo-horror.
[97] See David Caute, *The Great Fear: The Anti-Communist Purge under Truman and
Eisenhower* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1978), 114–38.
[98] For Kamal Saleem see
http://www.booksandculture.com/articles/2010/mayjun/mixedmessage.html; and
for Walid Shoebat see http://www.jpost.com/Features/Article.aspx?id=96502.

4. Flak And The Enforcers

"Flak refers to negative responses to a media statement or program, and can come in the form of letters, telegrams, phone calls, petitions, lawsuits, speeches and bills before Congress, and other modes of complaint, threat, and punitive action."[99] Receiving flak can be extremely costly to a media organization, as this may put off advertisers or effect crucial government relations for sources.

During the 1970's and 1980's the corporate community sponsored the growth of "flak producing" institutions such as American Legal Foundation, the Capital Legal Foundation, the Media Institute, the Center for Media and Public Affairs, and Accuracy in Media (AIM), in efforts to monitor the media's adherence to the corporate message. Instead of focusing on foreign policy in the media, these institutions put their efforts towards demonstrating the "liberal bias and anti-propensities of the corporate media."[100]

AIM is one of the more prominent institutions, a small yet crucial part of the larger corporate right-wing campaign attack. Established by Reed Irvine, AIM grew quickly as it was funded well by eight different oil companies.[101] The function of AIM is to harass and pressure the media to follow the corporate agenda and a hard-line, right wing foreign policy. It attacks the media for alleged deficiencies whenever they fail to toe the line on foreign policy.[102] Through the work of Irvine, AIM has

---

[99] Herman and Chomsky, Manufacturing Consent (2011 Kindle ed.), Kindle Location 1811.
[100] Herman and Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* (2011 Kindle ed.), 27.
[101] Louis Wolf, "Accuracy in Media Rewrites News and History," *Covert Action Information Bulletin* (Spring 1984): 26–29.
[102] Herman and Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* (2011 Kindle ed.), Kindle Locations 1851-1853).

done well to apply "flak" when journalist stray away from the established policy, such as Raymond Bonners' departure from *Time*.[103] Chomsky noted Irvine's influence stating, "His ability to get the publisher of *The New York Times* to meet with him personally once a year—a first objective of any lobbyist—is impressive testimony to influence.[104]

Although Chomsky and Herman's model is two decades old, the flak filter "may be more prevalent now than Chomsky and Herman ever envisioned."[105] Analyzing 36 AIM reports between 2007 and 2008, Brian Goss interrogated AIM's discourse and their investment in making truth claims. Goss's investigation concludes that AIM remains one of the top producers of flak, and their discourse does not align with its stated mission of "fairness, balance, and accuracy".[106]

One of the most recent cases of flak came in July of 2010 when CNN's Senior Editor of Middle East Affairs, Octavia Nasr, was fired after tweeting, "Sad to hear of the passing of Sayyed Mohammed Hussein Fadlallah… One of Hezbollah's giants I respect a lot."[107] Before CNN made the decision to fire Nasr, numerous flak producing machines applied pressure for her termination, such as the Anti-Defamation League.[108] Although CNN stated in an internal memo that Octavia was "an extremely dedicated and committed member of the team", it concluded "her

---

[103] Louis Wolf, "Accuracy in Media," 32–33.
[104] Herman and Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* (2011 Kindle ed.), Kindle Locations 8616-8617.
[105] Brian Goss, "The Left-Media's Stranglehold: Flak and Accuracy in Media Reports," *Journalism Studies,* Vol. 10, No. 4, 2009, 455-473.
[106] Ibid.
[107] The tweet can be viewed at http://twitter.com/#!/octavianasrcnn.
[108] The Anti-Defamation League, "ADL Letter to CNN," July 6th, 2010, http://www.adl.org/media_watch/tv/CNN_Editor_Praises_Hezbollah_Leader_070610.htm.

credibility in her position as senior editor for Middle Eastern affairs had been compromised."[109] *Times* columnist, Thomas Friedman, found CNN's actions "troubling," yet made sure he did not make the same mistake as he followed with, "She should have been suspended for a month, but not fired."[110]

Flak can also come from government officials. As Oliver Boyd explains regarding the 2003 Iraq invasion:

> There is direct evidence from the televised press conferences of leading administration officials such as President George W. Bush, Vice President Dick Cheney, or Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, of how such sources frequently use their privileged voice and elevated position on the podium to embarrass journalists who ask the 'wrong' question, or adapt the 'wrong' tone, and to marginalize or ignore journalists who they think are unlikely to conform.[111]

Flak stems from the media themselves, the corporate community, and most of all, the government. Through its symbiotic relationship with the media, the government is able to assail, threaten, or "correct" the media who may deviate to far off the established line. This process enables flak to be a crucial factor in filtering news.

5. Manichean Thinking

Ideology marks the last filter in the PM. When the PM was first published in 1988, this filter focused on anti-Communism; the consistent projection of the evils of

---

[109] Steve Krakauer, "CNN's Octavia Nasr Leaving Network After Controversial Tweet," *Mediaite*, July 7, 2010. http://www.mediaite.com/tv/breaking-cnns-octavia-nasr-leaving-network-after-controversial-tweet.
[110] Thomas Friedman, "Can We Talk?" *New York Times*, July 17th, 2010, accessed October 7, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/27/opinion/27friedman.html.
[111] Oliver Boyd-Barrett, "Judith Miller, The *New York Times*, and the Propaganda Model," *Journalism Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 4, 2004, p. 435-449.

communism and its threat to Western ideology and politics. Now, this filter remains

applicable as opposing ideologies remain elevated in the media. Chomsky and

Herman state, "This ideology helps mobilize the populace against an enemy, and

because the concept is fuzzy it can be used against anybody advocating policies that

threaten property interests or support accommodation with Communist states and

radicalism."[112] The current prevailing anti-Western ideology is "radical Islam" or

what many in the media call "the return of Islam."[113]

What tends to happen in the media is a process of dichotomizing the world

into "us" and "them." This method has been seen as a regular practice, but can be

intensified to prepare the nation for war. David Altheide demonstrated through

extensive qualitative media analysis how the U.S. government promoted the "War

on Terrorism", via media outlets, by disseminating a "discourse of fear", and by

"selectively framing discourse to proclaim the moral and social superiority of the

United States."[114] He explains "by providing a context of meanings and images, the

mass media prepare audiences for political decisions about specific actions,

including war."[115] In a content analysis of the *Times* and *Newsweek* five weeks after

the 9/11 attacks, Domke Hutcheson concluded that "government and military

officials consistently focus on American core values including individualism, liberty

and equality and themes of U.S. strength and power such as the U.S. role as a super

power and moral leader among nations while simultaneously demoralizing the

---

[112] Herman and Chomsky, Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media (Kindle Locations 1881-1883). Pantheon. Kindle Edition.
[113] Edward Said, *Covering Islam*, x.
[114] David Altheide, "The Mass Media and Terrorism", *Communication and Discourse* 1 no. 287, (2007): 287-308.
[115] Ibid., 287.

enemy in a good versus them context."[116] This anti-Western ideology filter is a

critical and potent element of effective propaganda.

When an event occurs in the world, raw information is collected. In the U.S.,

this information must pass through the guided-market system, shaped by these five

filters. Before the information is broadcast or printed for the audience, the residue

is cleansed, leaving a story that fits well within the acceptable boundaries

constructed by the power elite.

C. Marginalizing Dissent & The Validity of the PM

A third hypothesis advanced by Chomsky and Herman was that the PM would

be "effectively excluded from discussion...however well-confirmed the model may

be ... it is inadmissible, and ... should remain outside the spectrum of debate over

the media...Plainly it is either valid or invalid. If invalid, it may be dismissed; if valid

it *will* be dismissed."[117] As predicted, the PM has been largely excluded from the

media, as well as the fields of political science and communications.[118]

Supporting this claim further, Noam Chomsky himself has in fact been

marginalized from the chosen media outlet analyzed in this thesis, *The New York*

Times. Discussed in his recent book, *Death of the Liberal Class*, Chris Hedges notes

---

[116] J. Domke Hutcheson, D. Billeaudeaux, and A. Garland, "U.S. National Identity, Political Elites, and a Patriotic Press following September 11," *Political Communication* 21 (2004): 27-50.

[117] Noam Chomsky, *Necessary Illusions: Thought Control in Democratic Societies* (London: Pluto, 1989), 11.

[118] Analyzing 3053 articles sampled from ten media and communication journals published in Europe and North America between 1988 to 2007, only 79 articles (representing 2. 6 per cent of the total) attended to the PM. See Mullen, *Twenty Years On*.

that during the 1970s, the *Times* editor Abe Rosenthal "banned social critics such as

Chomsky from being quoted in the paper."[119] Observing some of the minute

coverage Chomsky has received in the *Times*, one review accused Chomsky of

employing "falsehoods with exaggerations."[120] Another article states that Chomsky

"evades the complexities of the world as it is,"[121] and another simply claims, "he

exaggerates."[122]

A large part of the criticism targets the PM as a conspiratorial view of the

media.[123] Herman and Chomsky respond stressing that the PM actually constitutes

a "free market analyses" of media, "with the results largely an outcome of the

working of market forces."[124]

> With equal logic, one could argue that an analyst of General Motors who
> concludes that its managers try to maximize profits (instead of selflessly
> labouring to satisfy the needs of the public) is adopting a conspiracy theory.[125]

As noted in the five filters discussed above, the PM is a framework that conveys how

market forces produce a filtered text, not the work of a conspiracy.

Another criticism claims the PM is deterministic, functionalist and

simplistic.[126] Herman has replied to these criticisms, declaring that, "Any model

involves deterministic elements." The PM explains patterns of media behavior in

---

[119] Chris Hedges, *Death of the Liberal Class* (Nation Books, October 17, 2010).
[120] Samantha Power, "The Everything Explainer," *New York Times*, January 4, 2004.
[121] A. O. Scott, "Overflowing with Opinions, Lacking in Minced Words," *New York Times*, November 22, 2002.
[122] James Chase, "The Complex Metamorphosis of American Foreign Policy," *New York Times*, December 16, 2003.
[123] Including Entman, 1990; Lemann, 1989; and Nelson, 1990.
[124] Chomsky and Herman, *Manufacturing Consent* (2002), xii.
[125] Noam Chomsky, *Towards a New Cold War: Essays on the Current Crisis and How We Got There* (London: Sinclair Browne,1982), 94.
[126] Including Eldridge, 1993; Golding and Murdock, 1991; and Schlesinger, 1989.

terms of "mechanisms and policies whereby the powerful protect their interests

naturally and without overt conspiracy."[127] Another sharp criticism is that the

model neglects the impact of journalistic professionalism.[128] The PM does state that

journalists and editors play central roles in disseminating information and

mobilizing media audiences in support of the special interest groups that dominate

the state and private economy, but it assumes that the processes of control are often

unconscious. It argues that meanings, which are formed at an unconscious level, are

essentially filtered by the constraints that are built into the system (rewards and

punishments), causing conscious decisions to be understood as natural, objective,

and within commonsense.[129] Instead of assuming that newsroom workers

consciously align themselves with the dominant elites, it states that the corporate

media recruit right-minded personnel to fill staff positions.

> Those who choose to conform, hence to remain within the system, will
> soon find that they internalize the beliefs and attitudes that they express and
> that shape their work; it is a rare individual who can believe one thing and say
> another on a regular basis.[130]

Countering other critiques of their model, Herman and Chomsky concede that

the PM cannot account "for every detail of such a complex matter as the working of

the national mass media."[131] They also note that the media are not monolithic, and

are not entirely closed to dissent or debate.

---

[127] Edward Herman, "The Propaganda Model: A Retrospective," *Against All Reason* 1, no. 1-14, (December 2003). http://www.chomsky.info/onchomsky/20031209.htm
[128] Including Goodwin, 1994; Hallin, 1994; and Sparks, 2007.
[129] Chomsky and Herman, *Manufacturing Consent (2002)*, 2.
[130] Noam Chomsky, *On Power and Ideology: the Managua Lectures* (Cambridge: South End Press, 1987), 125.
[131] Chomsky and Herman, *Manufacturing Consent (2002)*, 304.

> Whatever the advantages of the powerful ... the struggle goes on, space exists and dissent light breaks through in unexpected ways. The mass media are no monolith.[132]

In *Manufacturing Consent,* Herman and Chomsky acknowledge, "The system is not all powerful."[133] They conclude, "Government and elite domination of the media have not succeeded in overcoming the Vietnam syndrome and public hostility to direct US involvement in the destabilization and overthrow of foreign governments."[134]

Herman and Chomsky state that there is "a need for a macro, alongside a micro view of media operations" so as "to see the pattern of manipulation and systemic bias."[135] This thesis approaches media operations in the micro sense, investigating a specific policy, and the media's role in upholding that policy. This thesis applies the PM to the *Times* reporting regarding Hezbollah's continued FTO designation in Chapter 6.

---

[132] Edward Herman cited in Philip Schlesinger, *Culture and Power: Media, Culture, and Society* (London: 1992, Sage), 308.
[133] Herman and Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent (2002)*, 306.
[134] Ibid. 306.
[135] Chomsky and Herman, *Manufacturing Consent* (1988), 2.

This thesis argues Hezbollah's FTO designation, a political instrument for the power elite, is justified and maintained largely by the corporate media working as a member of the power elite. In efforts to further this argument, the question must be explored: How are the power elite's interests served by designating Hezbollah a FTO? Although varying interests are at stake, this investigation focuses on the highly profitable weapons industry, and the ensuing corporate and political connections among the power elite. As this chapter will explain, the weapons industry was chosen because Hezbollah's "threat" allows weapons to continuously flow from the large weapon manufacturers to the state of Israel, creating a continuous flow of profits to the power elite.

I. The Big Business of the Weapons Industry

Weapon manufacturing is a sizeable and profitable industry within the United States. In 2010, arms sales totaled 4.8% of GDP.[136] In 2008, despite the global economic recession, the U.S. increased its sales by 8%, accounting for 68% of the world's foreign weapon sales.[137] While the global average fell 7.6%, U.S. weapon sales increased totaling $37.8 billion in U.S. dollars. Despite intense international competition, U.S. arms manufacturers were expected to sell a record $46.1 billion in

---

[136] Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, *SIPRI Yearbook 2010*, http://www.sipri.org/yearbook/2010.
[137] Jasmin Melvin, "U.S. Leads World in Foreign Weapon Sales: Report," *Reuters*, September 6, 2009, accessed October 10, 2011. http://www.reuters.com/article/2009/09/06/us-arms-usa-idUSTRE5851XH20090906.

military hardware to foreign governments in 2011, a nearly 50% jump from $31.6 billion from 2010.[138]

Among the world's top twenty weapon manufactures, fourteen are American companies.[139] Although the UK company, BAE Systems, is the number one weapons manufacturer in the world, the next five spots belong to U.S. companies: Lockheed Martin, Boeing, Northrop Grumman Corporation, General Dynamics, and Raytheon. In 2002, these companies received $82.7 billion from government defense contracts, or 41.9% of the total revenue from government defense contracts awarded to the top 100.[140] In 2008, these five U.S. companies sold $128 billion in arm sales alone.[141] In sum, the weapons industry is big business.

II. Loyal Customer

One of the largest customers of U.S. weapons is the state of Israel. Granted as military assistance, Israel received $7.2 billion in weaponry from 1990-2000.[142] Between 2000-2009, it received $19 billion in weapons from the U.S. Under the

---

[138] W.J. Hennigan, "U.S. arms makers look overseas as domestic demand shrinks," *Los Angeles Times,* June 15, 2011, accessed October 11, 2011, http://articles.latimes.com/2011/jun/15/business/la-fi-weapon-exports-20110616.

[139] *Economist*, "Bangs for Bucks," April 12, 2010, accessed, October 11, 2011. http://www.economist.com/node/15895032.

[140] Richard Girard, "The Weapons Manufacturer That Does it All: A Profile of Arms Giant Lockheed Martin," *Polaris Institute*, November 2005. http://www.polarisinstitute.org/files/Lockheed%20Martin.pdf.

[141] Stockholm International Research Peace Institute, Yearbook 2010, Table 6A.1 http://www.caat.org.uk/resources/facts-figures/top-world-cos.php.

[142] William D. Hartung and Frida Berrigan, "Report: U.S. Arms Transfers and Security Assistance to Israel," *World Policy Institute*, May 6, 2002. http://www.worldpolicy.org/projects/arms/reports/israel050602.html

2007 Memorandum of Understanding, the U.S. will transfer $30 billion of weapons

to Israel between 2009-2018. Today, the U.S supplies 18% of Israel's defense

budget.[143]

These weapons, given by the U.S. government through grants, or Foreign

Military Financing (FMF), are manufactured by the companies listed above, which

have been awarded defense contracts. Lockheed Martin, the largest weapons

manufacturer in the U.S., has supplied Israel with 237 F-16 fighter planes at $34

million a unit, along with a number of C-130 transport planes.   Boeing has sold

Israel 50 F-4E Phantom jets at $18 million a unit, 90 F-15 Eagle jets at $38 million a

unit, 42 AH-64 Apache Attack helicopters at $14.5 million a unit, and a number of

AGM 114 Hellfire missiles and Harpoon anti-ship missiles. Raytheon, the chief

defense system salesmen, has sold millions of dollars worth of missiles to Israel,

including the Tomahawk missile, the Sidewinder, the Maverick, the Sparrow and the

Patriot.[144]

These corporations have a stake in Israel using its military arsenal so it can

be replenished, or they at least need the perception that more and better weapons

are needed in efforts to combat "imminent threats." Observing the relationship

between these corporations and the U.S. government, a steady flow of weapons will

always exist.

---

[143] Walter Pincus, "United States Needs to Reevaluate its assistance to Israel,"
Washington Post, October 18, 2011, accessed October 18 2011,
http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/united-states-needs-to-
reevaluate-its-assistance-to-israel/2011/10/15/gIQAK5XksL_story.html
[144] Hartung, "Reports: U.S. Arm Transfers."

III. Government-Corporate Connection

Ranked no. 135 on *Fortune* magazine's list of the world's 500 biggest corporations, Lockheed Martin is the largest weapons manufacturer in the United States. The majority of its profits stem from government contracts, and many of these contracts are for weapon sales to Israel. It profited over $19 billion in weapon sales to Israel alone from 2000 to 2005.[145] Besides the $17.5 billion Lockheed Martin pulls in annually from the United States Department of Defense, it receives close to $8 billion a year from U.S. federal agencies as diverse as the Social Services Administration, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Energy, the Federal Aviation Administration, the U.S. Postal Service, the Department of Transportation, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Census Bureau.[146] A 2010 report notes that approximately 85% of Lockheed's annual revenue (nearly $40 billion) comes from government contracts.[147] In 2010, Lockheed received $35.9 billion from the Department of Defense alone.[148] Only a few months into 2012, and Lockheed has secured a contract to sale $900 million worth of PATRIOT PAC-3 missiles to Israel.[149] An examination of its Board of Directors demonstrates that its links with the government are much stronger than simply contractual agreements.

---

[145] Girard, "The Weapons Manufacturer."

[146] Ibid.

[147] United States Securities and Exchange Commission, "Lockheed Martin Corporation," Annual Report, December 31, 2010, www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/936468/000119312511045739/d10k.htm.

[148] Ruth Flower, "Rein in Profits of Major Pentagon Contractors," *FCNL*, March 2012, www.fcnl.org/issues/budget.

[149] Matthew Potter, "FY12 Defense Contracts Flow and Lockheed Martin Benefits," January 31, 2012, www.defenseprocurementnews.com/topics/countries/israel/.

Able to exercise all the powers of the corporation, in 2005 the Board of

Directors was made up of former Under Secretary of Defense, Pete Aldridge Jr.,

former director of the Transportation Department, John Brophy, former Deputy

Attorney General, James Comey, former Admiral and Commander of the U.S. Navy,

James Ellis Jr., and former policy advisor on national security, William Inglee. This

revolving door spins in both directions, as a number of former Lockheed directors

have, or still do work for the U.S. government. These include Deputy Administrator

for Defense Programs in the Department of Energy, Everet Beckner, the wife of Vice

President Dick Cheney, Lynne Cheney (who was compensated $120,000 a year for

attending four meetings)[150], Deputy Secretary of Defense and Secretary of the Navy,

Gordon Engand, and National Security Advisor, Stephen Hadley.[151]

The current Board of Directors consists of Robert J. Stevens, who was

recently appointed to the Obama Administration's Advisory Committee for Trade

Policy and Negotiations, James Ellis, former Admiral and Commander for the U.S. Air

Force, Gwendolyn King, former commissioner of the Social Security Administration,

James Loy, former Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security, and Joseph Ralston,

former Vice Chairmen for the Joints Chief of Staff.[152]

Besides the government-corporate revolving door of directors, Lockheed is a

member of a number of influential industry associations and think tanks including:

Aerospace Industry Association, Business Industry Political Action Committee,

[150] Michelle Ciarrocca, W. Hartung, "Axis of Influence: Behind the Bush
Administration's Missile Defense Revival," *World Policy Institute*, July 2002.
http://www.worldpolicy.org/projects/arms/reports/execsumaxis.html.
[151] Girard, "The Weapons Manufacturer."
[152] Lockheed Martin, Board of Directors, www.lockheedmartin.com/us/who-we-
are/corporate-governance/board.html.

Center for Security Policy, National Defense Industrial Association, and the US Council for International Business. Lockheed's involvement with these organizations, coupled with their extensive lobbying efforts,[153] offers them a unique opportunity to influence policies favorable to the defense industry and the corporation itself.[154]

The benefits that Lockheed receives from the U.S. government are obvious, but how do the governing elites benefit from the relationship? Besides the revolving door of high earning jobs provided, Lockheed Martin is one of the largest political donors. In the three U.S. election cycles (2000, 2002, 2004), Lockheed donated $7,271,339 (40% to the Democrats, 59% to the Republicans) to Federal candidates.[155] This money was not targeting a specific party, but was strategically aimed at candidates who are members of congressional committees overseeing defense budgets. Nearly 60% of their donations were donated to members of Congress who were sitting either on the House Armed Services Committee or on the Committee on Appropriations.[156]

This same corporate-government connection is seen in the U.S. arms company, Raytheon. Totaling $21.7 billion dollars in sales in 2007, with 96% of it in arms sales, Raytheon is fifth largest arms company in the world.[157] The majority of Raytheon's arms sales are to the U.S. government, specializing in missile defense

---

[153] Between 1998 and 2004, Lockheed Martin spent $55,373,840 on lobbying members of the U.S. Congress on legislation. Ibid.
[154] Ibid.
[155] ibid.
[156] Ibid.
[157] David Hess, "Raytheon Fact Sheet," *Medical Association for Prevention of War*, October, 2008. www.mapw.org.au.

systems. Raytheon is a large recipient of U.S. defense contracts.   It should be noted that Raytheon has found itself in the courtroom recently, pleading guilty of corruption in obtaining these defense contracts.[158] Not being deterred by these charges, Raytheon developed all four of Israel's defense systems during the past decade, which were gifted by the U.S. government and paid for by the U.S. taxpayer.

The corporate-government connections run at the highest of levels with Raytheon. Richard Armitage, former Deputy Secretary of State, is a company consultant, Sean O'Keefe, former Director of the Office of Management and Budget, is a strategy advisory board member, Warren Rudman, a former Senator, sits on the Board of Directors, and John Deutch, former director of the CIA, is also a member of the Board of Directors.[159] Secretary Armitage made his name known in the corporate media when he made a bold statement about the "threat" that Hezbollah poses: "Hezbollah made the A-team of terrorists, while maybe al-Qaeda is actually the B-team."[160] Discussed more in Chapter 6, this statement, although made in 2003, has, and still is, being used in the corporate media. This accusation came as no surprise as Raytheon's defense systems were given to Israel for the main reason of "defending Israel against rocket attacks from Hezbollah." Armitage's statement served as a strong sales point for the multi-million dollar missile systems delivered to Israel. Secretary Armitage has also served as a consultant to Boeing's weapons department, another large distributer to Israel.

---

[158] Ibid.
[159] Ibid.
[160] Daniel Byman, "Should Hezbollah Be Next?" *Foreign Affairs Magazine*, November/December 2003.

The corporate-government connections is also seen in Northrop Grumman who has employed Lewis Libby, former White House Chief to the President, Dov Zakheim, former Under Secretary for Comptroller, Douglas J. Feith, former Defense Under Secretary for Policy, Paul Wolfowitz, former Deputy Defense Secretary, and James Roche, former Secretary of the Air Force, who would become the Vice President of Northrop.

Exhausting the point, during George W. Bush's first term, thirty-two major appointees of the administration were former executives, consultants, or major shareholders of top weapons contractors.[161] Continuing the trend, President Barak Obama has appointed officials such as Secretary of the Navy and former director of the defense contractor Enersys, Ray Mabus, Deputy Under Secretary for the Department of Defense and former Vice President for Raytheon, Frank Kendall III, General Counsel for the Department of Homeland Security and former Vice President to G.E., Ivan Fong, Director of National Intelligence and former Executive Director for the defense contractor Booz, Allen & Hamilton, James Clapper, and Deputy Secretary of Defense and former lobbyist for Raytheon, William J. Lynn III.[162]

Within the weapons industry, the CEO's of these large corporations and top government officials gain tremendous benefits. Some gain large incomes from these high status positions, others improve their stock portfolio; such as former White House Advisor Karl Rove who is a major shareholder of Boeing. The established formula allows members of the power elite to attain large sums of money and high

---

[161] Ciarrocca, "Axis of Influence."
[162] Washington Post, "Who's Who,"
http://projects.washingtonpost.com/2009/federal-appointments/by-branch/

political status. Within this transaction – Lockheed sells weapons to the U.S. government and the government gives them to Israel for free - the American taxpayer ends up with the bill. While the U.S. government is currently cutting education and medicare programs to combat the current economic problems, how is it able to justify the amount of military aid to Israel?

IV. Maintaining The Formula

One means to maintain this formula – a steady flow of weapons to Israel at the taxpayers' expense - is the qualitative military edge (QME). "Enshrined in congressional legislation, it requires certification that any proposed arms sale to any other country in the Middle East will not adversely affect Israel's qualitative military edge over military threats to Israel."[163] In 2009 meetings with defense officials in Israel, Undersecretary of State Ellen Tauscher "reiterated the United States' strong commitment" to the formula and "expressed appreciation" for Israel's willingness to work with newly created "QME working groups," according to a cable of her meetings that was released by WikiLeaks.[164] A unique aspect about the formula is that some neighboring countries, such as Saudi Arabia and Egypt, are U.S. allies, but are considered threats by Israel. So when Obama made an agreement to sell 84 F-15 fighter jets and other weapons worth $60 billion to Saudi Arabia,[165] it had to counter those weapons for Israel to maintain their military edge. That counter came

---

[163] Pincus, "Assistance to Israel."
[164] *Ibid*.
[165] Ian Black, "Barack Obama to authorize record $60bn Saudi Arms Sale," *The Guardian*, September 13, 2010, accessed October 12, 2011, http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/sep/13/us-arms-deal-saudi-arabia.

in the form of giving Israel 20 F-35 fifth generation stealth fighters, which are still

being developed.   This process can also be referred to as a U.S.-generated arms race

– the U.S. government sells weapons to Saudi Arabia, and then is legally obligated to

sell better weapons to Israel, and then later sells Saudi better weapons, and then is

legally obligated to sell Israel better weapons, and then the process is repeated.

The QME program helps justify the enormous amount of weapon sales to

these countries, but it is not the only program that ensures weapon sales. Other

avenues to ensure a consistent flow of weapons to Israel are the missile defense

programs that make up their multilayered missile and defense apparatus; including

the Iron Dome System, the Arrow III system, the Magic Wand system, and the new,

David's Sling Short Range Missile Defense System. The U.S. weapons manufacturer

Raytheon has played an extensive part in producing all four of these systems.

Although all four are currently active, Israeli military commanders have recently

stated they need at least 10-15 more to effectively cover the northern border from

potential attacks from Hezbollah.[166] To fund these additional Iron Domes' the U.S.

Congress passed a bill to authorize an additional $205 million, on top of the existing

$3 billion, for the project.[167] The Magic Wand system was also implemented to

combat missiles fired from Hezbollah.[168] Each projectile fired from the Magic Wand

---

[166] *UPI*, "Raytheon-Rafael get boost for Iron Dome," August 23, 2011, accessed October 15, 2011, http://www.upi.com/Business_News/Security-Industry/2011/08/23/Raytheon-Rafael-get-boost-for-Iron-Dome/UPI-18551314128093.
[167] Pincus, "Assistance to Israel."
[168] *Defense Update*, "Israel Embarks on a Third Ballistic Defense System," 2007, accessed October 15, 2011. http://defense-update.com/newscast/0207/news/010207_iron_cap.htm.

system will cost $1 million.[169] Adding another layer to Israel's missile defense

program, Lt. Gen. Henry Obering, Director of the Pentagon's Missile Defense Agency,

recently signed a Project Agreement with Israel in efforts to develop David's

Sling.[170] Unlike the U.S.-Israel Arrow interceptor, which is managed by Israel,

funded jointly by the two countries, but intended only for Israeli defense, David's

Sling, will be co-managed, co-funded, and optimized to meet operational

requirements of both governments.[171] This system is designed to combat long-

range missiles, with the primary strategy to eliminate potential threats from

Hezbollah and Iran. Maintaining all four of these systems requires a constant flow of

weaponry from the U.S., and the higher the threat, the faster the flow, and the more

wealth transferred to the power elite.

If the U.S. manufactured fighter jets, tanks, armored vehicles, defense

systems, and plethora of missiles and other weaponry were not enough, the U.S. War

Reserves Stocks for Allies, beginning in the 1980's, ensures at least another $1.2

billion of U.S. weapons can be stored in Israel in 2012.[172] This ensures another $1.2

billion to the power elite. This military program allows the U.S. to store arms and

equipment on Israeli bases for use in wartime. In the 1990's, the arrangement was

expanded to allow Israel to use the weapons, but only with U.S. permission. This

was first enacted during the 2006 war against Hezbollah, with the U.S. allowing

---

[169] ibid.
[170] Barbara Opell-Rome, "U.S.-Israel to Develop David's Sling Missile Defense," *Defense News*, August 7, 2011, accessed October 18 2011. http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?i=3664531.
[171] ibid
[172] Starting in 2012, the U.S. will be able to store $1.2 billion of weaponry on Israeli bases. Pincus, "Assistance to Israel."

Israel to use stored cluster artillery shells. The use of these cluster bombs drew

large international criticism, as the majority of the targets were Lebanese civilians.

The cluster bombs used were the M77 submissions delivered by the Lockheed

Martin Multiple Launch Rocket System (MLRS).[173] At least one million unexploded

bomblets remained on Lebanese soil after the war ended, leading to at least 200

post-war casualties.[174] These casualties led to a global ban known as the Cluster

Munitions Convention, which is part of international humanitarian law aimed a

protecting civilians. This global ban has been endorsed by more than a hundred

nations, yet unsurprisingly not by either the U.S. or Israel.[175]

The above programs are well established, providing multiple opportunities

for an abundance of weapon sales to Israel. Yet in order to continue a steady flow of

these weapons, ensuring high profits for the military contractors, there must be a

conflict, or at least the perception of an imminent threat to Israel. If organizations

such as Hezbollah or Hamas can remain dangerous threats, or manufactured threats,

these weapons can continue to flow without question. This thesis argues that the

power elite is able to utilize the corporate media to communicate and construct this

requisite threat. Before examining the filtered news fit to print in regards to

Hezbollah, a historical analysis of Hezbollah followed by an examination of the FTO

designation process is required to further the stated argument – Hezbollah has

---

[173] Frida Berrigan, "Made in the U.S.A.: American Military Aid to Israel," *Journal of Palestine Studies* 38, No. 3 (Spring 2009): 6-21.
[174] *Human Rights Watch*, "Israel and Cluster Munitions," February 8 2008, cited in Berrigan, "Made in the U.S.A."
[175] Berrigan, "Made in the U.S.A."

evolved away from the definitions of a FTO, and is only included on the list because

the inclusion serves the interests of the power elite.

CHAPTER 4
HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF HEZBOLLAH

I. Origins, Founding, and the Initial Cadre of Hezbollah

Hezbollah's former Deputy Secretary General, Naim Qassem, cites the Israeli

invasion of 1978, "The Litani Operation," as the precursor for the establishment of

Hezbollah.[176] The exact date is unclear, but it is assumed that this operation and the

1982 Israeli invasion both contributed to an environment that enabled young Shiite

men to unite in a resistance movement that would become Hezbollah.

After winning its independence from France in 1943, Lebanon's search for an

identity began. Signing the defining National Pact, Maronite Christians and Sunni

Muslims set the terms of reference for Lebanon's independence. This pact created a

political system that was based on sectarian communities, or confessions.

Consisting of 18 different recognized sects, each according their own political

privileges, the political system of Lebanon is incomparable to any other nation.

Holding the most power, the Maronites were awarded the presidency, the Sunnis

won the premiership, and the Shi'a were given speakership of parliament, a position

that held little constitutional power. This disempowered political position coupled

with their impoverished and underdeveloped community in Southern Lebanon,[177]

represents a common theme in Arab Shi'a history. Found in Bahrain, Iraq, Kuwait,

---

[176] Naim Qassem, *Hizbullah: The Story from Within* (London: Saqi Books, 2005), 67.
[177] Augustus Norton, *Amal and the Shi'a: The Struggle for the Soul of Lebanon*
(Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1987), 16-23.

and Saudi Arabia, the Shi'a community is often oppressed due to the dominant Arab Sunnis despising them for their deviation from the path of Sunni Islam.[178]

Against the difficult backdrop of constraining domestic policies,[179] the influx of a hundred thousand Palestinian refugees from the creation of the state of Israel in 1948, and the PLO establishing a virtual state-within-the state of Lebanon, the Shi'a community was hungry for radical change. Attracted to parties, which denounced the tribal, religious, or ethnic bases of discrimination, many Shi'a turned to the secular opposition parties like the Syrian Social Nationalist Party (SSNP), the Lebanese Communist Party (LCP), and the Organization for Communist Labor Action.

Starting in the early 1970's, the armed Palestinian presence began to rapidly increase, and the civil war began to show its face. These heightened tensions provided an array of secular parties an environment to capture the support of the Shi'a community. Among these emerging groups was the predecessor and eventual rival to Hezbollah, the reformist Amal movement.

Founded in 1975 by Sayyid Musa al-Sadr as the militia wing of al-Sadr's Harakat al-Mahrumin (Movement of the Deprived), Amal (Afwaj al-Muqawamat al-Lubnaniyya), won many adherents serving as a viable option to the parties of the Left. Aligning with other radical reformists groups within the Lebanese National Movement, Amal quickly grew in popularity. Amal was seen as a feasible protector in a conflict torn country, although a large amount of its support came from an

---

[178] Augustus Norton, *Hezbollah: A Short Story* (NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009), 12.
[179] Norton, *Hezbollah*, 13.

outside state, Libya.[180] After fading in popularity due to its support for Syria and its

armed intervention to prevent a victory by the PLO and the LMN over the Maronite

militias,[181] Amal strongly reemerged after a confluence of events: founder, al-Sadr,

mysteriously disappeared, the Israeli invasion in 1978, and the Iranian revolution in

1979. Challenging the presence of the Palestinian guerrillas, who were seen as an

occupying force prone to brutality, Amal drew much support from the growing Shi'a

middle class.[182] Clashes began to erupt between Amal militiamen and Palestinian

guerrillas, ultimately leading to Amal tacitly welcoming the Israeli invasion of 1982

in order to break the power of the Palestinian fighters.[183] Amal's leaders, Nabih

Berri and Daoud Suleiman Daoud, were seen as the orchestrators' of this devious

act. This move by Berri, combined with his participation in the National Salvation

Committee, created a deep divide within Amal, as the young radicals within the

organization described the Committee as no more than an "American-Israeli bridge"

allowing the United States to enter and control Lebanon.[184]

     With no clear hierarchy, ideological disagreements began to run rampant

among the Amal leaders. Young Lebanese clerics such as Subhi al-Tufayli and Abbas

al-Musawi, who were being educated at the revered Shi'a seminaries in al-Najaf,

Iraq, sought to penetrate and reform Amal's secular outlook from within. Faced

with much inhospitality in Iraq due to the growing power of the Shi'a in Iran, these

young clerics came back to Lebanon with a revolutionary fervor and commitment to

---

[180] Judith P. Harik, *Hezbollah: The Changing Face of Terrorism* (London; New York: I.B. Tauris, 2005), 22.
[181] Norton, *Hezbollah*, 18.
[182] Ibid., 22.
[183] Ibid., 23.
[184] Norton, *Amal and the Shi'a*, 105.

change their society. Their agenda was further affirmed when Hussein Fadlallah, who was the most influential 'alim' in Lebanon, urged them to stray away from Amal's de facto secularism and toward something approximating an Islamic system of rule.[185]

Wanting to eliminate the PLO and establish a pro-Israeli government in Beirut, Israel launched the "Peace for Galilee" operation on June 6th, 1982. Augustus Norton, an expert on Lebanese politics, explains that within the Israeli government at the time, as within the American foreign policy establishment, there was little understanding of the developments under way among the Shi'a Muslims of Lebanon, and no analysis was made of the impact of this invasion on them.[186] Although the revolutionary Shi'a were pursuing a path of emulating Iran's Islamic revolution, the invasion pushed the Shi'a further in this direction, creating conditions for the establishment of Hezbollah. The former Israeli Prime Minister, Ehud Barak, stated in July 2006, "When we entered Lebanon…there was no Hezbollah. We were accepted with perfumed rice and flowers by the Shi'a in the south. It was our presence there that created Hezbollah."[187] Instead of swiftly withdrawing, Israel's occupation of southern Lebanon created an environment for Hezbollah to rapidly expand.

From 1982 through the mid 1980's, Hezbollah was less an organization than a "cabal"[188] or "a clandestine militia."[189] Although the group was young and lacking in

---

[185] Jamal Sankari, *Fadlallah: The Making Of A Radical Shi'ite Leader* (Saqi Books, 2005), 172.
[186] Norton, *Hezbollah*, 33.
[187] Quoted in Norton, *Hezbollah*, 33.
[188] Ibid., 34.

organization, it was committed and indeed effective.

Occupied Lebanon was plagued with deadly violence. After the U.S. led agreement between Israel and the PLO, calling for the departure of all Palestinian fighters, including Yasser Arafat, a multinational force (MNF) led by U.S., French, British, and Italian troops arrived in Lebanon in late August 1982 to provide stability. Within three weeks of their arrival, Lebanese President Bashir al-Gemayyel was assassinated. Two weeks later, the U.S. and other MNF participants mobilized additional forces. However, instead of a peacekeeping force, their objective changed to assisting the new Lebanese government and army. This new task charged to the MNF, as well as their heavy-handed presence, was not well received.

In its first operation on November 11, 1982, Hezbollah member, Sheikh Ahmad Qasir, drove a bomb-laden car into the Israeli Intelligence headquarters in the southern city of Tyre. More than 75 Israeli officials and soldiers were killed. In April of 1983, in what was perceived to be a direct statement by Hezbollah in opposition to the MNF, a suicide bomber struck the U.S. embassy in Beirut killing 63 people. Although most western officials charge that Hezbollah was involved in this attack, many place the responsibility solely on Iran.[190] Robert Baer, a former CIA agent with extensive experience in Lebanon and in the middle east, has argued that Hezbollah was not involved: "It's not that Hezbollah is doing the terrorism out of Lebanon. They didn't do the U.S. Embassy in 1983 or the Marines. It was the Iranians. It's a political issue [in the U.S.] because the Israelis want the Americans to

---

[189] Harik, *Hezbollah,* 2.
[190] Norton, *Hezbollah*, 71.

go after Hezbollah."[191] After a U.S. brokered agreement was signed on May 17th, 1983 by Israel and Lebanon, calling on Israel to withdraw back to the "security zones", many Lebanese, tired of blood-shed, favored the agreement and hesitated to join or support the resistance. Five months later on October 16th, an Israeli army patrol blundered into the small town of al-Nabatiya during a mass procession on Ashura and opened fire in an attempt to disperse the crowd. Whatever the intent, the result left several Lebanese citizens dead. This was a defining event in the sense that those sitting on the fence quickly threw their weight behind the resistance.

Within a week of the al-Nabatiya incident, on October 23rd, two trucks loaded with explosives were driven into the Marine Corps and French Paratroopers barracks in Beirut. For both the U.S. and France, this attack, killing 241 Americans and 58 Frenchmen, remains one of the deadliest in their history. Although Hezbollah's involvement remains an allegation, there is little question the attacks were carried out by Lebanese Shia militants under Iranian direction.   The October 1983 attack, along with the continuing violence throughout Lebanon, led Ronald Reagan to "redeploy" the marines by early 1984, and the MNF ceased to exist.

II. The Open Letter Of 1985 And The Developments That Led To Its Irrelevance

The U.S. Department of State claims that Hezbollah was founded in 1982, but it could be argued that it did not become a cohesive organization until the mid-1980's. Prior to 1985, Hezbollah was a secretive organization, with no published ideology or

---

[191] *Christian Science Monitor*, July 7, 2003 cited in Norton, *Hezbollah*, 78.

identity. The original cadre did not want to participate in the official Lebanese

political system, since this might divert the movement from promoting the

resistance activities.[192] Deputy Secretary Naim Qassem stated that Hezbollah

avoided political activity at the time because of the need to organize its ranks, to

consolidate the movement, and to protect itself from infiltration by Israeli

intelligence.[193] By 1985 the leadership within Hezbollah began to see the harm in

remaining secretive in their operations.[194] Wanting to show its transparency,

Hezbollah's leaders published an open letter addressed to the "Downtrodden in

Lebanon and in the World" that put forth their founding principles and

organizational structure.[195] Providing a framework for Hezbollah's outlook on the

world, the letter declared that the world is divided between the oppressed and the

oppressors, with the latter struggling for influence at the expense of the Third

World.[196] It highlighted the "misguidance and ignorance" of Western ideas, and the

"progression and creativity" that Islam can bring.[197] Domestically, it stated the need

to eradicate foreign corruption by "the final departure of America, France, and their

allies from Lebanon and the termination of the influence of any imperialist power in

the country."[198]

One of the main burdens of the letter was to explain and justify Hezbollah's use

---

[192] Eitan Azani, *Hezbollah*: *The Story of the Party of God* (Palgrave Macmillian, 2008), 141.
[193] Ibid., 141.
[194] Harik, *Hezbollah*, 66.
[195] "An Open Letter: The Hizbollah Program," *The Jerusalem Quarterly*, No. 48, (Fall 1988): 15. http://www.standwithus.com/pdfs/flyers/hezbollah_program.pdf.
[196] Translation in Norton, *Amal and the Shi'a*, 178.
[197] Ibid., 184.
[198] Ibid., 173.

of violence, which the West trivialized as "a handful of fanatics and terrorists who are only concerned with blowing up drinking, gambling, and entertainment spots."[199] They then positioned themselves as a force of resistance against Israel's occupation of Lebanon and Palestine stating, "Israel's final departure from Lebanon is a prelude to its final obliteration from existence and the liberation of venerable Jerusalem from the talons of occupation."[200]

Although the letter was precise on the movement's friends and enemies, it remained ideologically ambiguous and never stated the movement's intended political design for Lebanon. Not hiding its "commitment to the rule of Islam," Hezbollah advocated the "adoption of the Islamic system on the basis of free and direct selection by the people, not the basis of forceful imposition, as some people imagine."[201] It also stated, that once Lebanon was free "the Lebanese will be allowed to determine their fate; if they choose freely, they will choose Islam."[202]

The letter was conveniently published during a triumphal time in Lebanon, as political and military successes had led to the humiliating departure of the American marines and an Israeli withdrawal from most of Lebanese territory. By January 1985, a month later, the celebrating ceased when Israel decided to position its forces in its self-declared "security zone", becoming a magnet for Hezbollah attacks.[203]

Not deviating from the militant tone of the open letter, Hezbollah moved

---

[199] Ibid., 170.
[200] Ibid., 173.
[201] Norton, *Amal and the Shi'a*, 175.
[202] Norton, *Hezbollah*, 39.
[203] Augustus Norton, "The Future of Civil Society in the Middle East," *Middle East Journal* 47, no. 2 (1993).

aggressively in the mid-to late 1980's. Groups linked to Hezbollah, if not directly

controlled by the party, began to kidnap foreigners. Perhaps the most infamous act

during this period was the June 1985 high-jacking of TWA flight 847 orchestrated by

Imad Mughniyah, an individual associated with Hezbollah's External Security

Organization until his assassination in 2008. Imad was driven by the fate of 766

Lebanese prisoners who were being held in Israel's Atlit prison and suffering from

extremely difficult conditions without recourse to the protections of international

law.[204] The crisis finally ended when Israel quietly released the Lebanese prisoners

from the Atlit prison. Another notable event during this time was the February

1988 kidnapping of U.S. Marine Corps Colonel William R. Higgins. While Higgins

was serving with the UN forces in he south, he was taken captive by a group known

as the "Believers' Resistance," a group with ties to Hezbollah, and eventually

murdered.

At the end of the decade, numerous events, including the end of the Lebanese

civil war and the last days of the Cold War, began to change the outlook of

Hezbollah, and notably the Iranian-Hezbollah relationship. Although Hezbollah was

highly influenced and funded by Iran throughout the 1980's, Iran focused on

restoring a post-revolutionary and post-Gulf War Iran, prompting it to distance itself

from Hezbollah.

Through the 1980's Hezbollah refused to participate in the Lebanese political

system due to political corruption. But by the 1990's, in contrast to the 1985 open

letter, Hezbollah had decided to engage the Lebanese political arena. This change

---

[204] Norton, *Hezbollah*, 42.

was prompted due to the attitudes and aspirations of its growing domestic

constituency, mostly consisting of an expanding Shi'a middle class.   Although

admiring Hezbollah's relative veracity and dissatisfaction with Amal's blatant

corruption, this broadened constituency made known that it did not want to live in

an Islamic Republic. Observing the benefits of having a place at the table of

government, Hezbollah withdrew its goal of establishing an Islamic State, and has

characterized the open letter as "obsolete and no longer an authoritative guide."[205]

After a number of high-ranking officials in Hezbollah were interviewed on al-Jazeera

TV in September 1998, the conclusion made was that "the open letter belonged to a

certain historical moment that had passed."[206]

III. "Rules Of The Game," The 2000 Israeli Withdrawal, and Hezbollah's Political Entry

By 1990, Keeping with the 1989 Ta'if Accord, all the militias in Lebanon, except

for Hezbollah, agreed to disband. Hezbollah justified maintaining its arms on the

grounds it was a "resistance movement," aimed at ending Israel's occupation and

defending the country against the Israel-sponsored SLA (South Lebanon Army), not

a militia. With many in Lebanon, especially in the south, seeing the Israeli

occupation as an impediment to the country's recovery and seeing the Lebanese

army as too weak or ineffective to push Israel out, Hezbollah's position was widely

---

[205] Norton, *Hezbollah*, 46.

[206] Joseph Elie Alagha, *The Shifts in Hizbullah's Ideology: Religious Ideology, Political Ideology, and Political Program* (Leiden: ISIM; Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006), 328.

accepted.[207]

During the 1990's practical "rules of the game" emerged between the

Hezbollah-led resistance forces and Israel and the SLA.[208] Israel would not attack

civilian targets in Lebanon, and the resistance would only attack the Security

Zone.[209]   On July 25th 1993, Israel launched "Operation Accountability" in response

to the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) and Hezbollah killing 5

IDF soldiers in the Security Zone. Through aerial attacks, Israel targeted Shi'a towns

and villages with the goal of disrupting civilian life, which disrupted the "rules of the

game". This was designed to push the civilians out of the south in hopes that they

would shift their support away from Hezbollah. After a U.S. brokered cease-fire,

Israel and Hezbollah agreed to a temporary reduction in violence and the exclusion

of civilian attacks. Although both held to the agreement for a time, the agreement

collapsed in 1996 after Hezbollah fired katyusha rockets into Israel in retaliation for

a roadside bomb explosion that caused the death of a 14-year old Lebanese boy and

injured three others in the village of Barashi.[210] In response to the rockets, coupled

with the campaign season, the IDF launched "Operation Grapes of Wrath" on April

11, 1993, intended to undermine popular support for Hezbollah among the

Lebanese, as well as prompt Syria to rein in the organization.[211] The strategy failed,

mainly because of the horrific massacre at Qana. Among the 300,000 to 500,000

[207] Ibid., 40-41.
[208] Norton, *Hezbollah*, 83.
[209] For a more detailed account of this time peridou see Daniel Sobelman, *New Rules of the Game: Israel and Hizballah after the Withdrawal from Lebanon* (Tel Aviv: Jaffe Center for Strategic Studies, Tel Aviv University, 2004).
[210] Norton, *Hezbollah*, 84, citing a 1996 UNIFIL report and a 1996 Amnesty International report.
[211] Ibid.

residents who were seeking refuge from the barrage of Israeli missiles, some took cover at the U.N. base in Qana – a protected zone under international law. Instead of finding safety, 106 civilians were killed by Israeli artillery that came pouring down on the U.N. base. Not only did a U.N. and Amnesty International report find the attack intentional, but also the UN Secretary-General military adviser stated that the shelling of the UNIFL site was not accidental.[212] "No incident in recent memory has inspired more hatred for the Jewish state than the Qana attack."[213]

Following this horrific event, U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher brokered an agreement that followed the same rules as the 1993 agreement. Progressing past the oral agreement of 1993, this agreement was committed to paper, though neither party ever actually signed it. One exceptionally critical point about these negotiations was that Israel never challenged the right of Hezbollah to attack its soldiers in Lebanon, thus conceding that the IDF was an occupation force in the country. Further, the agreement committed both sides to refrain from attacking civilians and launching attacks from civilian areas.[214] A U.S.-led monitoring group oversaw the implementation of the agreement, which operated effectively in policing and reinforcing the "rules of the game" from 1996 to 2000.

One notable observation during this period was Hezbollah's apology in November 1998 for the katyusha firing, stating it had never authorized the firing and condemned the act. Also, it should be emphasized that the resistance

---

[212] See UN Security Council document S/1996/137, May 7, 1996. See also Amnesty International, "Unlawful Killings during Operation 'Grapes of Wrath,'" July 1996, http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/info/MDE15/042/1996, (accessed January 30, 2010).
[213] Norton, *Hezbollah*, 85.
[214] Ibid., 85.

operations carried out by Hezbollah were targeted against Israeli soldiers and the SLA, not against civilians. The twelve suicide attacks launched by Hezbollah were all targeted against the occupation forces and their allies - all legitimate resistance targets.[215]

The "rules of the game" were not always honored. Usually if a resistance attack against Israel resulted in the death of an Israeli soldier, Israel's disproportionate response would result in the "accidental" death of civilians. Hezbollah did well to move within the "rules of the game," leaving Israeli soldiers frustrated. Adopting a "shoot first and ask questions later" policy, civilians were regularly killed; a total of five hundred Lebanese and Palestinian civilians were killed between Israel's invasion and withdrawal in 2000. This number is 30 times the number of Israeli civilian fatalities during this time.[216]

This period was also marked by indirect Israeli-Hezbollah negotiations, usually through UNIFEL or a European state. In 1996, in return for the bodies of two IDF and 17 SLA soldiers, Israel released 45 detainees and the remains of 123 Lebanese. In 1998, another notable exchange involving the body of Hadi Nasrallah, the son of Hezbollah Secretary-General Hasan Nasarallah, was completed.

When General Ehud Barak was elected prime minister of Israel in 1999, he promised he would withdraw from Lebanon within 12 months. After attempting bilateral negotiations with Syria, accompanied by President Clinton, the

---

[215] Ibid., 85.
[216] Ibid., 87.

negotiations failed.[217] These failed negotiations began to cause speculation that Israel might unilaterally withdrawal from Lebanon. Fear of mass chaos, including "the slaughter of collaborators and bloody vendettas," began to overcome Beirut and Damascus. [218] Hasan Nasarallah began to play politician, sending out clear analysis and calm assurances of Hezbollah's preparation for the withdrawal, and condemning revenge attacks or retaliatory killings. During this period, Hezbollah settled on a position of calculated and modest ambiguity concerning the Israeli withdrawal, never stating its intentions after the occupiers left. On May 24, 2000, Israel withdrew after 22 years of occupying Lebanon, and the country remained remarkably calm.

Following the Israeli withdrawal, Hezbollah's leaders began to debate whether the movement should focus on Lebanese politics, or maintain the resistance posture both in Lebanon and in the Middle East. After internal party discussions, and Nasrallah consulting with Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, they chose the latter strategy. This resistance was to be aimed at Israel and its presence in the village of Shebaa, a disputed territory occupied by Israel. Although Hezbollah maintained its resistance posture, the next 6 years, apart from harassing fire, aggressive patrolling, and heated rhetoric by both sides, was a relatively quiet, peaceful time by historical standards.[219] This 6-year period was an important time as both parties understood the "rules of the game," and stability across the hostile border was observed to be possible. Obtaining much support during this time, Hezbollah was seen to be a

---

[217] William Quandt, *Peace Process: American Diplomacy And The Arab-Israeli Conflict Since 1967* (University of California Press, 2005), 328.
[218] Norton, *Hezbollah*, 89.
[219] Ibid., 91.

crucial and effective means to deter another Israeli invasion, giving it a viable platform in the political arena.

When the civil war in Lebanon finally ended in 1990, elections had not been held for 18 years, and only about two-thirds of the 1975 Chamber of Deputies survived the bloody war. After an unpopular, Syrian influenced, transitional step of parliamentary appointments in 1991, which filled 40 seats, the first post-civil war elections were finally held in 1992.

These elections posed a difficult question for Hezbollah: Should it adhere to its previous denunciation of the confessional electoral system as corrupt and reject participation, or change directions and contest the elections? Although the majority of Hezbollah's leaders had rejected participation throughout the 1980's, one of the most influential Shi'a clerics in Lebanon, Sheikh Muhammad Hussein Fadlallah, had been arguing for years that a revolutionary transition to Islamic rule in Lebanon was impossible given the state's diverse society, and therefore a gradual restructuring and increased participation would be required.[220] Another Lebanese cleric, the late Shaikh Muhammad Mahdi Shams al-Din, president of the Supreme Islamic Shi'a Council from 1978 to 2001, told Augustus Norton in a 1997 interview that it was necessary for Islamist parties to take into account the power of contending secular forces. Shams al-Din emphasized that political compromises are often necessary.[221]

Debated by 12 leading members, including Na'im Qassem, Nasrallah, and Subi al-Tufayli, the questions at hand were: Was participation in a "non-Islamic" government legitimate? Should ideology bend to practical interests? And would

[220] Sankari, *Fadlallah*.
[221] Norton, *Hezbollah*, 99.

Hezbollah, by its participation, be co-opted into a secular political system, thereby abandoning its principles and Islamic vision?[222] In the end, with the blessing from Ali Khamenei to participate, 10 of 12 members embraced the idea of running for office. Seeing the benefits of gaining official recognition as a political institution in Lebanon, a public podium, and the means to influence the budget to its constituents' advantage, Nasrallah announced on July 3, 1992 that the party would compete in that summer's elections.[223]

In the 1992 elections, Hezbollah and its allies won 12 seats in the Lebanese parliament, including eight Shi'a seats. Since this election, Hezbollah has routinely won around 10 percent of all parliamentary seats. Notably, one of Hezbollah's attractions is it avoids religious themes in its political campaigns, and focuses on economic exploitation and under development, inequities in the political system, personal freedom and opportunity, and, most of all, security.[224]

In the 1996 elections, Hezbollah performed well, stressing its crucial role in protecting the country. Campaign posters read: "They [Israel] resist with their blood, resist with your vote."[225] In the 2000 elections, Hezbollah formed an alliance with Amal – the Resistance and Development Bloc – winning all 23 available seats in southern Lebanon and more than a quarter of all seats in parliament. This momentum carried through to the 2005 elections, where Hezbollah won 11% of the parliamentary seats, and the Resistance and Development Bloc won 27% of the

---

[222] Qassem, *Hizbollah*.
[223] Norton, *Hezbollah*, 101.
[224] Ibid., 102.
[225] Ibid., 102.

69

seats nationwide.[226]

Hezbollah's political achievements, social services, and security attracted much support from the Shi'a in the southern Lebanon. But after the Israeli withdrawal in 2000, Lebanese officials and citizens began to increase pressure on Hezbollah to disarm. Yet, Hezbollah refused, claiming it was the only legitimate force capable of defending Lebanon against an Israeli invasion. Observing the movement's military stature and growing arsenal, most supporters were convinced that it could, in fact, repel a foreign invasion, or at least resist more effectively than the Lebanese national army. In July 2006, Hezbollah had to substantiate its claims as it entered a 34-day war with Israel.

IV. The 2006 Israel-Hezbollah Conflict

Tensions began to increase in November 2005 when Hezbollah attempted to capture several Israeli soldiers to trade for Lebanese prisoners. In May of 2006, Hezbollah fired on an Israeli border post, wounding an Israeli soldier. Within the "rules of the game", Israel would normally shell a few Hezbollah positions and command and control centers. Instead, Israel opted for a larger, more punishing operation, shelling 20 Hezbollah positions. Hezbollah responded again by launching eight, very inaccurate Katyusha rockets at Safad, home to the Israeli army's northern headquarters.

The proximate catalyst was the dramatic and extremely successful operation carried out by Hezbollah on July 12, 2006. Hezbollah militants ambushed a

---

[226] Angus Reid Global Monitor: Election Tracker. http://www.angus reid.com/tracker/view/6962, (accessed January 30, 2011).

motorized Israeli patrol in an unpopulated area of northern Israel on its border with

Lebanon,[227] and captured two Israeli soldiers and killed three others. After the IDF

pursued the militants into Lebanon, five more soldiers were killed. Although

Hezbollah expected an Israeli response, the July 13th Israeli retaliation showed that

Nasrallah had made a major miscalculation, a statement he eventually admitted.[228]

On July 13th Israel destroyed 59 stationary rocket launchers concealed in the

homes of Hezbollah activists. This initial attack proved Israel to be firing with

relative precision and intelligence as only 20 Lebanese civilians were killed, a small

number compared to their past record.[229] Unfortunately, this precision quickly

faded, and the civilian casualties began to multiply.

By July 14th Lebanon was blockaded from the sea, the Beirut airport was

damaged, and Nasrallah's offices had been bombed. In response, Nasrallah

instructed his listeners on the radio to look towards the sea, making perfect

theatrical timing as an Iranian-produced C-802 Noor guided missile struck an Israeli

naval vessel, killing four of its sailors. Just as Nasrallah was surprised with Israel's

response, this attack surprised Israel in how well Hezbollah was prepared.[230] This

became even more evident after Hezbollah struck the city of Haifa on July 16th with

longer-range rockets provided by Syria and Iran. By the end of the war, Israel

realized its miscalculation, as one Israeli Brigadier, General Guy Zur, described

---

[227] The majority of sources used by this author state this operation happened in
northern Israel, yet the exact location is unknown.
[228] Norton, *Hezbollah*, 136.
[229] Harel, *34 Days,* 91.
[230] Norton, *Hezbollah*, 136.

Hezbollah as "by far the greatest guerrilla group in the world."[231]

Israel's strategy was centered on creating a "killing box."[232] Relying on its air power, Israel targeted roads, bridges, seaports, and airports throughout Lebanon, cutting off re-supply routes for Hezbollah. It also struck Hezbollah's television station, al-Manar, repeatedly, but strangely enough, the station was never interrupted. The population in southern Lebanon was forced to flee to relative safety, many taking refuge in schools or parking garages. Part of the "killing box" strategy was to clear out the civilians, as Israel not only struck gasoline stations but food stores as well. This "killing box" strategy is also defined as collective punishment, a war crime under the fourth Geneva Convention.[233]

The day after Hezbollah struck Haifa, Prime Minister Olmert addressed the Knesset stating his goals: the return of the two captured soldiers, a complete cease-fire, the deployment of the Lebanese army in the south, and the expulsion of Hezbollah from the south.[234] The Israeli government was confident it could eliminate Hezbollah entirely, and it tried to make this known to Washington frequently. One Israeli official promised President Bush a "quick and decisive"[235] result, and told Condoleezza Rice, "You did it in 70 days [in Kosovo], but we need half of that."[236]

---

[231] USA Today, September 14, 2006, cited in Norton, *Hezbollah,* 140.
[232] Norton, *Hezbollah*, 137.
[233] The Fourth Geneva Convention defines collective punishment as the punishment of a group of people as a result of the behavior of one or more other individuals or groups. The punished group may often have no direct association with the other individuals or groups, or direct control over their actions.
[234] Ibid., 139.
[235] Ibid., 139.
[236] Hersh, "Annals of National Security," 31.

Israel's goal of completely eliminating Hezbollah was soon to be seen as wishful thinking, and at the expense of over a thousand civilians. On July 30th, Israel's international support faded quickly after it again bombed the village of Qana, killing 28 civilians, including 16 children.[237] By mid-August 2006 a UN and Lebanon-brokered cease-fire was in place, Israel and the U.S. were forced to dramatically scale back their demands and expectations for the war's outcome, and southern Lebanon lay in ruins.

On August 11th 2006, the UN Security Council passed resolution 1701, which was shaped by the "Seven Point Plan" previously proposed by Lebanese Prime Minister Fouad Siniora. The following day the Lebanese cabinet, including two Hezbollah ministers, unanimously approved the cease-fire. Shortly after the vote, Siniora gave a speech to the Lebanese parliament praising Hezbollah and highlighted, "the perseverance of Hezbollah fighters" and their vital role in Lebanon.[238] Following this speech, Nasrallah announced that Hezbollah, being part of the Lebanese government, would hold to its part of the agreement.

What was projected to be an easy Israeli victory and elimination of Hezbollah from southern Lebanon, at least by the U.S. and Israel, ended up being a lose-lose war that caused an enormous amount of damage and the unnecessary death of over a thousand civilians. The war demonstrated that Israel, and the majority of the rest of the world, was unaware of Hezbollah's capabilities. Moreover, the war demonstrated that Israel and the U.S. had minimal understanding of Lebanon's

---

[237] *Human Rights Watch*, "Israel/Lebanon: Qana Death Toll at 28," August 1, 2006, accessed August 9, 2011.
http://www.hrw.org/en/news/2006/08/01/israellebanon- qana-death-toll-28.
[238] Harel, *34 Days*, 235.

politics.

By the end of the 34-day war, half the population of northern Israel was displaced (500,000 people) and most of the civilian population of southern Lebanon was displaced (900,000 people, or one-quarter of Lebanon's population). Material losses were also high, totaling $500 million in Israel and about $4 billion in Lebanon. But the most disturbing number was the amount of civilians killed. At the end of the war 43 Israeli civilians and 1,109 Lebanese civilians had been killed.[239]

Although there was no unequivocal winner, many would grant the victory to Hezbollah. Hezbollah competed well with the highly revered IDF, and was by no means eliminated. Hezbollah actually emerged stronger and with greater support from the Lebanese community. Capitalizing on the destruction in southern Lebanon, including 900 factories and 15,000 homes severely damaged or destroyed,[240] Hezbollah responded rapidly to the needs of civilians. One Lebanese shopkeeper reported receiving $1,000 for redeemed IOUs that Hezbollah fighters had left during the war.[241] More astonishing was that Hezbollah paid $10,000 to $12,000 to each of the 15,000 homeless families in southern Lebanon, and distributed about 25 thousand free meals.[242] Although the 2006 conflict was devastating for all parties involved, Hezbollah increased its legitimacy within the Lebanese government, gained further domestic support through its post-war aid, and further justified its militant posture by cooperating with the Lebanese army,

---

[239] Norton, *Hezbollah*, 142.
[240] *BBC*, "Middle East Crisis: Facts and Figures," August, 31, 2006, accessed September 28, 2011, http//news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/5257128.stm.
[241] Reinoud Leenders, "How the Rebel Regained His Cause: Hizbullah & the Sixth Arab-Israeli War," *MIT Electronic Journal of Middle East Studies* 6, 2006, 46.
[242] Norton, *Hezbollah*, 142.

since half of the army consisted of Shi'a, and by displaying its ability to protect

Lebanon from further attacks.

V. Hezbollah Today

At the end of the 2006 war, Hezbollah enjoyed an abundance of international

support. At home, Hezbollah began to increase its work within the community,

capitalizing on its strong post-war support. Social services and public works is a

notable feature of Hezbollah, yet is unknown to most in the U.S. and other countries

in the West. Based in a community plagued with poverty and war, Hezbollah

provides much for the struggling families in southern Lebanon. The Lebanese

government offers extremely poor social services, and what is offered is mainly

distributed in Beirut. This system offers little to the southern Lebanese, causing

them to turn to other means.

Hezbollah offers an array of social services, including construction companies,

schools, hospitals, dispensaries, news organizations, and banking institutions.[243]

Hezbollah's most effective banking institution is al-Qard al-Hasan, meaning the

"good loan", which offers 750 small loans a month.[244] Although these services are

concentrated in the south and predominantly Shi'a areas, many of Hezbollah's

services meet the needs of anyone that needs help. Hezbollah's medical services,

including three hospitals and twelve health centers, treats all walk-in patients,

regardless of political views, religion or race. The movement also provides free

---

[243] See "Lebanon: The Many Hands and Faces of Hezbollah," UN Office for
the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, March 29, 2006.
[244] Norton, *Hezbollah*, 110.

health coverage and prescription-drug coverage. Educationally, Hezbollah's

Education Unit operates a number of primary and secondary schools at extremely

low costs.[245]

One of the largest organizations created by Hezbollah is Jihad al-Bina

Development Organization, which was responsible for the reconstruction and repair

of southern Lebanon after the Israeli attacks in 1993, 1996, and 2006.[246] This

organization, along with other Hezbollah oriented organizations, promptly met the

needs of the 15,000 displaced families following the 2006 war, displaying the

competence and professionalism that has won much of its support from the

Lebanese Shi'a. Other notable Hezbollah-led organizations are the Hezbollah

Women's Committee and the Islamic Health Committee.

Hezbollah not only meets the basic needs of the southern population, which is

ignored by the national government, it provides well. One Shi'a in southern

Lebanon said, "there are no needy people in al-Dayhiya", explaining that the rich

fabric of social and charitable organizations meet the needs of people who would

otherwise be impoverished.[247] Today, Hezbollah is the country's largest and most

dependable providers of social services.[248]

Politically, Hezbollah knows the game well, maneuvering through "a

patchwork of competing sectarian and personal interests, joined only by fraying

threads of national identity."[249] Following the 2006 war, Hezbollah began to call for

---

[245] Flanigan, "Hezbollah's Social Jihad," 3-4.
[246] Azani, *Hezbollah,* 116.
[247] Norton, *Hezbollah*, 111.
[248] Flanigan, "Hezbollah's Social Jihad," 8.
[249] Norton, *Hezbollah*, 171.

the establishment of a "National Unity Government", which would have entailed the movement and its allies obtaining one-third of the cabinet positions and veto power within the Lebanese government. After Prime Minister Fouad Siniora and the ruling coalition dismissed these demands, Hezbollah and its allies sparked the "Lebanese Revolt", which consisted of large-scale protests and sit-ins. A dead lock soon arose and so did violence. After the Lebanese government shut down Hezbollah's extensive fiber-optic communications network, an integral part of the movement's security infrastructure, Hezbollah blocked off the airport. It became evident that the government was not going to be able to return to the status quo. The United States had always clung to the "politically convenient fiction that a consensus government (with an attendant role for Hezbollah) could be avoided."[250] But after seeing the realities on the ground in May 2008, the U.S. grudgingly supported the effort by the Emir of Qatar to mediate the negotiations that would lead to a consensus government that included Hezbollah. On May 21st, 2008, the Doha Agreement was signed and a consensus government was created in which the opposition would hold an effective veto. This was a significant victory for Hezbollah and the opposition bloc, obtaining a broad role within the Lebanese political arena.

After a grueling 34-day war, Hezbollah emerged even stronger, competing well with the IDF and proving its abilities to its constituents. Its performance during the June war shocked not only Israeli officials, but Washington as well, dismantling their misguided approach of solving the "Hezbollah problem" with force.

In 2007, further substance was given to the argument that Hezbollah is more

---

[250] Norton, *Hezbollah*, 170.

77

capable of defending the country than the national army. In May of 2007, the

Lebanese Armed Forces (LAF) was tested when Fatah al-Islam (FAI), a Sunni

extremist group based in the Nahr al-Barid refugee camp near Tripoli, attacked an

LAF unit killing several soldiers. The LAF responded forcefully, but the FAI put up a

fierce resistance that ended up lasting over three months and killed 168 soldiers.

The LAF enjoyed great public support during the fighting, but its insufficient

capabilities were on display for all to see. At the early stages of the fighting, the LAF

actually ran out of ammunition, and was able to continue only because the U.S.

airlifted it more supplies.[251]

In June of 2007, another Sunni militant group set off a roadside bomb that

ended up killing six UNIFL peacekeepers. Although UNIFEL had been charged with

the task of ensuring that Hezbollah would not reconstitute an armed presence

adjacent to the Israeli-Lebanese border, the June attack prompted several of the

national military contingents in UNIFL to quietly bolster informal liaison

arrangements with Hezbollah in order to benefit from its "well-oiled intelligence

network" and enlist its help in forestalling future militant attacks.[252] This reliance

on Hezbollah also stemmed from an April 2008 comment from Al-Qaeda's new

leader, Ayman al-Zawahiri, calling for attacks on "Crusaders and Jews," specifically

including UNIFEL.[253] The UNIFL-Hezbollah alliance and al-Zawahiri's statement is a

clear example that the grouping of Hezbollah and Al-Qaeda together is a false

political construction.

---

[251] Norton, *Hezbollah*, 164.
[252] Ibid., 165.
[253] Ibid.

The Hezbollah disarmament debate continues in Lebanon, but events like those discussed above and other actions by the Lebanese government have continued to legitimize Hezbollah as a national resistance movement. For example, in the November 2009 "Policy Declaration" the Lebanese government publicly supported Hezbollah's resistance against Israel's occupation. The declaration stated:

> It is the right of the Lebanese people, Army and the Resistance to liberate the Shebaa Farms, the Kfar Shuba Hills and the northern part of the village of Ghajar as well as to defend Lebanon and its territorial waters in the face of any enemy by all available and legal means.[254]

With the national government publicly supporting Hezbollah along with its continued status as the only force capable of defending Lebanon, Hezbollah will remain a dominant force in the country and will more than likely not disarm.

Hezbollah is an organization that encompasses a large network of social services, a large foothold within the national government, and an impressive military and intelligence unit. It has proven that it cannot be easily destroyed by force, and that it will only be recognized as a legitimate political organization so long as it maintains its resistance wing. Moreover, Hezbollah shows no signs of disappearing and will be an important part of the future, constructive or not. Current U.S. policy makers need to appreciate this reality, and approach the crucial state of Lebanon with a strategy that includes all parties. This comprehensive approach will require the removal of Hezbollah from the U.S. FTO list.

The next chapter examines the current FTO designation process and its

---

[254] Franklin Lamb, "Lebanon 'accepts' Hezbollah's weapons," *Aljazeera Magazine*, December 2, 2009.

political nature, the criteria for designation, and other notable cases of designation

in efforts to assess the accuracy of Hezbollah's FTO designation.

During the 1980's and 90's, a shift in rhetoric began to fuse Islam and terrorism, producing an idea that terrorism can only be terrorism when the element of Islam is present. Although the majority of terrorist attacks during this time period were carried out by Puerto Ricans (76), followed by Jewish groups (16), right-wing groups (6), and then Muslims (5),[255] the latter group was constructed to be the most radical and dangerous threat. Immediately after the 1995 bombing of the federal building in Oklahoma City, numerous "terrorism experts" within the corporate media were linking Arabs, Muslims, and Middle Easterners to the explosion.[256] After it was known a white American from New York committed the attacks, a *New York Times* reporter asserted that although the Oklahoma massacre was the work of American terrorists, "most other attacks against Americans came from the Middle East."[257] This neatly framed report was among many that contributed to the linking of Islam and "terrorism."

This linkage has contributed to a change in the meaning of terrorism, used with emotionally charged language and politically driven motives. The process of labeling a terrorist organization is too often driven by the political climate and not

---

[255] Federal Bureau of Investigation. Terrorist Research and Analytical Section. 1995.
[256] For example: CBS Evening News, 19 April 1995; *New York Times*, 20 April 1995; *Washington Post*, 20 April 1995; and the *International Herald Tribune*, 26 April 1995.
[257] A.M. Rosenthal, "Things America Can Do to Curtail Terrorism, Domestic and Foreign," *New York Times*, April 1995. Cited in Fawaz Gerges, "Islam and Muslims in the Mind of America," *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 588, no. 73, (2003): 73-87.

actual intelligence. Counterterrorism is a critical element of U.S. law enforcement and should be focused on actual, imminent threats. This chapter analyzes the FTO designation process and its political nature, investigating if Hezbollah's designation is still accurate.

I. Defining Terrorism, FTO Designation Criteria, And Legal Ramifications

The term terrorism is one of varying definitions. With differing perspectives and ideologies, establishing an agreed upon definition on the international stage has proven to be impossible. Some governments, although vague and open to interpretation, have stated their official definition of terrorism, but many have been unwilling to commit to defining the term. These vague definitions, or absence of definitions, can create political complications.   Without a clear set of criteria, the decision to label an individual or an organization a terrorist becomes completely subjective depending upon whether one sympathizes with the individual, group, or cause being addressed.[258]

Since this thesis is investigating U.S. policy, it will focus on the definitions of the U.S. government. Yet, even when one focuses only on the U.S. government's definition, the same inconsistencies found on the international stage are seen between the numerous U.S. government agencies. A 2003 U.S. Army report cited a 1988 study, which identified 109 separate definitions of terrorism.[259] Each agency

---

[258] Bruce Hoffman, *Inside Terrorism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 32.
[259] Jeffrey Record, *Bounding the Global War on Terrorism* (U.S. Army War College: Strategic Studies Institute, December 01, 2003), 6

has its own objectives and authorities, producing differing usages of language within each definition.

Complicating this issue further, the U.S. government not only has differing language between its agencies, but has several different "terrorists lists". This includes the "State Sponsors of Terrorism" list, the "Specially Designated Terrorists" list, the "Specially Designated Global Terrorists" list, the "Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons" list—a master list that contains the other lists - the "Terrorist Exclusion List," the "Foreign Terrorist Organization" list, and the newly formed "Foreign Terrorist Organization of Global Reach" list. Since the FTO list is the primary U.S. government resource in designating foreign terrorists organizations, this list is the focus of this thesis. Further, the FTO list is unique in that it authorizes specific measures to be legally carried out against a designated group and simultaneously serves as a symbolic tool for U.S. foreign policy.

Analyzing the FTO designation process, this thesis focuses on the criteria used during FTO designation under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA). Provided by section 140(d)(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989, "terrorism" is defined as "premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by sub-national groups or clandestine agents." Provided by section 212(a)(3)(B) of the INA, "terrorist activity" is defined as "Any activity which is unlawful under the laws of the place where it is committed (or which, if committed in the United States, would be unlawful under the laws of the United States or any State) and which involves any of the following:

(I) The highjacking or sabotage of any conveyance (including aircraft, vessel, or vehicle.)

(II) The seizing or detaining, and threatening to kill, injure, or continue to detain, another individual in order to compel a third person (including a governmental organization) to do or abstain from doing any act as an explicit or implicit condition for the release of the individual seized or detained.

(III) A violent act upon an internationally protected person (as defined in section 1116(b)(4) of title 18, U.S.C.) or upon the liberty of such a person.

(IV) An assassination.

(V) The use of any: (a) biological agent, chemical agent, or nuclear weapon or device, or (b) explosive, firearm, or other weapon or dangerous device (other than for mere personal monetary gain), with intent to endanger, directly or indirectly, the safety of one or more individuals or to cause substantial damage to property.

(VI) A threat, attempt, or conspiracy to do any of the foregoing.

Since these definitions are used during the FTO designation process, these are the definitions that will be used to assess the applicability of the designation to Hezbollah.

The 1996 Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (AEDPA), which amended section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA),[260] was signed into law in order to "deter terrorism, provide justice for victims, provide for an effective death penalty, and for other purposes." Further, the AEDPA provided the Secretary of State authorization to designate an organization as a "foreign terrorist organization" (FTO) if the following legal criteria are met:

1. The organization must be foreign.

2. The organization must engage in terrorist activity, as defined by section 212(a)(3)(B) of the INA, or terrorism, as defined in section 140(d)(2) of the

---

[260] Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-132, § 301(a)(1), 110 Stat. 1214, 1247 (1996) [AEDPA].

Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989, or retain the capability and intent to engage in terrorist activity or terrorism.

3. The organization's terrorist activity or terrorism must threaten the security of U.S. nationals or the national security (national defense, foreign relations, or economic interests) of the United States.

If the Secretary of State decides an organization meets the above criteria, he or she may add the organization to the FTO list by informing Congress and publishing a notice in the *Federal Register*.[261] When first put into practice, a designation lasted for two years and then had to be reviewed and re-designated. But in 2004, the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act (IRTPA) replaced this requirement by explicit review and revocation procedures. The IRTPA states:

> An FTO may file a petition for revocation 2 years after its designation date (or in the case of redesignated FTOs, its most recent redesignation date) or 2 years after the determination date on its most recent petition for revocation. In order to provide a basis for revocation, the petitioning FTO must provide evidence that the circumstances forming the basis of the designation are sufficiently different as to warrant revocation. If no such review has been conducted during a five-year period with respect to designation, then the Secretary of State is required to review the designation to determine whether revocation would be appropriate.[262]

Further, the Secretary of State can remove an organization from the FTO list at any time if he or she feels the reasons for its designation have changed.

When an organization is assigned to the FTO list, numerous legal ramifications ensue. Once an organization is designated, the Treasury Department can block financial transactions, directly affecting its assets.[263] The designation also enables

---

[261] Audrey Kurth Cronin, "The "FTO" List and Congress: Sanctioning Designated Foreign Terrorist Organizations," *Congressional Research Service (CRS)*: CRS Report for Congress, RL32120, October 2003, 2.
[262] United States Department of State, *Foreign Terrorist Organizations (FTOs) Fact Sheet* (Office of Counterterrorism, October 11, 2005)
[263] Ibid.,18 U.S.C. § 2339B(a)(2).

the Justice Department to prosecute anyone who violates these sanctions, providing material support or resources to the designated organization.[264] Further, Homeland Security is given the ability to conduct immigration sanctions and deportations of any person affiliated with a designated group.[265]

II. Political Nature

Since its inception, the FTO designation process has become increasingly vulnerable to the prevailing political winds. As discussed above, the IRTPA of 2004 amended the original law, further centralizing the designation process. The amendment placed numerous restrictions on the judicial branch's ability to review the designations, and gave the executive branch the ability to designate the organization of its choice without review from other branches, effectively eliminating the crucial democratic element of checks and balances.   With the enactment of these laws the list has an enormous potential for misuse and abuse, "emerging as a handy tool to suppress dissent, dissuade Americans from backing insurrectionary movements overseas, and deport immigrants tied to the groups."[266] The State Department can effectively tie an organization to one end or another of the "axis of evil" almost on a whim, whether they are an Al-Qaeda-style terrorist group or a group engaged in a civil war or liberation struggle.[267] Nancy Chang of the Center for Constitutional Rights points out, "foreign policy interests often determine who is added [to the FTO list] and who is not. And once a group is on the list, it's

---

[264] Ibid., 18 U.S.C. § 2339B(a)(1).
[265] Ibid., 8 U.S.C.S. § 1182(a)(3)(B) (LexisNexis 2008).
[266] Robert Dreyfuss, "Colin Powell's List," *The Nation*, (March 2002): 16.
[267] Ibid.

just about impossible to be removed. It's a highly politicized process."[268]

Adding to the political nature of the designation process, the criteria used to designate an organization is structured in extremely broad terms. The primary reason the U.S. has not succeeded in convincing the other 191 countries to apply its "terrorist" designation to Hezbollah is these countries prefer a more precise conception of terrorism rather than the vague criteria of the U.S. It should be noted that besides the U.S., only Britain, Canada, Australia, and Israel designate Hezbollah as a current terrorist organization. Britain is the only country that recognizes the political wing of Hezbollah while still maintaining their terrorist label for the militant wing of Hezbollah. Unlike the rest of the world, and these four other countries, the U.S. has set its criteria to be extremely vague; to the point one member of the organization can cause the whole organization to be designated for a one-time use of a "dangerous device".[269]   Further, the definition of "terrorist activity" listed above is extremely broad, in that it could be applied to traditional criminal activity.

The most problematic aspect of the process is the ability of one to use non-factual information as evidence to designate an organization. A 1999 ruling in the US Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit pointedly noted, "the law does nothing to prevent the Secretary of State from using gossip, innuendo, misinformation and disinformation in assembling the case against a group." When reviewing a case regarding the People's Mojahedin Organization of Iran (PMOI), the court noted that the administrative record "consists entirely of hearsay, none of it

---

[268] Ibid.
[269] 8 U.S.C.S. § 1182(a)(3)(B)(iii)-(iv) (LexisNexis 2008).

was ever subjected to adversary testing, and there was no opportunity for counter-evidence by the organizations affected."[270] This case demonstrates how the designation process was created so that even though the laws within the process are followed, an organization can be designated without evidence. Simply stated, a group can be placed on the FTO list if the Secretary of State wants them on the list to further a political agenda.

Confining the designation process solely to the executive branch without proper checks and balances from other branches, structuring the designation criteria in broad terms, and allowing misinformation and disinformation to be included in the administrative record, the FTO designation process holds a tremendous amount of potential to be utilized as a political tool for the power elites.

III. Notable Cases

Before the FTO list was ever created, its politicized nature was evident. Seeing it as a means to weaken Arab and Islamic organizations that opposed the Oslo peace process, the pro-Israeli Anti-Defamation League quickly blasted Secretary of State Warren Christopher for "dragging his feet" in implementing the FTO list.[271] *The New Yorker* reported that when Newt Gingrich, then Speaker of the House, heard Hamas and Hezbollah were not going to be added, he quickly utilized his influence within the lobby system, mounting enough pressure for the two to be designated.[272] In 2001, when Hezbollah and Hamas did not make the new "FTO of Global Reach," list,

---

[270] Dreyfuss, "Colin Powell's List," 19.

[271] Ibid.17.

[272] Ibid. Along with Hamas and Hezbollah, 12 other Palestinian and Islamic groups were included in this additional designation.

the Israeli lobby and pro-Israel Congressmen applied enough pressure on President Bush, even after Secretary Rumsfeld said this would be "redundant", to include the two organizations.[273]

There are currently 47 organizations on the FTO list. Many of these have been challenged, not only by the groups themselves, but also by U.S. officials. One notable case was the designation of the Peoples Mujahedeen Organization of Iran (PMOI). After it was designated in 1997, a senior government official said that the "inclusion of [PMOI on the FTO list] was intended as a goodwill gesture to Tehran and its newly elected moderate president."[274] The PMOI quickly petitioned the D.C. Circuit to review its designation. This petition was declined by the court, which was under heavy restrictions, basing its decision on the Secretary of State's "political judgment."[275] The court recognized that "because nothing in the legislation restricts the Secretary of State from acting on the basis of third hand accounts, press stories, material on the Internet or other hearsay regarding the organization's activities, the 'administrative record' may consist of little else."[276] In 1998, a majority of the House of Representatives signed a letter challenging the PMOI's FTO designation.[277] Instead of fulfilling their request, the State Department re-designated the PMOI in 1999, and added the National Council of Resistance of Iran (NCRI), a sister

---

[273] Norton, *Hezbollah,* 48.
[274] Norman Kempster, "U.S. Designates 30 Groups As Terrorists," *Los Angeles Times*, October 9, 1997, A16.
[275] Shapiro, "Politization of the Designation," 4.
[276] PMOI I, 182 F.3d at 18-19. Cited in Ibid., 4.
[277] Audrey Kurth Cronin, Congressional Research Service Report for Congress: Foreign Terrorist Organizations 67 (Feb. 6, 2004), available at http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/RL32223.pdf. Accessed October 20, 2011.

organization of the PMOI.[278] In 2000, when asked why the State Department had

decided to add NCRI to the list, Martin Indyk, former U.S. ambassador to Israel,

stated, "the Iranian government had brought this to our attention."[279]

Not only are organizations placed on the FTO list for political purposes, but

also some who may fit the FTO criteria are left off. Two Pakistani-based groups,

Lashkar-e-Taiba and Jaish-e-Muhammed, have been requested by some within the

State Department to be added to the list. After their assault on India's parliament in

2003, Selig Harrison, director of the national security project for the Center for

International Policy, voiced his concern saying, "They assassinated civilians, they

assassinated police…they really are terrorists."[280] But others within the State

Department claimed that their designation would offend Pakistan and undermine

President Musharraf.[281] The concern for the U.S. relationship with Musharraf ended

up outweighing any evidence supporting their designation.

IV. Evaluating the Accuracy of Hezbollah's FTO Designation

When the first FTO list was published on October 8th 1997, 30 organizations

were designated. Hezbollah was included, but only after the exertion of Gingrich's

political pressure discussed earlier.[282] Hezbollah's initial designation was justified

by its role in the 1983 attacks on the U.S. embassy and marine barracks in Beirut,

---

[278] See Designation of Foreign Terrorist Organizations, 64 Fed. Reg. 55,112 (Oct. 8, 1999).
[279] Dreyfuss, "Colin Powell's List, 18.
[280] Ibid.
[281] Ibid.
[282] U.S. Department of State. Office of the Coordination for Counterterrorism. *Patterns of Global Terrorism: 1997*. Released April 1998.

the attack on the U.S. embassy annex in Beirut in 1984, and the 1992 bombing of the Israeli embassy in Argentina.

In the 2011 State Department publication *Country Reports on Terrorism*,[283] Hezbollah's inclusion on the FTO list is still justified by the 1983 bombing of the U.S. embassy and marine barracks, the 1985 high jacking of TWA flight 847, and its implication in the 1994 bombing of the Asociacion Mutual Israelita Argentina (AMIA) building in Buenos Aires. In addition to these events, the report also states that Hezbollah is training and supporting Iraqi Shi'a militias in Iraq. This allegation was made after a senior Hezbollah member, Ali Mussa Daqduq, was captured in 2007 by U.S. forces in Iraq while he was assessing Shi'a militia groups. Yet, the report never states that these organizations were terrorist organizations, nor does it claim that their training was for the purposes of carrying out terrorist attacks. Applying the above definitions and criteria, Hezbollah's connection to these militias cannot serve as support for its FTO designation.

Also noted in the report are Hezbollah attacks against the IDF after Israel withdrew from Lebanon in 2000. But if one applies the definitions of "terrorist activity" in section 212 (a) (3) (b) or "terrorism" in section 140 (d) (2) within the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, terrorism is defined as an "act against a non-combatant target." Clearly, the IDF is not a non-combatant target. Additionally, the attacks were carried out in the Shebaa Farms region, an area that Hezbollah, and the rest of the members of the Lebanese national government claim as occupied territory. Israel's own Prime Minister, Ehud Olmert made the statement after an

---

[283] U.S. Department of State. Office of the Coordination for Counterterrorism. *Country Reports on Terrorism 2011*. August 18, 2011.

attack in 2006 against IDF soldiers, "The events of this morning cannot be considered a terrorist strike; they are the acts of a sovereign state that has attacked Israel without cause. The Lebanese government, which Hezbollah is a part of, is trying to upset regional stability."[284] If the Israeli Prime Minister is stating these are not terrorist attacks, how can the State Department's accusation regarding these attacks hold any validity?

The resistance operations against Israel were further legitimized in the "Policy Declaration" of 2009, discussed earlier in chapter 3, which explains Hezbollah's extensive role within the Lebanese government. The document recognizes Hezbollah as a crucial part of the Lebanese Resistance against the Israeli occupation forces, and charges the movement with defending Lebanon from its enemies.

When the U.S. State Department included Hezbollah on the 2011 FTO list, it was stating that Hezbollah is a current, active terrorist organization. When utilizing the FTO designation criteria and definitions of the U.S. State Department, the accuracy of Hezbollah's designation is flawed. Explained above, Hezbollah's involvement with the Shi'a militia's in Iraq and its conflict with the IDF after it withdrew from Lebanon in 2000 cannot be used to designate Hezbollah a FTO. The most recent activity that is used to designate Hezbollah on the FTO list is the 1985 high jacking of TWA flight 847. Therefore, to label Hezbollah a current, active terrorist organization based on an event that occurred 26 years ago is not accurate.

---

[284] Harel, *34 Days*, 75.

V. Current Threat?

The FTO list is re-evaluated every two years for good reason: in the hopes that designated organizations may alter their behavior due to a change in leadership or objectives. Since Hezbollah was first included on the FTO list in 1997, no sound evidence has been added to sustain its designation. Discussed in the previous chapter, Hezbollah's development into an active political organization that provides extensive social services has only moved it further away from the designation criteria. Yet its designation remains, and the accusations that landed it on the list have only become more insistent throughout the past two decades. Notably, not one Congressional resolution mentioned Hezbollah in the 1980's, when it was engaging in more resistance activities, but in March of 2005, 17 years after the last U.S. government defined Hezbollah sponsored terrorist attack, the U.S. House of Representatives passed a resolution, by an overwhelming 380-3 margin, condemning "the continuous terrorist attacks perpetrated by Hezbollah."[285]

Given the preceding, how is Hezbollah's FTO designation maintained? How is the U.S. House of Representatives able to pass a resolution that states Hezbollah is currently carrying out terrorist attacks? How does the movement remain an imminent threat to the U.S., although it has never attacked or tried to attack the U.S. within its borders?

The FTO designation process is highly politicized. It is organized in a manner that allows it to be utilized as a political instrument for the interests of the power elite. To further a political agenda, the power elite can place any organization on the

---

[285] U.S. House of Representatives, 109th Congress, (2005-2006).

list that threatens its interests. In the case of this thesis, keeping Hezbollah on the list enables unwarranted support for Israel, specifically a steady flow of weapons that provides a steady flow of profits to the power elite. But if Hezbollah is not currently engaging in terrorist activity, there needs to be a perception that it is an active terrorist organization to sustain the designation. This perception is created through the corporate media delivering propaganda to the general public, or the "bewildering herd," operating as a member of the power elite. This thesis now moves to investigate the corporate media outlet The *New York Times*, and coverage of Hezbollah.

The PM states that the corporate media operate, and propagandize on behalf of, the powerful societal interests, or the power elite, of which they are apart. Among other functions, these media giants continuously support the policy line of the governing elite and rarely deviate from the boundaries they establish. Further, the PM explains that the "liberal" media serve the crucial function of setting the "left" boundary of debate, or the farthest one can go before leaving the frontier of "thinkable thought". With numerous studies conveying its support for the power elite, coupled with its accepted label as a leading representative of the "liberal" media, *The New York Times* is the focus of this analysis.

I. The Track Record

The *Times* has an extensive track record for creating the parameters of elite opinion. Reporting has either been slanted to support or justify the actions of the power elite, or has succumbed to remaining silent on issues that may be too difficult to defend. A veteran *Times* reporter, James Hess, stated that in all 24 years of his service at the paper he "never saw a foreign intervention that the *Times* did not support, never saw a fare increase or a rent increase or a utility rate increase that it did not endorse, never saw it take the side of labor in a strike or lockout, or advocate a raise for underpaid workers. And don't let me get started on universal health care and Social Security. So why do people think the *Times* is liberal?"[286]

---

[286] Quoted in Edward S. Herman, "The New York Times Versus Civil Society:

Representing the "left" of American media, the *Times* is an establishment institution and serves establishment ends. *Times* historian Harrison Salisbury stated about former executive editor Max Frankel, "The last thing that would have entered his mind would be to hassle the American establishment, of which he was so proud to be a part."[287]

The *Times* propaganda service dates back at least to the Russian Revolution. Investigating the *Times*, Walter Lippmann and Charles Merz found that the paper had reported the imminent or actual fall of the revolutionary government 91 times, and had Lenin and Trotsky in flight, imprisoned, or killed on numerous occasions. *Times* news about Russia was "a case of seeing, not what was there, but what men wanted to see."[288] During the McCarthy era, the management caved in under the pressure from the Eastland Committee[289] by firing employees who were former communist.[290]

During and after the Vietnam War, a common theme spewed out by conservative mythology was that the "liberal" media, which included the *Times*, "lost the war," and the *Times* was simultaneously celebrating its ability to pursue a critical role. Yet, both were wrong as the *Times* consistently served the state, transmitted propaganda, and confined criticism to matters of tactics while excluding

Protests, tribunals, labor and militarization and wars," *Z Magazine*, (December 2005),
http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Herman%20/NYTimes_CivilSociety.html.
[287] Ibid.
[288] Walter Lippmann and Charles Merz, "A Test of the News," *New Republic*, August 4, 1920.
[289] A Congressional Internal Security Subcommittee, led by James Eastland, serving to investigate the Communist Party.
[290] Edward S. Herman, "All News Fit to Print", *Z Magazine*, April, 1998,
http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Herman%20/AllNewsFit_Herman.html.

criticism of premises and intentions.[291] Harrison Salisbury conceded that in 1962

the *Times* was "deeply and consistently" supportive of the war policy and never

questioned the war's intentions.[292] However, in 1965, when elite opinion began to

shift to the idea that the intervention was a tragic mistake, the *Times* reporting

began to be more critical. This critical reporting culminated into the publication of

the *Pentagon Papers* in 1971.

Many look to the *Pentagon Papers* as a moment when the liberal media broke

through the parameters of debate and provided the public with information that

informed them of the truth. Although the *Times* did become critical of the war, to

this day, even in the *Pentagon Papers*, the *Times* confined criticism to tactics and

cost, never questioning premises and intentions. Further, the *Times* never

abandoned the framework and language of apologetics, never labeled the U.S.

invasion as aggression, and held with the government spouted line that the U.S. was

"invited in." Moreover, the fact that the *Times* became critical of the war after 1965,

does not discount the fact that it supported the war for 20 years prior. It was only

when public and elite opinion became critical did the *Times* become critical. The

Times never broke the parameters of debate.

Throughout the Cold War, the *Times* was a consistent publisher of

anticommunist language. Publisher Arthur Hays Sulzberger regularly admonished

his editors to focus on the Soviets as "colonialists," to use the phrase "iron curtain,"

---

[291] Ibid.
[292] Edward Herman provides a detailed account of the language used by reporters that keeps them within the established framework. See Herman, "All News That Fits to Print."

and generally exhibited the Manichean world-view of anticommunist ideologues.[293]

In 1946, the constructed Soviet threat was utilized to send money to the

government in Greece, as the *Times* echoed State Department press releases on their

front page, asserting that the "issues" were containment of an expanding Soviet

Union and American willingness to aid a government "violently opposed by the

Soviet Union."[294] Of course this was disinformation, as Stalin honored the postwar

settlement with the West, leaving it free to dominate Greece.[295]

Pushing the "threat" further, the *Times* was a regular reporter of falsified

reports about the amount of weapons the Soviets possessed. In December of 1976,

the CIA's "Team B" was established to produce the administration's desired

conclusions, and included hardliners Richard Pipes and Paul Nitze. The team

produced a politicized document that claimed the Soviet Union had increased its

military spending by 45 percent within one year. Failing to analyze its potential

political nature and ignoring other experts within the field, David Binder of the

Times wrote a front-page article that took the Team B report at face value.[296]

Unfortunately for the *Times*, in 1983 the CIA admitted that these estimates were

fabrications.   Revealing numerous lies streaming from the administration through

the corporate media, Tom Gervasi, in his book, *Myth of Soviet Military Supremacy*,

explains the *Times* continuous production of disinformation. After Gervasi

compared the *Time's* reports of their data of Soviet warheads with a report he

obtained from the Pentagon, he concluded the paper's reports "were inconsistent,

---

293 Herman, "All News That Fits to Print."
294 James Reston, *New York Times*, February 28, 1947. Cited in Ibid.
295 Ibid.
296 David Binder, *New York Times*, Dec. 26, 1976. Cited in Ibid.

distorted, incompetently assembled, and persistently biased toward overstating

Soviet capabilities."[297]

If reporting false information about opposing militaries was not enough to

scare the public into unwarranted support for government policies, the *Times* was

extremely effective at creating the "Evil Empire" perception of the Soviet Union. One

subtle yet potent example was the reporting of Jerzy Popieluszko, a Polish priest

murdered by the Polish police in October 1984. The *Times* produced 78 articles,

including ten front-page articles of this story alone.[298] This high amount of

reporting made sure that everyone knew who Jerzy Popieluszko was, that he was

murdered, and that this murder occurred in a Communist state. In comparison,

between the years 1964-1978, 72 religious leaders were murdered in Latin

America. The *Times* produced eight articles related to those murders. Between

1980-1985, 23 priests, missionaries, and other religious workers were murdered in

Guatemala. These victims received seven articles from the *Times*. Even four

American women religious workers who were murdered in El Salvador in 1980 only

had a third of the *Times* articles of the Polish priest. The reason for the vast

difference in the amount of reporting is that the Polish priest was murdered in a

Communist state, whereas others were murdered in U.S. client states.

The *Times* also did well to help ignite the "terrorism" propaganda campaigns

during the Reagan administration, specifically tying the Soviets to sponsors of

"international terrorism". Between 1976 and 1981 numerous acts of terrorism

were committed in Latin America, yet the *Times* only reported 22 victims of state

---

[297] Tom Gervasi, *Myth of Soviet Military Supremacy* (Harpercollins, 1986).
[298] Herman and Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* (2011 Kindle ed.) 38.

terror, of which 21 lived in the Soviet Union.[299] In 1981, the *Times* contributed to

the propaganda campaign of assigning responsibility of an assassination attempt

against the Pope to the KGB.   Accepting reports from figures such as Claire Sterling,

author of the *Terrorist Network*, the *Times* blindly reported the findings without

further investigation.[300] And in 1990, when Melvin Goodman, a CIA officer, testified

that the KGB plot was a fraud, the *Times* neglected to report it.[301]

Leading another propaganda campaign, the *Time's* reporting of the

commercial Korean airliner that was shot down by the Soviets compared to its

reporting of the commercial Iranian airliner that was shot down by the U.S., serves

as another potent example. Flight KA007, which was shot down on September 1,

1983 by the Soviet military, produced 147 articles in the *Times* in September alone,

and for 10 days merited a special section in the paper.[302] Taking administration

claims at face value, the *Times* dismissed the Soviets accidental explanation, and

used words such as "savage," "brutal," and "uncivilized". One article stated, "There

is no conceivable excuse for any nation shooting down a harmless airliner."[303] But,

when the USS Vincennes shot down the Iranian commercial airliner in 1988, the

Times stated it was a "tragic error" and "irresponsible behavior" by the victims.[304]

---

[299] Herman, "All News Fit to Print."
[300] For more on the Times excepting Claire Sterling as an expert on terrorism see Herman and Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* (2011 Kindle ed.), 145.
[301] Herman, All News Fit to Print."
[302] Ibid.
[303] *New York Times*, September 2, 1983. Cited in Ibid.
[304] *New York Times*, August 4, 1988. Cited in Ibid.

One study explained how these similar stories were framed differently in the *Times* by measuring the magnitude[305] of each story. The findings found that the *Times* carried 286 stories of the KAL incident, and 102 stories of the Iran Air incident. Further, the findings showed that the *Times* used sharply contrasting frames on each event, demonizing the Soviets and covering for the Americans.[306]

Surveying the past decade, the *Times* carried out one if its most impressive propaganda campaigns in history – setting the stage for the 2003 Iraq war. Prone to serve the government's war policy, as was observed throughout the Cold War and the Vietnam War, the *Times* was already in full swing at the beginning of the decade when it editorialized in favor of barring Ralph Nadar from the 2000 Presidential debates on the grounds that Gore and Bush provided the public with all the alternatives it needed.[307] Throughout 2002, the *Times* saturated its pages with the threat of Saddam housing weapons of mass destruction. This information, primarily reported by Judith Miller, was being supplied by military and intelligence officials, and as was later discovered, Ahmed Chalabi, a convicted embezzler and head of the Iraqi National Congress, a U.S.-financed exile group with close ties to the Pentagon.[308] Chalabi provided Miller with disinformation concerning weapons of mass destruction (WMD), and Miller provided myriad front-page stories that sought

---

[305] Developed by Robert Entman in *Projections of Power*, magnitude is defined as magnifying those elements of a depicted reality that favor's one sides position, and further, how much material on the event is available.

[306] Entman, Robert, *Projections of Power: Framing News, Public Opinion, and U.S. Foreign Policy* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2004), 29-31.

[307] Herman, "*The New York Times* Vs. Civil Society."

[308] Oliver Boyd-Barrett, "Judith Miller, *The New York Times*, and the Propaganda Model," *Journalism Studies 5,* no. 4, (2004): 438.

to convince the public that Iraq had WMD.[309] Interestingly, Chalabi was never cited

in her articles, and her sources consisted of "anonymous sources and hearsay."[310]

Coordination was at its best between Miller and various government officials as

stories would hit the paper containing "new evidence," and then be echoed the next

day by Dick Cheney who would site the *Times* "new evidence."[311] The most daring

critique of the *Times* Iraq propaganda was its over reliance on sources sympathetic

to the administration. Dissenting voices, made up of nuclear, intelligence, and other

experts were either ignored or "buried deep." A January 9, 2003 report from the

head of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) stated, "after weeks of

intensive inspection, [it] had found no sign whatever of any effort by Iraq to resume

its nuclear program," was buried on page A10.[312] But on April 23, 2003, Judith

Miller wrote a front-page report titled, "Illicit Arms Kept Till Eve of War, An Iraqi

Scientist Is Said To Assert."[313] Reading closely, the title explains that Miller never

spoke to the scientist, who is "said to assert" something by "U.S. military officials."

The criticism of the *Times* propaganda became too strong for the paper when the

industry publication, Editor & Publisher, called on the *Times* to reassess Miller's

[309] Michael Massing, "Now They Tell Us", *New York Review of Books,* LI:3, February 26 2004, accessed October 18, 2011. http://www.nybooks,com/articles/ 16922.
[310] B. Vann, "*New York Times* Reporter Judith Miller Accused of hijacking Military Unit in Iraq", *World Socialist*, June 27 2003, accessed October 24, 2011. wsws,org/arHcles/2003/jul2003/.
[311] Herman, "The New York Times Vs. Civil Society."
[312] Boyd-Barrett, "Judith Miller," 440.
[313] Judith Miller, "Illicit Arms Kept Till Eve of War, An Iraqi Scientist Is Said To Assert," *New York Times*, April 23, 2003, accessed October 20, 2011.

work. On May 26, 2004, Bill Keller, the executive editor, published a piece

"apologizing for aspects of the *Times* coverage."[314]

One might assume this embarrassing exposure would deter the *Times* from

publishing this type of war propaganda again, but a recent article by Robert Naiman,

published in Al Jazeera, uncovers the papers misleading reports on Iran's nuclear

program.[315]   Naiman highlights a *Times* article written by Steve Erlanger that

included this paragraph:

> The threats from Iran, aimed both at the West and at Israel, combined with *a recent assessment by the International Atomic Energy Agency that Iran's nuclear programme has a military objective*, is becoming an important issue in the American presidential campaign [emphasis added by Naiman].[316]

Highlighting the misleading accusation that the IAEA's most recent report shows the

programme to have a military objective, Naiman cites a *Washington Post* article

published on December 9:

> But the IAEA report does not say Iran has a bomb, nor does it say it is building one, only that its multiyear effort pursuing nuclear technology is sophisticated and broad enough that it could be consistent with building a bomb.[317]

Interestingly enough, if one tries to search for this deceptive article on the *Times*

website, one will not find it as it no longer exists. It was removed from the paper

without any note explaining why, something it is supposed to do.

---

[314] The Editors, "The Times and Iraq," *New York Times,* May 26, 2004, accessed October 20, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2004/05/26/world/from-the-editors-the-times-and-iraq.html?scp=1&sq=the+times+and+iraq&st=nyt.

[315] Robert Naiman, "The New York Times Misleading Public on Iran," *Al Jazeera*, January 12, 2012, accessed January 13, 2012. http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2012/01/20121872656281735.html.

[316] Steve Erlanger, "Europe Takes Bold Step on a Ban of Iranian Oil," *The New York Times*, January 4, 2012.

[317] Patrick Pexton, "Getting Ahead Of The Facts On Iran," *The Washington Post*, December, 9, 2011. http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/getting-ahead-of-the-facts-on-iran/2011/12/07/gIQAAvvCjO_story.html.

These examples demonstrate that the *Times* has, and is, an effective media outlet for distributing propaganda on behalf of the power elite. Playing a large role in establishing the "liberal" boundary, effectively suppressing dissent or ignoring alternative sources, and utilizing its political relationships to produce opinion-shaping articles, while simultaneously maintaining the "liberal" label, the *Times* is one of the most compelling media corporations in executing systematically the PM.

II. The *New York Times* & the Propaganda Model

A. Size, Concentrated Ownership, Owner Wealth, and Profit Orientation

The owners of The New York Times Company control a large and complex business organization, which had 2010 revenues of $2.9 billion and earnings of $1.4 billion.[318] The Times Company operates in two segments, News Media Group and About Group. The News Media segment comprises the New York Times Media Group, the New England Media Group, and the Regional Media Group. The New York Times Media Group comprises the *New York Times*, the *International Herald Tribune*, NYTimes.com, Baseline, Inc., the New York Times Index, which produces and licenses the New York Times Index, Digital Archive Distribution business which licenses electronic archive databases, and the New York Times News Services Division, which transmits articles, graphics, and photographs from the *Times*, the *Boston Globe*, and other publications to newspapers, magazines, and Web sites, as well as owns interest in Epsilen, LLC, a hosted online education solution. It also

---

[318] The financial profile of the *Times* can be accessed at
http://finance.yahoo.com/q/is?s=NYT&annual.

distributes content on other digital platforms, including mobile applications, social networking sites, and reader application products. The New England Media Group includes the *Boston Globe*, Boston.com, the Worcester Telegram & Gazette, and Telegram.com. The Regional Media Group consists of 14 daily newspapers in Alabama, California, Florida, Louisiana, North Carolina, and South Carolina, as well as related print publication businesses. The About Group segment consists of the Web sites of About.com, ConsumerSearch.com, UCompareHealthCare.com, and Caloriecount.about.com. Additionally, the company holds interest in a Canadian newsprint company; Metro Boston LLC, which publishes a free daily newspaper in the greater Boston area; quadrantONE LLC, which is an online advertising network; New England Sports Network, a regional cable sports network; and 50% of Roush Fenway Racing.[319] And oddly enough, the *Times* owns a substantial portion of the Boston Red Sox.[320]

The Ochs-Sulzberger family has owned the paper since 1896. Adolf Ochs was the first owner of the *Times*, followed by his son Arthur Hays Sulzberger, followed by his son Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, followed by is son Arthur Ochs Sulzberger Jr., who is now the current chairman and publisher.[321] Sulzberger is just one of the 27 family members that currently sit in high positions at the *Times*.[322]

---

[319] Ibid.

[320] The *Times* owns 17% of New England Sports Venture which owns the Boston Red Sox and Fenway Park, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/02/business/media/02times.html

[321] "New York Times Timeline 1881–1910". The New York Times Company, accessed October 25, 2011, http://www.nytco.com/company/milestones/timeline_1881.html.

[322] Joe Hagan, "Bleeding 'Times' Blood," *New York Magazine*, October 5, 2008, accessed November 2, 2011, http://nymag.com/news/media/51015/.

Occupying the majority of the board of directors, the Sulzberger family keeps a

tight grip on the information that flows out to the public. Evidence has been

revealed that the publisher frequently contributes to numerous news decisions.

Analyzing memos between employees, one researcher notes "Sulzberger was not

reluctant to express opinion on news coverage or to request specific stories."[323]

This type of ownership control has resulted in the belief systems of the

family trickling down into print. Susan Tifft, a chronicler of the *Times*, concludes

that the family's ideological and religious beliefs shape much of what is published.

She concludes, "It has become increasingly apparent that the family's self-image as

Jews has profoundly shaped the paper."[324] Although Sulzberger Jr. was the first in

the family not to be raised Jewish, he maintains what Tifft calls the "Jewishness" of

the *Times*, including his uncritical support for Israel. Writing an article during his

senior year at Browning University, Sulzbeger states, "Israel will survive…Arabs

may finally overrun the country, but she will survive. It is impossible to work with

the people [Arabs], talk with them, and live with them and think otherwise. Israel

will survive simply because she has everything to gain, and nothing to lose."[325]

More recently, Sulzberger has publicly shown his support for Israel when he and the

executive editor, Bill Keller, visited an Israeli settlement in Ariel as part of a Yesha

---

[323] Daniel Chomsky, "An Interested Reader: Measuring Ownership Control at The New York Times," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 23. No. 1 (March 2006): 1-18.
[324] Susan Tifft, *The Trust: The Private and Powerful Family Behind the New York Times* (Back Bay Books, September 20, 2000).
[325] Cited in *Palestine: Information with Provenance (PIWP database)*, "Arthur Ochs Sulzberger Jr.," October 30, 2010, accessed November 13 2011, http://cosmos.ucc.ie/cs1064/jabowen/IPSC/php/authors.php?auid=11163.

Council PR campaign.[326] This support was seen throughout the analysis in the next section of this chapter.

Of the 97.6 million Class A shares of stock, the Sulzberger family owns 17.5 millions shares, or 18%, but the family also owns 87% of the Class B shares, which entitles them to elect a majority (9) of the 14 directors. Explained in "The 1997 Proxy Statement of The New York Times Company," these special voting rights were implemented to insure family control.[327]

One of the other key elements of this filter is the media industry's integration into the market; something the *Times* has done well. The owners often associate with other power elites who are anxious to build relationships with such a powerful newspaper. Many of these contacts are made on the board of the holding company, which includes top business leaders from IBM, First Boston (a major investment bank), the Mercantile Bank of Kansas City, Bristol-Myers Squibb (drugs), Phelps Dodge (copper), Metropolitan Life, Verizon Communications, Nabisco Inc., and other corporations. The company also has a $200 million line of credit with a group of commercial banks, and periodically uses investment banks to underwrite its bonds and notes and help it buy and sell properties.[328] These bankers, directors, and other stockholders create enormous amounts of pressure to focus on the bottom line, and would not be pleased if the *Times* published news hostile to the interests of the corporate community. Deeply integrated into the market, the ownership of the

[326] Akiva Novick, "New York Times execs visit West Bank city," *ynetnews.com*, October 29, 2010, accessed November 13, 2011, http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3976644,00.html.
[327] Kenneth Richieri, "The New York Times Proxy Statement," March 11, 2009, pg. 5,13, http://www.nytco.com/pdf/2009_Proxy_Statement.pdf.
[328] Herman, "All the news that fits to print."

Times is an active member of the power elite.

This author conducted a search of *Times* articles that included the words "Lockheed," and "Lebanon." Of the 40 articles that included these two words, not one was critical of Lockheed's weapon sales to Israel, and never mentioned the cluster bombs, discussed in chapter 3, that claimed 200 civilians after the 2006 war with Hezbollah had concluded. Only one article, dating back to 1982, discussed Lockheed's controversial cluster bombs, yet the article was not critical of the bombs themselves.[329] The article was only reporting that the Reagan administration had delayed the shipment to Israel, but never mentions why. As noted earlier, the *Times* is fully integrated into the market and will not be hostile to large, profiting corporations such as Lockheed Martin.

Another structural relationship of importance is the media's dependence on and connections with the government. One crucial connection that emerged in the 1950's was the *Times* relationship with the CIA. Veteran *Times* reporter Harrison Salisbury wrote in *Without Fear of Favor*, that CIA officials like Allen Dulles, James Angleton, Frank Wisner, Kim Roosevelt, Richard Helms, and others, "were good friends of, and wined, dined, and vacationed with, a large array of *Times* officials and reporters."[330] He goes on to quote CIA official Cord Meyer that there had been a "relationship of cooperation between the *Times* and the Agency, a relationship of

---

[329] News Summary; SATURDAY, JULY 17, 1982, accessed January 8, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/1982/07/17/nyregion/news-summary-saturday-july-17-1982.html?scp=2&sq=Lockheed+Lebanon+cluster&st=nyt.
[330] Harrison Salisbury, *Without Fear or Favor: The New York Times and its Times* (Times Books: 1980).

trust between the CIA and *Times* correspondents."[331] The *Times* is also keen on

making friends with the top political figures. Max Frankel, former executive editor,

was extremely close to Henry Kissinger. Throughout his term, Kissinger "put that

relationship to good use, employing Frankel's trust to delay stories."[332]

The *Times* close relationship with government has also been shown through

the revolving door of personnel. The most notable example is Leslie Gelb, who

moved from director of policy planning at the Pentagon (1965-68) to the *Times*,

then to policy planning at the U.S. State Department (1977-79), and then back to the

Times as diplomatic correspondent, Op Ed column editor, and foreign affairs

correspondent (1981-93), and then on to head the Council on Foreign Relations.[333]

Another example is Richard Burt, the *Times's* Pentagon correspondent during key

Cold War years (1974-83), who moved into the Reagan State Department in

1983.[334]

The revolving door is still revolving with the Obama administration. Solomon

Watson, former chief financial legal officer at the *Times*, now serves as the general

counsel for the U.S. Army, and William Kennard, who was elected to the *Times* board

of directors in 2001, served as the chairman of the FCC (1997-2001), and is now the

U.S. ambassador to the European Union.

The Sulzberger family has created a large, complex media company that allows

it to guide its publications with its own personal ideologies. Along with the paper's

full integration into the market, causing profit oriented forces to constrain reporting

---

[331] Ibid.
[332] Herman, "All the news that fits to print."
[333] Ibid.
[334] Ibid.

to a strict "corporate friendly" bottom line, and its close relationship with government agencies, the *Times* fits well into the first filter of the PM.

B. The Advertising License To Do Business

The *Times* first felt the need to adjust to an advertising based model in the 1970's when its stock price fell from $53 in 1968 to $15 in 1976.[335] While at its lowest in August of 1976, *Business Week* ran an article explaining that the *Time's* decrease in profits was due to its "slide to the left," and its "anti-business" reporting.[336] Quickly, the *Times* made adjustments to rectify this "left" problem by first bringing on A.M. Rosenthal, who was referred as a "terrific anticommunist" and a self described "bleeding heart conservative,"[337] as the executive editor. Along with other moves such as ousting editor John Oakes and replacing him with the more conservative Roger Starr, the *Times* shifted to softer, more advertising friendly news.[338] Rosenthal established a Product Committee, and entire sections of the paper began to be allocated to Men's and Women's Clothing, House & Home, Food and Dining, and Style.[339] This trend has continued, and the *Times* has taken efforts to create a business friendly, consumer atmosphere that is attractive to big advertisers. And now that the *Times* is the top U.S. online newspaper,[340] the advertisement-based model will only intensify. Further, this model will push

---

[335] Ibid.
[336] "Behind the Profit Squeeze at the New York Times," *Business Week*, August 30, 1976. Cited in Ibid.
[337] Quoting William Buckley Jr. in Ibid.
[338] Ibid.
[339] Ibid.
[340] According to May 2010 Score Media Metrix Data.

foreign news and news of international conflicts aside, as these stories could put

their consumers out of their shopping mood.[341] Former *Times* editor Max Frankel

says that the more newspapers pursue Internet audiences, "the more will sex,

sports, violence, and comedy appear on their menus, slighting, if not altogether

ignoring, the news of foreign wars or welfare reform."[342]

Testing Max Frankel's prediction, this author conducted a search of front-page

Times articles discussing the Boston Red Sox, news of fashion, and the deadliest

conflict in the world since World War II, the conflict in Congo. Between January 1,

2000 and December 31, 2010, the *Times* published 117 articles discussing the Red

Sox, 716 discussing fashion, and 17 discussing a conflict that kills 45,000 people

every month.

In 2010, the *Times* revenue from advertising alone was $26 billion.[343]

Providing a consumer friendly environment, and avoiding stories of war and civilian

casualties, or a least placing them on back pages, will continue to be the aim of the

Times whose main focus is to generate profits.

C. Sourcing Corporate Media

Economic necessity and reciprocity of interests drive the corporate media to

---

[341] For a detailed account of how the advertizing based model drives conflict-oriented news to the side, see Peter Hart and Julie Hollar, "Fear and Favor 2004," Fairness and Accuracy in Reporting, (March/April 2005), http://www.coldtype.net/Assets.05/Essays/05.Fair.pdf.

[342] Herman and Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* (2011 Kindle ed), 17.

[343] Tanzina Vega, "Online Ad Revenue Continues to Rise," *New York Times*, April 13, 2011, accessed October 12, 2011, http://mediadecoder.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/04/13/online-ad-revenue-continues-to-rise/.

utilize official government sources. These official sources can come in the form of press conferences, interviews, and press releases. Or, information can flow from "countering" unofficial sources that become labeled as "experts," who are usually found to be on the government payroll. The *Times* has regularly been observed to be a mouthpiece for official and "unofficial" government sources.

The examples discussed earlier – U.S. policy on Greece, Vietnam, the "evilness" of the Soviets, and the U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003 – were all reported by echoing government sources. Other examples not discussed above include the *Times* relentless support for NAFTA,[344] the vilification of Hugo Chavez,[345] the Milosevic tribunal,[346] and the U.S. invasion of Panama.[347]

The *Times* has also been known to utilize "experts" as their sources. Besides Reagan's "terrorism expert" Claire Sterling,[348] discussed above, the *Times* regularly cited Soviet arms and intelligence "expert" Arkady Shevchenko. It was later known that Shevchenko was only an "expert" because the *Times* featured him as one.[349] Recently, the *Times* cited terrorism "expert" Will McCant in the 2011 Norway attack, stating:

---

[344] See Thea Lee, "False Prophets: The Selling of NAFTA," *Economic Policy Institute*, (July 1995); Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent*, citing *Times* articles Thomas Lueck, "The Free Trade Accord: The New York Region," *New York Times*, November 18, 1993; and editorial, "NAFTA's True Importance," *New York Times*, November 14, 1993.
[345] See Kevin Young, "Colombia and Venezuela: Testing the Propaganda Model," *MALA, (*November/December 2008).
[346] See Edward S. Herman and David Peterson, "Marlise Simons on the Yugoslavia Tribunal: A Study in Total Propaganda Service," *ZNet*, (2004).
[347] See Sandra Dickson, "Understand Media Bias: The Press and the U.S. Invasion of Panama," *Journalism Quarterly* 71:4 (1994): 809.
[348] For Sterlings credentials see Herman, *Bulgarian Connection*, 125–46.
[349] See Edward J. Epstein, "The Invention of Arkady Shevchenko."

> A terror group, Ansar al-Jihad al-Alami, or the Helpers of the Global Jihad, issued a statement claiming responsibility for the attack, according to Will McCants, a terrorism analyst at C.N.A., a research institute that studies terrorism.[350]

It was later discovered that McCant's information was wrong, and his credentials as an "expert" was simply the *Times* invention.[351]

As the propaganda campaign for the Iraqi invasion of 2003 blatantly displayed, the *Times* has a close relationship with government officials. The symbiotic relationship is seen in numerous cases, flooding the public with "analysis" of elite guided stories. This thesis projects that this pattern will be observed in the *Times* reporting of Hezbollah.

D. Flak and the Enforcers

Flak refers to negative responses to a media statement or program.[352] It can stem directly from the government, or indirectly from government funded monitoring or think-tank operations such as the American Legal Foundation, the Capital Legal Foundation, the Media Institute, the Center for Media and Public Affairs, and Accuracy in Media (AIM). AIM, functioning to harass the media and put pressure on them to follow the corporate agenda and a hard-line, right-wing foreign policy, was headed by Reed Irvine. In 1982, Irvine launched a campaign against

---

[350] Times article cited in Benjamin Doherty, "How a clueless "terrorism expert" set media suspicion n Muslims after Oslo horror," *The Electronic Intifada,* July 23, 2011, accessed November 10, 2011, http://electronicintifada.net/blog/benjamin-doherty/how-clueless-terrorism-expert-set-media-suspicion-muslims-after-oslo-horror.

[351] See Doherty, "clueless terrorism expert," July 23, 2011.

[352] Herman and Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* (2011 Kindle ed.), 26.

Times reporter Raymond Bonner, criticizing the Central America correspondent for reporting that U.S.-trained troops had massacred civilians at the Salvadoran village of El Mozote.[353] After Bonner was fired from the *Times* for speaking against the power elite's interests, the story faded from the pages. Twenty-three years later, the *Times* ran an article titled, "O.A.S. to Reopen Inquiry Into Massacre in El Salvador in 1981," confirming the findings of Bonner.[354] Unfortunately, "flak" hindered the democratic responsibilities charged to journalists, causing this story to be buried for over two decades.

Bonner has not been the only journalist to be dismissed for his investigative reporting. The *Times* follows a certain party line, and those who do not adapt to that line are eased out, such as Richard Eder[355] or Sydney Schanberg.[356] More recently, *Times* columnist, Ben Stein, was fired because as he says, "I started criticizing Mr. Obama quite sharply over his policies and practices."[357] In sum, the *Times* is an establishment paper, and as a result of the fourth filter, reporters will report within an establishment framework or leave.[358]

---

[353] On Irvines' direct contribution to the firing of Raymond Bonner see Wolf, "Accuracy in Media," 32–33.

[354] Ian Urbina, "O.A.S. to Reopen Inquiry Into Massacre in El Salvador in 1981," *The New York Times*, March 8th, 2005.

[355] Herman, "All news that fits to print."

[356] After writing the article "New York; Doer and Slumlord Both," *New York Times*, March, 9th, 1985, exposing the ways the powerful real estate owners abuse the poor, Shanberg was asked to leave the paper.

[357] Danny Shea, "Ben Stein Hints: I was fired from New York Times for criticizing Obama," *Huffington Post*, May 5, 2011, accessed October 16, 2011, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2009/08/10/ben-stein-hints-i-was-fir_n_255897.html.

[358] Herman, "All the news that fits to print."

E. Manichean Thinking

The fifth filter, Manichean thinking, mobilizes the populace against an enemy, and because the concept is fuzzy, it is used against anybody advocating policies that threaten the interests of the power elite.[359] This filter tends to cause issues to be framed in terms of dichotomous thinking, for example the "west" and "them", "with gains and losses allocated to contesting sides, and rooting for "our side" is considered an entirely legitimate news practice."[360]

Edward Herman explains that "the *Times's* commitment to anticommunist ideology, and its acceptance of the Cold War as a death struggle between the forces of good and evil, ran deep and severely limited its objectivity as a source of information."[361] Continuously used throughout the Cold War, this same restrictive, dichotomous thinking still plagues the *Times* in the post-Cold war era.

One of the most popular dichotomies that is spread across the pages of the *Times* is the "West" and Arab/Muslim, also observed as civilized and uncivilized. Although this Arab/Muslim filter has become stronger after September 11th, 2001, the *Times* has a history of portraying "them" in a negative way.

In his content analysis of the *Times* portrayal of Arabs from 1917 – 1947, I. Mousa concluded that the *Times'* coverage was mostly conflict-oriented and unfavorable to the Arabs.[362]   He noted that western sources were cited more often

---

[359] Herman and Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent (2011 Kindle ed.)*, 29.
[360] Ibid., 30-31.
[361] Herman, "All the news that fits to print."
[362] I. Mousa, *The Arab Image in the US Press* (New York: Peter Lang, 1984).

than Arab sources,[363] and that coverage was limited, distorted and presented from a

colonial viewpoint.[364] Analyzing articles between 1947-1948, another scholar

concluded that the *Times* actively mobilized public support for the creation of

Israel.[365] When Truman changed his mind to support a UN trusteeship over

Palestine, the move was framed by the *Times'* editorials as "cowardly, weak and

indicative of Truman's lack of leadership skills."[366] Analyzing *Times* coverage of the

1956 Suez War, the 1967 Six-Day Arab–Israeli War, the 1973 Arab–Israeli October

War and the 1982 Israeli invasion of Lebanon, two scholars carrying out two

different studies concluded Arabs were not presented fairly and objectively, and

were described as backward, dishonest, and unreliable.[367] Analyzing editorials of

the *Times* between 1967–1977, Daugherty and Warden found that "anti-Arab *New

York Times*" editorials outnumbered those supportive of Israel by a ratio of three to

one.[368] Analyzing the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982, Batarfi found that the

Times portrayed Israel as aggressive, but that it still justified Israel's actions twice as

much as the Arabs.[369] Conducting a content analysis of the *Times* coverage of the

---

[363] The use of western sources more frequently has also be confirmed by K. Batarfi, 'Three American Prestige Newspapers' Stand toward the Arab–Israeli Conflict: A Content Analysis of Editorials," (1997), paper presented at the *International Communication Division* at the 1997 AEJMC Convention.; and M. Suleiman, *Arabs in the Mind of America* (Brattleboro, VT: Amana Books, 1988).
[364] Ibid.
[365] B. Evensen, "Surrogate State Department? Times Coverage of Palestine," *Journalism Quarterly* 67, no. 2, (1990): 391–400.
[366] Ibid., cited in Dina Ibrahim, "The Middle East in America Media: A 20th century Overview," *International Communication Gazette* 71, no. 511 (2009).
[367] Suleiman, *Arabs in the Mind of America*; and Batarfi, "Three American Prestige Newspapers."
[368] D. Daugherty, and M. Warden, "Prestige Editorial Treatment of the Mideast during 11 Crisis Years," *Journalism Quarterly* 56 no. 4 (1979): 776–82.
[369] Batarfi, "Three American Prestige Newspapers."

term 'Islam' between 1988-1992, another researcher found that coverage was mostly centered on crises, conflict, and war, and that the *Times* was consistent in justifying Israeli actions.[370]   In her content analysis of editorials in the *Times* between 1997-1998, Ghada Khouri found that the *Times* did not publish one single Arab perspective out of 59 articles.[371]

More recently, one study investigated how the *Times* reported the Arab/Muslim six months before and after 9/11. The study found that the *Times* discussed American Arabs or Muslims in 17 articles six months before 9/11, and discussed them in 376 articles in the six after 9/11. Further, the *Times* reported the term *Muslim* in 345 articles six months before 9/11 and in 1,468 articles six months after 9/11.[372]

The *Times* has also played its part in merging the terms *Islam* and *terrorism* together, making Islam a required element for the term *terrorism* to be applied. The *Times* made this mistake about the bombing in Norway discussed above. After it was known that a non-Muslim, Anders Beivik, was responsible for the attacks, it ran an article stating:

> Initial reports focused on the possibility of Islamic militants, in particular Ansar al-Jihad al-Alami, or Helpers of the Global Jihad, cited by some analysts as claiming responsibility for the attacks. American officials said the group was previously unknown and might not even exist.

---

[370] K. Sheikh, V. Price and H. Oshagan, "Press Treatment of Islam: What Kind of Picture do the Media Paint?," *Gazette* 56, no. 1 (1995): 139–54.

[371] G. Khouri, "The Other Gulf War Syndrome: Flaws in US Media Coverage of the 1997/98 Iraq Crisis, Issue Paper # 27," Washington, DC: *ADC Research Institute* (1998).

[372] Nacos, Brigitte, "Muslim Americans in the News before and after 9/11," *Colombia University*, August 8th, 2002, http://www.apsanet.org/~polcomm/news/2003/terrorism/papers/nacos.pdf.

There was ample reason for concern that *terrorists* might be responsible.[373] In other words, now that we know the attacker was not a Muslim, we know "by definition" that terrorists are not responsible. Conversely, when it was thought that Muslims were responsible, that meant also "by definition" that it was an act of terrorism.

The fifth filter, Manichean thinking, is powerful, and the *Times* is not immune. The paper's reporting has and will be guided by this filter, as deviating away would place them on the "uncivilized" side, thus outside of the system and into economical turmoil. As Bush so famously said to a joint session of Congress on September 20th, 2001, "Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists."

III. The Cleansed Residue Fit To Print: The NYT's Coverage of Hezbollah

The analysis of the *Time's* reporting of Hezbollah was analyzed in three different sections. First, this thesis analyzed the *Times* reporting during the six months following 9/11. Before 9/11, Hezbollah had not been accused of a terrorist attack since the 1994 AMIA building, a charge never proven. Further, no evidence has ever been found that links Hezbollah to 9/11, or Al Qaeda. This analysis examined if and how the *Times* linked Hezbollah to 9/11, to Al Qaeda, and how it portrayed it as a current, active terrorist group. The PM states that the corporate media will serve the policy of the power elite – maintaining Hezbollah's FTO designation. Thus, this thesis projected that the *Times* would link Hezbollah to 9/11, Al-Qaeda, and portray it as a current, active terrorist organization.

---

[373] Article cited in Doherty, "clueless terrorism expert," July 23, 2011

Second, the PM states that the corporate media will marginalize dissent. This analysis examined the few government officials and other prominent voices who have stated their disagreement with Hezbollah's designation, and examined the amount of coverage awarded to their dissent. Further, the analysis observed the prominent voices that have made public statements for not only Hezbollah's continued designation, but also for the U.S. to engage the organization militarily. This thesis projected that very little, or none, of these dissident voices would be reported in the *Times*, and that ample coverage would be awarded to those who spoke supportively for Hezbollah's continued designation.

Third, this thesis briefly examined the most current coverage of Hezbollah in the *Times*. This analysis researched the most recent reports concerning the organization, searching for dissent coverage or reporting that broke with past coverage.

A. Applying 9/11, Al Qaeda, and the 1980's, again, to Hezbollah

Between September 11th, 2001 and March 11th, 2002, the *Times* published 122 articles that were either centered on Hezbollah, or at least discussed the group in relation to the main focus of the article. During this time period, Hezbollah never carried out any "terrorist" operations or acts of violence, made any major political changes, or any other action that would cause an increase in international news representations of the movement compared to the six months before 9/11. Yet, the *Times* increased its coverage of Hezbollah nearly three and half times more (36 articles) than the six months prior to 9/11. Overall, the *Times* journalists presented

Hezbollah in a manner that displayed their acceptance of the State Department

label, writing within the accepted boundaries and never questioning the current U.S.

policy.

In describing Hezbollah, 89 articles used "terrorists" as the preceding

adjective, 17 used "anti-Israeli," and 9 used "extremists". Other popular

descriptions were "Israeli-focused," "terror-dispenser," and "a coalition of terror."

Found in 52 articles, the *Times* kept a steady flow of reporting that echoed senior

political figures who grouped Hezbollah and Al Qaeda together. Forty-two articles

discussed the movement's inclusion on the FTO list, with the majority discussing its

initial absence on the new FTO of "global reach" list and then its addition after

mounting political pressure. Only one article out of the 122 articles discussed

Hezbollah's "other side" – its medical services and construction company that has

rebuilt much of the south's damage of years of conflict – describing Hezbollah as a

"difficult quandary" for the U.S. in labeling the group a terrorist organization of

global reach.[374] After listing the events in the 1980's that the State Department

uses to justify Hezbollah's designation, the article concluded with a quote from

Condoleezza Rice stating "it remains a dangerous organization."[375]

This pattern, "regularly selecting and ignoring history in order for them to

make their favored political points," is a common theme at the *Times*.[376] During

these six months, readers of the *Times* were reminded of the events in the 1980's –

[374] Neil MacFarquhar, "To U.S., a Terrorist Group; To Lebanese, a Social Agency," *The New York Times*, December 28th, 2001, accessed September 15, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/28/world/to-us-a-terrorist-group-to-lebanese-a-social-agency.html?scp=10&sq=terrorist+group&st=nyt.
[375] Ibid.
[376] See Herman, "All the news fit to print."

the 1983 Marine barracks and U.S. embassy bombing, and the 1985 hijacking of the

T.W.A. flight – in 83 different articles. On a number of occasions, the focus of the

article would not be Hezbollah, but the historical reference would still make a subtle

appearance. An article on September 27th, 2001 discussing the potential Arab allies

in the "War on Terror" provides an example:

> Syria, Iran and Lebanon, for example, have given unapologetic support to
> Hezbollah, the group that was blamed for suicide bombings against American
> targets during Lebanon's long civil war and remains on the State Department's
> list of terrorist organizations.[377]

Or an article in January discussing Iranian relations with Afghanistan:

> In Lebanon, Iran has also retained its close ties to Hezbollah, the Shiite group
> that has waged terrorism against the United States and Israel since the
> 1980's.[378]

Notice the author said, "since the 1980's," implying that Hezbollah was currently

"waging terrorism" against the U.S. and Israel. The author would have been more

accurate to say "in the 1980's," and to specify that the movement has never carried

out an attack within the United States. Other articles would stretch the events of the

1980's as if they happened in the last few years by slipping in lines such as, "Its

official funds sustain Hezbollah, with its long record of spectacular terrorist

---

[377] Douglas Jehl, "A NATION CHALLENGED: THE NEIGHBORS; Arab Allies Not
Jumping to Join U.S. Side," *New York Times*, September 27, 2001, accessed
September 15, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/27/world/a-nation-
challenged-the-neighbors-arab-allies-not-jumping-to-join-us-
side.html?scp=1&sq=Arab+Allies&st=nyt.
[378] Eric Schmitt, "A NATION CHALLENGED: REGIONAL POLITICS; IRAN EXERTS
SWAY IN AFGHAN REGION, WORRYING THE U.S," *New York Times*, January 10,
2002, accessed September 16, 2011,
http://www.nytimes.com/2002/01/10/world/nation-challenged-regional-politics-
iran-exerts-sway-afghan-region-worrying-us.html?scp=2&sq=Afghan&st=nyt.

attacks."[379]

As noted above, there has never been any evidence linking Hezbollah to the 9/11 attacks, or Al Qaeda. In fact, Hezbollah not only condemned the 9/11 attacks, but repeatedly condemned other attacks by Al Qaeda. Hezbollah has expressed outrage over the atrocities committed by Al Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan,[380] it viciously condemned the current leader of Al Qaeda, Ayman al-Zawahiri, in November 1997 when his Gama'at al-Islamiyya committed a massacre among civilians in Luxor, Egypt,[381] and in April 2008 when Ayman al-Zawahiri renewed Al-Qaeda's call for attacks on the "Crusaders and Jews," specifically including UNIFIL, the organization that Hezbollah was working with to combat Sunni militant groups in Lebanon.[382] Yet, *Times* reporting during the six months after 9/11 continuously included Hezbollah as a potential suspect in the attacks, or grouped Hezbollah and Al Qaeda together as one "unit of terror."   After it was known that Hezbollah did not have a part in 9/11, the *Times* continued to portray Hezbollah and Al Qaeda as one enemy in the "War on Terror."

The *Times* including of Hezbollah as a suspect began immediately when an article by John Burns on September 12th, 2001, stated that many of the groups that celebrated the attacks "will now be on the list of suspects." Listing those suspects,

---

[379] Edward Luttwak, "New Fears, New Alliance," *New York Times*, October 2, 2001, accessed September 16, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/02/opinion/new-fears-new-alliance.html?scp=1&sq=new+fears&st=nyt.

[380] See Nasrallah's statements in Al-Massira (Beirut), August 24, 1998, Al-'Ahd (Beirut), November 6, 1998, Al-Anwar (Beirut), September 16, 1998, and Al-Mujahid al-Siyyasi (Beirut), May 21, 2000.

[381] Amal Saad-Ghorayeb, *Hizbullah: Politics and Religion* (Pluto Press, 2002), 101 – 102.

[382] Norton, *Hezbollah*, 165.

Burns spoke of, "Islamic militant groups like Mr. bin Laden's Al Qaeda...and the Iran-backed Hezbollah."[383] Burns must have interpreted Hezbollah's condemning of 9/11 as a celebration. Serge Schmemann wrote a week later about Bin Laden's motivations for 9/11, describing him as an "Islamic zealot," and then warned of "a new wave of Islamic zealots, movements like Hezbollah, Islamic Jihad and Hamas that have waged relentless terror campaigns against Israel."[384] The sources used in the article were Joseph Alpher, an Israeli Security Analyst, and Martin Indyk, former U.S. ambassador to Israel. On October 1st, Judith Miller, the propagandist discussed earlier, wrote about the administration "taking aim at organizations with links to Mr. bin Laden's operations." She continued, making a false statement that this included "Hezbollah and other terrorists groups that bin Laden occasionally taps for his activities." Her sources consisted of "administration officials" and "federal officials."[385] Another bold statement made without any supporting evidence written by Stephen Engelberg and Matthew Purdy in their own question-and-answer formatted article read:

Q. -- Are there any other suspects?

[383] John Burns, "A DAY OF TERROR: THE MILITANT; America the Vulnerable Meets a Ruthless Enemy," *New York Times*. September 12, 2001, accessed September 18, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/12/us/a-day-of-terror-the-militant-america-the-vulnerable-meets-a-ruthless-enemy.html?scp=1&sq=enemy&st=nyt.

[384] Serge Schmemann, "Aftermath: The Target; Israel as Flashpoint, not Cause" *New York Times*, September 23, 2001, September 19, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/23/weekinreview/aftermath-the-target-israel-as-flashpoint-not-cause.html?scp=3&sq=aftermath&st=nyt.

[385] Judith Miller, "A NATION CHALLENGED: THE INVESTIGATION; U.S. SET TO WIDEN FINANCIAL ASSAULT," *New York Times*, October 1, 2001, accessed September 20, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/01/us/a-nation-challenged-the-investigation-us-set-to-widen-financial-assault.html?scp=1&sq=assault&st=nyt.

A. -- American officials continue to investigate whether any nation or other terrorist group had a hand in the attacks. One of the hijacking suspects, Mohamed Atta, met with an Iraqi intelligence agent in Prague in June 2000. And Al Qaeda, Mr. bin Laden's group, has forged ties to Hezbollah and other Islamic fundamentalist groups.[386]

Some articles actually named sources, but the majority were administration, State

Department, or Pentagon officials, displaying the third filter of the PM, such as:

Some senior Pentagon officials argued that there was strong, if inconclusive, evidence linking Hezbollah and Mr. bin Laden.[387]

Joseph Kahn reported on November 3rd, 2001:

The Bush administration imposed stringent financial sanctions today on the anti-Israeli organizations Hamas, Hezbollah and 20 other suspected terrorist groups. ''It reinforces the president's message that people have to choose and choose now,'' the official said. ''Al Qaeda was first and after that we're going after the rest of the terrorists.''[388]

Clyde Haberman stated the same day:

Anger over terrorism impelled the Bush administration to expand the list of suspected terrorists beyond a few groups like Al Qaeda, Osama bin Laden's network. Tough financial sanctions were imposed on 22 organizations, including Hamas and Hezbollah.[389]

[386] Stephen Engelburg and Matthew Purdy, "A NATION CHALLENGED: THE INVESTIGATION; Countless Questions, a Few Answers," *New York Times*, October 7, 2001, accessed September 20, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/07/us/a-nation-challenged-the-investigation-countless-questions-a-few-answers.html?scp=1&sq=countless&st=nyt.

[387] Elaine Sciolino, "A NATION CHALLENGED: HOLY WAR; Hezbollah and Hamas Put on Back Burner," *New York Times*, October 4, 2001, accessed September 20, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/04/world/a-nation-challenged-holy-war-hezbollah-and-hamas-put-on-back-burner.html?scp=1&sq=holy+war&st=nyt,

[388] Joseph Kahn, "A NATION CHALLENGED: THE MONEY TRAIL; U.S. Widens Net to Snare Terror Assets; Expands List," *New York Times*, November 3, 2001, accessed October 8, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/11/03/world/nation-challenged-money-trail-us-widens-net-snare-terror-assets-expands-list.html?scp=1&sq=terror&st=nyt.

[389] Clyde Haberman, "A NATION CHALLENGED -- AN OVERVIEW: NOV 2, 2001; Bad Economic News, Troops on the Golden Gate, Angry Firefighters," *New York Times*,

It should be noted that both authors only highlighted Hamas and Hezbollah out of

the 22 organizations added.

Edward Rothstein writing as an "expert" on the root causes of terrorism

explained:

> these judgments accept a view of terror that has been held by many terrorist
> groups throughout modern history. The theory is that terrorism is an extreme
> reaction to grievous and long-festering injustices that have not been redressed
> by other means. Such claims were made by European anarchists at the
> beginning of the 20th century, by the radical Baader-Meinhoff gang in the
> 1970's and, of course, by Islamic terrorist groups ranging from Hezbollah to Al
> Qaeda...But at the very least this theory is inconsistently applied.[390]

Bill Keller wrote in late November:

> They talked about whether the initial phase of the war should extend beyond
> Al Qaeda to target terrorist groups with popular backing in the Middle East,
> like Hamas and Hezbollah, and whether it should encompass sponsoring states
> -- Syria, Iran and especially Iraq...."Obviously there's Al Qaeda and there's
> Afghanistan, but we don't want to send a message that there's good terrorism
> and bad terrorism. You know, you can't be against Al Qaeda and then support
> Hezbollah,'' stated an administration official.[391]

This last line was a common argument from the administration that the *Times*

echoed; said Condoleezza Rice on November 9th: You cannot help us with Al Qaeda

November 3rd, 2001, accessed October 20, 2011,
http://www.nytimes.com/2001/11/03/world/nation-challenged-overview-nov-2-
2001-bad-economic-troops-golden-gate-angry.html?scp=2&sq=troops&st=nyt.
[390] Edward Rothstein, "CONNECTIONS; Exploring the Flaws in the Notion of the
'Root Causes' of Terror," *New York Times*, November 17th, 2001, accessed October
21, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/11/17/arts/connections-exploring-the-
flaws-in-the-notion-of-the-root-causes-of-terror.html?scp=1&sq=flaws&st=nyt.
[391] Bill Keller, "The World According to Powell," *New York Times*, November 25,
2001, accessed October 21, 2011,
http://www.nytimes.com/2001/11/25/magazine/the-world-according-to-
powell.html?scp=1&sq=Powell&st=nyt.

and hug Hezbollah -- that's not acceptable."[392]

Donald McNeil wrote an article on December 2nd analyzing which terrorist group in the world would be best to use when making comparisons to Al Qaeda. He stated, "The intensity of Al Qaeda's violence suggests comparisons to the Shining Path in Peru…but there was nothing suicidal in its ideology." He continued: "These killings (the Israeli assassination of Sheik Musawi) obviously didn't stop Hezbollah or Hamas, which, like Al Qaeda, incorporate in their ideologies the notion that martyrs are to be admired, rewarded in Paradise, and avenged on Earth."[393] Not only did he paint Hezbollah and Al Qaeda with one brush, he displayed his elementary understanding of terrorism, suggesting that suicide missions are a necessary component of terrorism, and all suicide missions are considered terrorism no matter who they target. Making the same kind of generalizations, Elaine Sciolino published an article on December 13th discussing an advertising campaign implemented by the State Department that offered rewards to citizens who gave information about "Palestinian terrorists," a topic that should not need reference to Hezbollah. Sciolino wrote:

> Until now, the State Department has resisted lobbying from American Jewish organizations and lawmakers to advertise rewards for Palestinian-related terrorism. Instead, it has confined its public appeals for information to terrorist suspects like Osama bin Laden (up to a $25 million reward) and

---

[392] Elaine Sciolino, "Saudi Charges Bush With Failure to Broker Mideast Peace," *New York Times*, November 9th, 2001, accessed October 21, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/11/09/world/saudi-charges-bush-with-failure-to-broker-mideast-peace.html?scp=2&sq=Saudi&st=nyt.

[393] Donald McNeil, "The Nation: Afterlife; Can Al Qaeda Rise If Bin Laden Falls?," *New York Times*, December 2, 2001, accessed October 21, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/02/weekinreview/the-nation-afterlife-can-al-qaeda-rise-if-bin-laden-falls.html?scp=2&sq=rise&st=nyt.

organizations like Hezbollah, the Lebanese Shiite movement.[394]

Writing about the need for the U.S. to strike Saddam Hussein, Richard Perle, a

Pentagon advisor and former member of the Bush administration, stated:

> We know that he (bin-Laden) has produced quantities of anthrax sufficient to kill millions of people, as well as other biological agents. Disseminated to would-be martyrs from Al Qaeda, Hezbollah, Hamas, Islamic Jihad or other terrorist groups, Saddam Hussein's biological arsenal could kill very large numbers of Americans.[395]

There has never been any evidence, or even allegations, that Saddam gave Hezbollah

biological weapons, nor has Hezbollah ever used biological weapons.

Another common theme found in the analysis was the linking of Hezbollah to

Iran in efforts to show how dangerous Iran is. Martin Indyk, former U.S.

ambassador to Israel, was given Op-ed space on September 28th to discuss who

should be a U.S. ally in the "War on Terror." Indyk asserted:

> In the case of Iran, we should not want that country in our coalition. The State Department has found Iran to be the world's foremost state sponsor of terrorism. Iran's terror network of intelligence services, Revolutionary Guards and the Lebanese-based Hezbollah clearly shows global reach.[396]

Misleading the public, Hezbollah has never carried out an attack of "global reach."

Following the pattern, Elaine Sciolino wrote:

---

[394] Elaine Sciolino, "U.S. to Use Reward Ads In Hunting Palestinians," *New York Times*, December 13, 2001, accessed October 20, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/13/world/us-to-use-reward-ads-in-hunting-palestinians.html?scp=1&sq=reward&st=nyt.
[395] Richard Perle, "The U.S. Must Strike Saddam Hussein," *New York Times*, December 28, 2001, accessed October 22, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/28/opinion/the-us-must-strike-at-saddam-hussein.html?scp=1&sq=strike&st=nyt.
[396] Martin Indyk, "Finding Allies in a World of Shadows," *New York Times*, September 28th, 2001, accessed October 23, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/28/opinion/finding-allies-in-a-world-of-shadows.html?scp=1&sq=Shadows&st=nyt.

Iran is listed by the State Department as the world's most active state sponsor of terrorism, largely because of its support for anti-Israeli groups, particularly the Lebanese Hezbollah.[397]

And she stated again one month later:

Mr. Khatami faces an uphill battle in criticizing others for promoting terrorism. Iran is listed by the State Department as the world's most active state supporter of terrorism, largely because of its arming of the Lebanese Shiite organization Hezbollah.[398]

Utilizing the same technique - using Hezbollah as a villianizing mechanism - but instead in connection with Syria, a *Times* journalists wrote that the only reason "Syria is on the State Department list is because it supports Hezbollah."[399] This is another false statement as the State Department listed many reasons why Syria is on the list other than its support for Hezbollah.[400]

The most blatant, inaccurate articles during these six months came from *Times* publisher William Safire. In an article titled "Enemy Of My Enemy," he wrote these two statements on November 29th, 2001:

The vigilantes of Hezbollah, the ''Party of God,'' are urged by clerics to beat up

---

[397] Elaine Sciolino, "A Nation Challenged, Iranians; Tehran Aide Assails Terror But Opposes U.S. Attack," *New York Times*, October 1st, 2001, accessed October 23, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/01/world/a-nation-challenged-iranians-tehran-aide-assails-terror-but-opposes-us-attack.html?scp=1&sq=Tehran&st=nyt.
[398] Elaine Sciolino, "Iran Chief Rejects Bin Laden Message," *New York Times*, November 10, 2001, accessed October 23, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/11/10/world/iran-chief-rejects-bin-laden-message.html?scp=2&sq=Iran&st=nyt.
[399] Neil McFarquhar, "A Nation Challenged: Damascus; Syria Repackages Its Repression of Muslim Militants as Antiterror Lesson, *New York Times*, January 14, 2002, accessed October 23, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2002/01/14/world/nation-challenged-damascus-syria-repackages-its-repression-muslim-militants.html?scp=2&sq=Syria&st=nyt.
[400] See the Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism 2001*, "Overview of State Sponsored Terrorism," http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/10296.pdf.

students with democratic yearnings...

> Even today, Iran's air cargo planes fly arms and explosives to Damascus for trucking to terrorist headquarters of Hezbollah in Lebanon, for use by suicide bombers against Israeli civilians.[401]

The claim in the first statement has never been discovered as a fact, an allegation, or any other kind of reference found in the research of this author. Safire also fails to name any kind of source for this claim. The second statement displays the author's lack of research, as all 12 of Hezbollah's suicide attacks have been targeted at non-civilians. Safire's reproduction of the PM continued in another article on December 17th, writing a piece about the evils of Yasir Arafat. He stated: "But the inescapable fact is that the suicide-murders of Jewish civilians are organized and carried out not only by Hamas, Islamic Jihad and Hezbollah, but also by Arafat's Force 17."[402]

Examining the six months following 9/11, this analysis found that Hezbollah was consistently grouped, compared, or even elevated above Al Qaeda; was continuously included in the list of suspects for 9/11; and was on numerous occasions used as a villianizing mechanism when the article was discussing U.S.-Iran or U.S.-Syria relations. Also, if sources were even cited, the majority were found to be administration or federal officials. Further, journalists consistently cited the events of the 1980's when describing or discussing Hezbollah's "current threat," the same information used in the FTO designation.

---

[401] William Safire, "Essay; Enemy Of My Enemy," *New York Times*, November 29, 2001, accessed October 24, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/11/29/opinion/essay-enemy-of-my-enemy.html?scp=1&sq=Enemy&st=nyt.
[402] William Saffire, "The Irrelevant Man," *New York Times*, December 17, 2001, accessed October 24, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/17/opinion/the-irrelevant-man.html?scp=1&sq=man&st=nyt.

B. Marginalizing Dissent

In the past decade, two prominent officials, Ryan Crocker, former U.S. ambassador to Iraq, and John Brennan, former Deputy National Security Advisor, as well as the Rand Corporation, one the major think-tanks in the U.S., have stressed the need for the U.S. government to open a dialogue or negotiations with Hezbollah.[403] Also, current Secretary of State Hillary Clinton made the distinction between Hezbollah's political party and its militant wing, only defining the latter as "a terrorist concern," on the *Charlie Rose* show in November 2009. This was the first time a U.S. diplomat had ever made such a distinction. But, a few days later a State Department spokesman explained, "The Secretary's statement is fully consistent with our existing policy. Hezbollah is a terrorist organization."[404] And then a few days later in an article in *The Nation*, a State Department Spokesman stated, "U.S. policy toward Hezbollah has not changed. We do not make any distinction between the political and military wings."[405] Whether Secretary Clinton was trying to redefine U.S. policy on her own, or simply made a mistake, the statement, which deviated from the long-standing policy, was made, and the administration, working with the media, quickly corrected it.

---

[403] On June 8, 2010, Ryan Crocker called for direct talks with Hezbollah officials before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. John Brennan called for dialogue in his published study in the July 2008 edition of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. The Rand Corporation published a report entitled "Building Moderate Muslim Networks," which called for negotiations with Hezbollah shortly after 9/11.

[404] Sharmine Narwani, "Did Clinton Just Change U.S. Policy on Hezbollah," *The Huffington Post*, November 12, 2009.

[405] Ibid.

Conversely, the past decade has seen various prominent officials stressing the need for Hezbollah's designation to remain, some even pushing for military engagement. Perhaps the most striking was Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage, the former Raytheon executive, who stated, "Hezbollah made the A-team of terrorists, while maybe al-Qaeda is actually the B-team."[406] U.S. Senator Bob Graham, the chairman of the Senate's Intelligence Committee, described Hezbollah's purported military training camps in the Lebanese Biqa' region as places "where the next generation of terrorists are being prepared."[407] And, CIA director George Tenet told the U.S. Congress in 2003 "Hezbollah, as an organization with capability and worldwide presence, is [al-Qaeda's] equal, if not a far more capable organization. I actually think they're a notch above in many respects."[408]

The PM states that the corporate media will marginalize those who deviate from the representations required by the power elite. Therefore, this analysis searched for the amount of coverage awarded to each voice listed above. The search reviewed *Times* articles starting from the date each person made his/her statement to the date this research was conducted, November 30, 2011. In regards to the voices that challenged the current policy – Ryan Crocker, John Brennan, and the Rand Corporation, and Secretary Clinton's "mistake" – no articles where found in the *Times* that mentioned their comments. In regards to the voices that stressed the need for Hezbollah's designation and even military engagement – Richard Armitage, Bob Graham, and George Tenet – this author found numerous articles either

---

[406] Byman, "Should Hezbollah Be Next?"
[407] Cited in US Council on Foreign Relations, *Collateral Damage: Iraq and the Future of US – Syrian Relations*, New York, 24 April 2003.
[408] Byman, "Should Hezbollah Be Next?"

discussing the official's condemnation of Hezbollah or citing the statements quoted above.

Eight articles discussed Richard Armitage and his condemnation of Hezbollah. Four separate articles did not mention Armitage's name, but cited his famous "A-team of terrorists" quote. Three of these stated that multiple officials made this quote, representing it as if it were official policy: Neil MacFarquhar stated, "Senior American officials have singled out Hezbollah as the ''A team'' of terrorism, more menacing than Al Qaeda,"[409] Robert Worth stated, "American officials sometimes referred to Mr. Mugniyah and his Hezbollah peers as the "A team" of international terrorism because of their cold professionalism and secrecy,"[410] and Eric Schmitt stated, "Some senior American officials, however, have singled out Hezbollah as the ''A Team'' of terrorism, considering it more menacing than Al Qaeda."[411] One article using the quote to describe U.S. and Israeli policy stated, "Israel and the United States put the armed Shiite Muslim group on the 'A team' of world terror."[412]

---

[409] Neil MacFarquhar, "Hezbollah Becomes Potent Anti-U.S. Force," *New York Times*, December 24, 2002, accessed October 24, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2002/12/24/world/hezbollah-becomes-potent-anti-us-force.html?scp=2&sq=Hezbollah&st=nyt.
[410] Robert Worth, "Bomb In Syria Kills Militant Sought as Terrorist," *New York Times*, February 14, 2008, accessed October 24, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/14/world/middleeast/14syria.html?scp=1&sq=Bomb&st=nyt.
[411] Eric Schmitt, "THREATS AND RESPONSES: THE MILITARY; Pentagon Draws Up a 20-to-30-Year Antiterror Plan," *New York Times*, January 17, 2003, accessed October 24, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2003/01/17/world/threats-responses-military-pentagon-draws-up-20-30-year-antiterror-plan.html?scp=1&sq=20-to-30-Year+Antiterror+Plan&st=nyt.
[412] Ian Fisher, "As its role shifts, Hezbollah Gains in Prisoner Trade," *New York Times*, January 29, 2004, accessed October 24, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2004/01/29/world/as-its-role-shifts-hezbollah-gains-in-prisoner-

Nine articles in the *Times* represented Senator Graham condemning Hezbollah.

The majority were part of the propaganda for the U.S. to invade Iraq, including:

> Senator Bob Graham, the Florida Democrat who was chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, has suggested that Hezbollah be dealt with before Baghdad because it is the most dangerous terrorist group on earth.[413]

> Mr. Graham said that beyond threats from Al Qaeda, American intelligence agencies had not adequately assessed threats posed by other Middle Eastern terror groups that are likely to be inflamed by a war with Iraq, among them Hezbollah, Hamas and Islamic Jihad. ''I think we make a mistake when we assume that the threat is only Al Qaeda,'' Mr. Graham said.[414]

One article wrongly applied Armitage's "A team terrorist" quote to Graham:

> And he said he supported giving the president the right to take military action, if necessary, against the terrorist organizations Hezbollah, Islamic Jihad and Hamas, which he has called ''the A team of international terrorists.''[415]

Although Armitage and Graham received an extensive amount of coverage

from the *Times* for their remarks on Hezbollah, CIA director George Tenet trumped

both with 34 articles. Each article cited Tenet's quote, reported his speech to

Congress in 2003, or cited other remarks he has made towards Hezbollah to

emphasis the journalists' point.

Analyzing these voices demonstrates the *Times* willingness to follow the

established policy, and to silence voices that deviated outside of the power elite's

---

trade.html?scp=1&sq=As+its+role+shifts%2C+Hezbollah+Gains+in+Prisoner+Trade&st=nyt.
[413] Eric Schmitt, "Threats and Responses."
[414] David Johnston, "THREATS AND RESPONSES: INTELLIGENCE; AGENCIES MONITOR IRAQIS IN THE U.S. FOR TERROR THREAT," *New York Times*, November 17, 2002, accessed October 26, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2002/11/17/us/threats-responses-intelligence-agencies-monitor-iraqis-us-for-terror-threat.html?scp=1&sq=Monitor&st=nyt.
[415] Adam Nagourney, "Two Democratic Contenders Clash on Universal Health Coverage," *New York Times*, April 28, 2003, accessed October 26, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2003/04/28/us/two-democratic-contenders-clash-on-universal-health-coverage.html?scp=1&sq=contenders&st=nyt.

constructed boundaries.

C. Current Status

Abundant coverage of Hezbollah continues in the *Times*. In 2011 alone, the movement was discussed in 243 *Times* articles, including 29 on the front-page. The majority of these articles centered on Hezbollah's alleged bank laundering, the Hariri trial and its alleged involvement in his death, and the organization's most recent moves in Lebanese politics.

The patterns observed in the previous sections still remain. *Times* readers were reminded again of Hezbollah's record in the 1980's in ten different articles in the past year. Linking Hezbollah to Al Qaeda is still found to be a common practice. One recent example reads:

> It was during that time that it is believed he [Osama bin Laden] honed his resolve against the United States. Within Al Qaeda, he argued that the organization should put aside its differences with Shiite terrorist groups like Hezbollah in Lebanon, the better to concentrate on the common enemy: the United States. He called for attacks against American forces in the Saudi peninsula and in the Horn of Africa.[416]

It is unknown if Bin Laden actually stated this, as the author never cited a source, but moreover, the author also failed to clarify that Hezbollah has continuously condemned Al Qaeda and has never stated an interest in forging ties with the organization. Further, the reader is left with the idea that Hezbollah and Al Qaeda are fighting together against "the common enemy: the United States."

---

[416] Kate Zernike, "The Most Wanted To Face of Terrorism," *New York Times*, May 2, 2011, accessed October 26, 2011, http://learning.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/05/02/what-is-your-reaction-to-the-death-of-osama-bin-laden/?scp=1&sq=face+terrorism&st=nyt.

Not only has the *Times* continued to portray Hezbollah and Al Qaeda as "one unit of terror," and perpetuated the perception that Hezbollah is currently carrying out "terrorist" attacks, but it has utilized the "radical-style" of Hezbollah as a villianizing term in domestic politics. Thomas Friedman has likened the Tea Party to Hezbollah in order to indict the former:

> It [the Tea Party] is so lacking in any aspiration for American greatness, so dominated by the narrowest visions for our country and so ignorant of the fact that it was not tax cuts that made America great but our unique public-private partnerships across the generations. If sane Republicans do not stand up to this Hezbollah faction in their midst, the Tea Party will take the G.O.P. on a suicide mission.[417]

Contributing to the "current terrorist" perception, Cambanis published an article on January 2011 entitled, "Hezbollah's Latest Suicide Mission."[418] Hopefully readers of the *Times* read the entire article to realize the author was referring to Hezbollah's ministerial resignation rather than an actual suicide bomb. Covering this political debacle in Lebanon, Cambanis echoed the alarm sounded by Prime Minister Hariri, an important figure in U.S. policy, stating:

> Hezbollah is likely to emerge the end winner because it is willing to sacrifice the Lebanese state to maintain it's standing in the Middle East and its perpetual war against Israel.[419]

Highlighting the common practice of marginalizing dissent, unlike Cambanis'

---

[417] Thomas Friedman, "Can't We Do This Right?" *New York Times*, July 26, 2011, accessed October 23, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/27/opinion/27friedman.html?_r=1&scp=1&sq =Cant%20we%20do%20this%20right%20thomas&st=cse.
[418] Thanassis Cambanis, "Hezbollah's Latest Suicide Mission," *The New York Times*, January 12, 2011, accessed October 24, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/13/opinion/13cambanis.html?scp=1&sq=hezb ollah%27s+latest+suicide&st=nyt.
[419] Ibid.

book, *A Privilege to Die: Inside Hezbollah's Legions and Their Endless War Against Israel,* Augustus Norton's book, *Hezbollah: A Short Story*, which was a major source for this thesis, was never reviewed by the *Times*. Norton, who far exceeds the credentials of Cambanis, wrote this detailed account of Hezbollah challenging the current U.S. policy toward Hezbollah. As the PM hypothesis suggests, the exclusion of Norton's book comes as no surprise.

Currently, *Times* coverage of Hezbollah remains supportive of the current U.S. policy, remaining within the boundaries of acceptable debate, and marginalizing those who deviate.

In sum, the *Times* coverage of Hezbollah satisfies the hypothesis of the PM. Representations of Hezbollah were presented in a way that upheld and justified its current designation on the FTO list. This required the *Times* to group Hezbollah with Al-Qaeda, the 9/11 attacks, and consistently highlight the events of the 1980's. At times, false information was presented to further support the current policy. Those who deviated or challenged the current policy were excluded from the *Times*, and those who expressed support for the policy were awarded a sizable amount of coverage. Filtered through the guided-market system, the *Times* systematic propaganda fits well to print.

CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSIONS

I. In Sum

This thesis investigated the corporate media's role in U.S. policy toward the

Shi'a political organization Hezbollah. Utilizing C. Wright Mills' Power Elite theory

and Noam Chomsky and Edward Herman's Propaganda Model, this thesis explored

Hezbollah's inclusion on the FTO list, and the forces that perpetuate its designation.

Specifically, this thesis utilized the PM, investigating if the leading American "liberal"

newspaper, *The New York Times*, portrayed Hezbollah, and its designation, within

the boundaries acceptable to the power elite. The findings concluded that the *Times*

never deviated from the established policy and marginalized dissenting voices,

satisfying the hypotheses of the PM.

Before analyzing the *Times* reporting of Hezbollah, this thesis began by

exploring the power elite's interests in Hezbollah's designation. Knowing other

variables affect the power elite's interest in continuing Hezbollah's designation as a

FTO, this thesis focused on the weapons industry. Chapter 3, investigated the profits generated through government contracts, specifically those contracts that are signed for the purpose of military aid to Israel. This industry is a large component of the power elite, producing interlocking relationships between the corporate and government elites. These relationships were seen primarily in the "revolving door" of high-status positions.

The established formula – U.S. weapon companies selling weapons to the U.S. government, and then the U.S. government giving Israel the weapons free while the American tax payer pays the bill – is maintained by the "common threats" Israel faces, and the "common threats" that the U.S. faces. This formula is executed in various ways, which were discussed in detail in chapter 3. Yet, the formula can only be continued if there is a constant threat to Israel, which creates a threat to the U.S. Maintaining the perception that Hezbollah is not only a threat to Israel, but to the U.S., the formula can be justified. Remaining on the FTO list for over two decades, Hezbollah carries the stigma of a terrorist organization, regardless of its activities. Further, its designation continues with unwarranted support from the corporate media, which is able to maintain the perception that Hezbollah is a current threat, actively carrying out "terrorist attacks".

To be sure of Hezbollah's activities and evolution away from a U.S. defined FTO, chapter 4 included a historical analysis of Hezbollah. The chapter explored the creation of Hezbollah and its initial objectives, conflict with Israel, entry into Lebanese politics, and evolution into a thriving political organization that possess its own effective military. Analyzing how Hezbollah developed throughout the past

three decades into Lebanon's largest social service provider, a major entity within the national Lebanese government, and Lebanon's largest and most effective military force, the primary aim of this chapter was to investigate the accusations that are used to justify Hezbollah's inclusion on the FTO list. This analysis was able to provide the information needed to test the applicability of Hezbollah's FTO designation.

Investigating Hezbollah as a FTO, chapter 4 explored the FTO designation process and its politicized nature. More specifically, the chapter analyzed the U.S. State Department's criteria and definitions that are used when placing an organization on the FTO list, and the resulting implications. Coupled with specific laws set in place detailed in chapter 4, the criteria and definitions used allow the process to be political in nature and used as a political instrument.

After observing the designation criteria and applying it to Hezbollah, the latest event that fits the criteria occurred 26 years ago. Noting that each FTO is re-evaluated every two years, its FTO designation stands as outdated. Yet, just as Hezbollah's activities during the 1980's are used to justify its continued designation as a current, active FTO, the corporate media echoes the same events portraying the movement as a current, active FTO. The corporate media's unwarranted support for this government policy was analyzed in Chapter 6, utilizing the PM with a focus on *The New York Times*.

This paper's analysis of the *Times* displayed its long history of operating as an establishment newspaper. This included analyzing its coverage of elite-led policies during the Cold War, the Vietnam War, and the 2003 Iraq war. Each policy

was, and is, awarded support, guarded from dissenting voices, and remained within the boundaries of acceptable debate.

This behavior – consistently supporting elite-led policies - was explained after observing how the *Times* functions within the PM. After applying each filter to the *Times*, the findings concluded that its reports are cleansed at each filter, leaving a residue that works as a member of the power elite.

Finally, this thesis analyzed the *Times* coverage of Hezbollah. After analyzing over 250 articles in three different sections; post 9/11-coverage, the marginalization of dissenting voices, and its current status, this thesis found that the *Times* operated in accordance with the PM hypotheses. The articles echoed the power elite-led policy toward Hezbollah, consistently portraying the organization as a current, active FTO. Further, this author could not find one article that questioned the current policy as the *Times* ignored voices that deviated from the representations that serve the interests of the power elite. As the PM suggests, the *Times* recreates the perception needed to maintain Hezbollah's designation.

II. Recommendations

A. U.S. Policy Toward Hezbollah

The current U.S. policy toward the Shi'a political organization Hezbollah is guided by the prevailing political winds blown by the power elite. Ignoring current information and failing to engage the complexities of Hezbollah and the political landscape it operates in, the policy is justified by outdated evidence that conveniently resurfaces as "breaking news".

In light of Hezbollah's development into a nationally recognized political organization, being the largest social service provider in Lebanon, and the country's most capable military force, the organization stands as a potent player within regional and global politics. The organization is continuing to grow in influence, and will be a significant part of the future, constructive or not. Thus, in the interest of the United States, the current policy toward Hezbollah needs to be re-evaluated, beginning with its removal from the FTO list.

Besides not fitting the criteria of the FTO list, Hezbollah needs to be removed in order for diplomatic options to be pursued. As Ambassador Ryan Crocker stated in his testimony to the Senate in 2010, "the 2006 conflict with Israel demonstrated that Hezbollah cannot be eliminated by military means."[420] Thus, the current policy stands ineffective. Although disagreeing with Crocker's use of the word "eliminated," this author agrees with his prescription: "We should talk to Hezbollah." Hezbollah is a large part of the Lebanese government, and the U.S. should deal with it directly.

By engaging Hezbollah diplomatically, not only can the U.S. potentially resolve the U.S./Hezbollah differences, but improve relationships among other countries that recognize Hezbollah. Awarding an organization for its progression could improve the U.S. image and have a powerful effect throughout the world. Further, Hezbollah could provide a means for the U.S. to engage Syria and Iran diplomatically, avoiding another costly war.

In sum, the current policy has not proven to be effective, yet remains cemented

---

[420] Crocker, Ryan, "Hearing on Hezbollah," Testimony to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, June 8, 2010, 3.

in the politicized nature of the FTO designation process. Thus, the U.S. policy

toward Hezbollah needs to be re-evaluated.

B. The Larger Problem

In his book, *Media Control*: *The Spectacular Achievements of Propaganda,*

Noam Chomsky poses two different conceptions of democracy:

> One conception of democracy has it that a democratic society is one in which the public has the means to participate in some meaningful way in the management of their own affairs and the means of information are open and free. If you look up democracy in the dictionary you'll get a definition something like that. An alternative conception of democracy is that the public must be barred from managing of their own affairs and the means of information must be kept narrowly and rigidly controlled.[421]

When analyzing the functions of the American media, that latter definition, similar

to Lippmann's "progressive democracy" discussed in the introduction of this thesis,

serves as the most accurate description of democracy in the U.S.

Describing the media's role in a functioning democracy, Anthony Lewis cites

Supreme Court Justice Powell: "no individual can obtain for himself the information

needed for the intelligent discharge of his political responsibilities…By enabling the

public to assert meaningful control over the political process, the press performs a

crucial function in effecting the societal purpose of the First Amendment."[422] After

observing the media's functions through the numerous cases applied to the PM, the

"societal purpose" of the media has not been its democratic duty of providing the

public with "the information needed for intelligent discharge of his political

---

[421] Chomsky, *Media Control*, 1-2.
[422] Anthony Lewis, "Freedom of the Press—Anthony Lewis Distinguishes Between Britain and America," *London Review of Books* 9, no. 21, (November 26, 1987).

responsibilities," but rather, in the words of Chomsky, "to inculcate and defend the economic, social, and political agenda of privileged groups that dominate the domestic society and the state."[423]

The misuse of the media is not a result of conspiratorial forces, but as the PM explains, a result of the media's structure and objectives as profit-oriented businesses, guided by market forces. Therefore, large, substantial changes in policy and regulations would need to occur within the media industry, such as guarding against the increasing centralization of the media. But as Chomsky and Herman note, the tendency for the media to operate as a member of the power elite has only grown stronger in the past two decades. Working from the bottom up, the more effective way to provide the needed information to the public in efforts to allow them "to intelligently discharge their political responsibilities," would be for a growth in grassroot movements, non-profit broadcasting networks, more public-access channels, and independent media print. Whether it's the growth in more independent publishers who are not tied to the guided-market system, such as Seven Stories Press, the current structure needs to be challenged to protect against the further erosion of the American democratic society.

---

[423] Herman and Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent (2011 Kindle ed.*), 298.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Russell, "New York Times Prepares Plan to Charge for Online Reading," *The Wall Street Journal*. January 24, 2011. Accessed September 18, 2011. http://online.wsj.com/article/SB100014240527487042134045761000338 83758352.html

Alagha, Joseph E., *The Shifts in Hizbullah's Ideology: Religious Ideology, Political Ideology, and Political Program*. Leiden: ISIM; Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006.

Altheide, David, "The Mass Media and Terrorism", *Communication and Discourse* 1 no. 287, (2007): 287-308.

Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-132, § 301(a)(1), 110 Stat. 1214, 1247 (1996) [AEDPA].

Azani, Eitan, *Hezbollah*: *The Story of the Party of God.* Palgrave Macmillian, 2008.

Bagdikian, Ben, *The Media Monopoly*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1987.

Barnouw, Erik, *The Sponsor*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Batarfi, K. "Three American Prestige Newspapers' Stand toward the Arab–Israeli Conflict: A Content Analysis of Editorials," (1997), paper presented at the *International Communication Division* at the 1997 AEJMC Convention.

BBC, "Findings on 9/11 split US press," June 17, 2004, accessed September 23, 2011. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/3816021.stm.

BBC, "Middle East Crisis: Facts and Figures," August, 31, 2006, accessed September
        28, 2011, http//news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/5257128.stm.

Bennett, Lance, Regina Lawrence, and Steve Livingston, *When the Press Fails*:
        Political Power and the News Media from Iraq to Katrina. Chicago: University
        of Chicago Press, 2007.

Berrigan, Frida, "Made in the U.S.A.: American Military Aid to Israel," *Journal of
        Palestine Studies* 38, No. 3 (Spring 2009): 6-21.

Black, Ian, "Barack Obama to authorize record $60bn Saudi Arms Sale," *The
        Guardian*, September 13, 2010, accessed October 12, 2011,
        http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/sep/13/us-arms-deal-saudi-
        arabia.

Boyd-Barrett, Oliver, "Judith Miller, *The New York Times*, and the Propaganda
        Model," *Journalism Studies 5,* no. 4, (2004): 435-449.

Brennan, John, "The Conundrum of Iran: Strengthening Moderates without
        Acquiescing to Belligerence," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and
        Social Science,* (July 2008).

Burns, John, "A DAY OF TERROR: THE MILITANT; America the Vulnerable Meets a
        Ruthless Enemy," *New York Times*. September 12, 2001, accessed September
        18, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/12/us/a-day-of-terror-the-
        militant-america-the-vulnerable-meets-a-ruthless-
        enemy.html?scp=1&sq=enemy&st=nyt.

Byman, Daniel, "Should Hezbollah Be Next?" *Foreign Affairs Magazine*,
        November/December 2003.

Cambanis, Thanassis, "Hezbollah's Latest Suicide Mission," *The New York Times*,
        January 12, 2011, accessed October 24, 2011,
        http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/13/opinion/13cambanis.html?scp=1&s
        q=hezbollah%27s+latest+suicide&st=nyt.

Caute, David, *The Great Fear: The Anti-Communist Purge under Truman and
        Eisenhower*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1978.

Chamie, Joseph, *Religion and Fertility: Arab Christian-Muslim Differentials*.
        Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Chase, James, "The Complex Metamorphosis of American Foreign Policy," *New York
        Times*, December 16, 2003.

Chomsky, Daniel, "An Interested Reader: Measuring Ownership Control at The New York Times," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 23. No. 1 (March 2006): 1-18.

Chomsky, Noam, *Towards a New Cold War: Essays on the Current Crisis and How We Got There*. London: Sinclair Browne, 1982.

Chomsky, Noam, *On Power and Ideology: the Managua Lectures*. Cambridge: South End Press, 1987.

Chomsky, Noam and Edward Herman, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1988.

Chomsky, Noam, *Necessary Illusions: Thought Control in Democratic Societies*. London: Pluto, 1989.

Chomsky, Noam, *Media Control: The Spectacular Achievements of Propaganda Campaigns*. New York: Seven Stories Press, 1997.

Chomsky, Noam, and Herman Edwards, *Manufacturing Consent*: *The Political Economy of the Mass Media.* New York: Pantheon Books, 2002.

Chomsky, Noam, and Edward Herman, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. New York: Pantheon. Kindle Edition, 2011.

Ciarrocca, Michelle, W. Hartung, "Axis of Influence: Behind the Bush Administration's Missile Defense Revival," *World Policy Institute*, July 2002. http://www.worldpolicy.org/projects/arms/reports/execsumaxis.html.

Congressional Report. "S. 2845--108th Congress: Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004." <u>GovTrack.us (database of federal legislation)</u>. 2004. January 12, 2012 <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bill.xpd?bill=s108-2845>

Crocker, Ryan, "Testimony Before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee," (June 8, 2010).

Cronin, Audrey Kurth, "The "FTO" List and Congress: Sanctioning Designated Foreign Terrorist Organizations," *Congressional Research Service (CRS)*: CRS Report for Congress, RL32120, October 2003.

Daugherty, D., and M. Warden, "Prestige Editorial Treatment of the Mideast during 11 Crisis Years," *Journalism Quarterly* 56 no. 4 (1979).

Deeb, Lara, "Hizballah in the Sights," *Middle East Research and Information Project*, MER258, accessed August 20, 2011, http://www.merip.org/mer/mer258/hizballah-sights.

Defense Update, "Israel Embarks on a Third Ballistic Defense System," 2007, accessed October 15, 2011. http://defense-update.com/newscast/0207/news/010207_iron_cap.htm.

Dickson, Sandra, "Understand Media Bias: The Press and the U.S. Invasion of Panama," *Journalism Quarterly* 71, no. 4 (1994).

Doherty, Benjamin, "How a clueless "terrorism expert" set media suspicion n Muslims after Oslo horror," *The Electronic Intifada,* July 23, 2011, accessed November 10, 2011, http://electronicintifada.net/blog/benjamin-doherty/how-clueless-terrorism-expert-set-media-suspicion-muslims-after-oslo-horror.

Dreier, Peter, "The Position of the Press in the U.S. Power Structure," *Social Problems*, (February 1992).

Dreyfuss, Robert, "Colin Powell's List," *The Nation*, (March 2002).

Economist, "Bangs for Bucks," April 12, 2010, accessed, October 11, 2011. http://www.economist.com/node/15895032.

Editors, "The Times and Iraq," *New York Times,* May 26, 2004, accessed October 20, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2004/05/26/world/from-the-editors-the-times-and-iraq.html?scp=1&sq=the+times+and+iraq&st=nyt.

Edsall, Thomas B., "Bringing Good Things to GE: Firm's Political Savvy Scores in Washington," *Washington Post*, April 13, 1985.

Engelburg, Stephen, and Matthew Purdy, "A NATION CHALLENGED: THE INVESTIGATION; Countless Questions, a Few Answers," *New York Times*, October 7, 2001, accessed September 20, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/07/us/a-nation-challenged-the-investigation-countless-questions-a-few-answers.html?scp=1&sq=countless&st=nyt.

Entman, Robert, *Projections of Power: Framing News, Public Opinion, and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Epstein, Edward, "The Invention of Arkady Shevchenko, Supermole: The Spy Who Came In to Be Sold," *New Republic*, July 15–22, (1985).

Erlanger, Steve, "Europe Takes Bold Step on a Ban of Iranian Oil," *The New York Times*, January 4, 2012.

Evensen, B. "Surrogate State Department? Times Coverage of Palestine," *Journalism Quarterly* 67, no. 2, (1990).

Farazmand, Ali, "The Elite Question," *Administration and Society* 31, no. 321, (1999).

Federal Bureau of Investigation. Terrorist Research and Analytical Section. 1995.

Fisher, Ian, "As its role shifts, Hezbollah Gains in Prisoner Trade," *New York Times*, January 29, 2004, accessed October 24, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2004/01/29/world/as-its-role-shifts-hezbollah-gains-in-prisoner-trade.html?scp=1&sq=As+its+role+shifts%2C+Hezbollah+Gains+in+Prisoner+Trade&st=nyt.

Fishman, Mark, *Manufacturing the News.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1980.

Flanigan, Shawn Teresa and Mounah Abdel-Samad, "Hezbollah's Social Jihad: nonprofits as resistance organizations," *Middle East Policy*, 2009.

Fried, Joseph, "Terror in Oklahoma City," *New York Times*, April 20, 1995, accessed September 18, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/1995/04/20/us/terror-oklahoma-city-terrorism-trial-judge-refuses-sequester-jury-terrorism-case.html?scp=2&sq=terrorism&st=nyt.

Friedman, Thomas, "Can We Talk?" *New York Times*, July 17th, 2010, accessed October 7, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/27/opinion/27friedman.html.

Friedman, Thomas, "Can't We Do This Right?" *New York Times*, July 26, 2011, accessed October 23, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/27/opinion/27friedman.html?_r=1&scp=1&sq=Cant%20we%20do%20this%20right%20thomas&st=cse.

Gambill, Gary, "Hezbollah and the Political Ecology of Postwar Lebanon." *Mideast Monitor* 1, no. 3, (September/October 2006).

Gerges, Fawaz, "Islam and Muslims in the Mind of America," *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 588, no. 73, (2003): 73-87.

Gervasi, Tom, *Myth of Soviet Military Supremacy*. Harpercollins, 1986.

Girard, Richard, "The Weapons Manufacturer That Does it All: A Profile of Arms Giant Lockheed Martin," *Polaris Institute*, November 2005. http://www.polarisinstitute.org/files/Lockheed%20Martin.pdf.

Haberman, Clyde, "A NATION CHALLENGED -- AN OVERVIEW: NOV 2, 2001; Bad Economic News, Troops on the Golden Gate, Angry Firefighters," *New York Times*, November 3rd, 2001, accessed October 20, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/11/03/world/nation-challenged-overview-nov-2-2001-bad-economic-troops-golden-gate-angry.html?scp=2&sq=troops&st=nyt.

Hadar, Leon, "What Green Peril?," *Foreign Affairs*, 72, No. 2, (Spring, 1993): 27-42.

Hagan, Joe, "Bleeding 'Times' Blood," *New York Magazine*, October 5, 2008, accessed November 2, 2011, http://nymag.com/news/media/51015/.

Hamilton, James, *All the News That's Fit to Sell: how the market transforms information into news*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press 2004.

Harel, Amos, and Avi Issacharoff, *34 Days: Israel, Hezbollah, and the War in Lebanon*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Harik, Judith P., *Hezbollah: The Changing Face of Terrorism*. London; New York: I.B. Tauris, 2005.

Hart, Peter and Julie Hollar, "Fear and Favor 2004," Fairness and Accuracy in Reporting, (March/April 2005), http://www.coldtype.net/Assets.05/Essays/05.Fair.pdf.

Hartung, William D., and Frida Berrigan, "Report: U.S. Arms Transfers and Security Assistance to Israel," *World Policy Institute*, May 6, 2002. http://www.worldpolicy.org/projects/arms/reports/israel050602.html

Hedges, Chris, *Death of the Liberal Class*. Nation Books, October 17, 2010.

Hennigan, W.J., "U.S. arms makers look overseas as domestic demand shrinks," *Los Angeles Times,* June 15, 2011, accessed October 11, 2011, http://articles.latimes.com/2011/jun/15/business/la-fi-weapon-exports-20110616

Hess, David, "Raytheon Fact Sheet," *Medical Association for Prevention of War*, October, 2008. www.mapw.org.au.

Hertsgaard, Mark, "How Reagan Seduced Us: Inside the President's Propaganda Factory," *Village Voice*, September 18, 1984.

Herman, Edward, "The Institutionalization of Bias in Economics," *Media, Culture and Society,* (July 1982): 275–91.

Herman, Edward and Frank Brodhead, *The Rise and Fall of The Bulgarian Connection*. New York: Sheridan Square Publications, 1986.

Herman, Edward, "The Propaganda Model Revisited," *Monthly Review* 48, July-August (1996).

Herman, Edward, "All News Fit to Print", *Z Magazine*, April, 1998.

Herman, Edward, "The Propaganda Model: A Retrospective," *Against All Reason* 1, no. 1-14, (December 2003), http://www.chomsky.info/onchomsky/20031209.htm.

Herman, Edward, and David Peterson, "Marlise Simons on the Yugoslavia Tribunal: A Study in Total Propaganda Service," *ZNet*, (2004).

Herman, Edward, "The New York Times Versus Civil Society: Protests, tribunals, labor and militarization and wars," *Z Magazine*, (December 2005).

Hersh, Seymour, "Annals of National Security: Watching Lebanon: Washington's Interests in Israel's War," *New Yorker*, August 21, 2006, 28-33.

Hilterman, Joost, *Civilian Pawns*. Washington D.C.: Middle East Watch, 1996.

Hoffman, Bruce, *Inside Terrorism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Human Rights Watch, "Israel/Lebanon: Qana Death Toll at 28," August 1, 2006, accessed August 9, 2011. http://www.hrw.org/en/news/2006/08/01/israellebanon- qana-death-toll-28.

Hutcheson, J. Domke, D. Billeaudeaux, and A. Garland, "U.S. National Identity, Political Elites, and a Patriotic Press following September 11," *Political Communication* 21 (2004): 27-50.

Ibrahim, Dina, "The Middle East in America Media: A 20th century Overview," *International Communication Gazette* 71, no. 511 (2009).

Indyk, Martin, "Finding Allies in a World of Shadows," *New York Times*, September 28th, 2001, accessed October 23, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/28/opinion/finding-allies-in-a-world-of-shadows.html?scp=1&sq=Shadows&st=nyt.

Interview with Noam Chomsky, "Excerpts From Manufacturing Consent," 1992. http://www.chomsky.info/interviews/1992----02.htm.

Jehl, Douglas, "A NATION CHALLENGED: THE NEIGHBORS; Arab Allies Not Jumping to Join U.S. Side," *New York Times*, September 27, 2001, accessed September 15, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/27/world/a-nation-challenged-the-neighbors-arab-allies-not-jumping-to-join-us-side.html?scp=1&sq=Arab+Allies&st=nyt.

Johnston, David, "THREATS AND RESPONSES: INTELLIGENCE; AGENCIES MONITOR IRAQIS IN THE U.S. FOR TERROR THREAT," *New York Times*, November 17, 2002, accessed October 26, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2002/11/17/us/threats-responses-intelligence-agencies-monitor-iraqis-us-for-terror-threat.html?scp=1&sq=Monitor&st=nyt.

Kahn, Joseph, "A NATION CHALLENGED: THE MONEY TRAIL; U.S. Widens Net to Snare Terror Assets; Expands List," *New York Times*, November 3, 2001, accessed October 8, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/11/03/world/nation-challenged-money-trail-us-widens-net-snare-terror-assets-expands-list.html?scp=1&sq=terror&st=nyt.

Keller, Bill, "The World According to Powell," *New York Times*, November 25, 2001, accessed October 21, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/11/25/magazine/the-world-according-to-powell.html?scp=1&sq=Powell&st=nyt.

Kempster, Norman, "U.S. Designates 30 Groups As Terrorists," *Los Angeles Times*, October 9, 1997, A16.

Khouri, G., "The Other Gulf War Syndrome: Flaws in US Media Coverage of the 1997/98 Iraq Crisis, Issue Paper # 27," Washington, DC: *ADC Research Institute* (1998).

Krakauer, Steve, "CNN's Octavia Nasr Leaving Network After Controversial Tweet," *Mediaite*, July 7, 2010. http://www.mediaite.com/tv/breaking-cnns-octavia-nasr-leaving-network-after-controversial-tweet.

Lamb, Franklin, "Lebanon 'accepts' Hezbollah's weapons," *Aljazeera Magazine*, December 2, 2009.

Laqueur, Walter, *A History of Terrorism.* Transaction Publishers, 1997.

Lee, Thea, "False Prophets: The Selling of NAFTA," *Economic Policy Institute*, (July 1995), http://www.epi.org/page/-/old/briefingpapers/falsep_bp_1995.pdf.

151

Leenders, Reinoud, "How the Rebel Regained His Cause: Hizbullah & the Sixth Arab-
        Israeli War," *MIT Electronic Journal of Middle East Studies* 6, 2006

Lewis, Anthony, "Freedom of the Press—Anthony Lewis Distinguishes Between
        Britain and America," *London Review of Books* 9, no. 21, (November 26,
        1987), http://www.lrb.co.uk/v09/n21/anthony-lewis/freedom-of-the-press.

Lippmann, Walter, and Charles Merz, "A Test of the News," *New Republic*, August 4,
        1920.

Lippman, Walter, *Essays in the Public Philosophy.* Boston: Little Brown, 1955.

Lueg, Andrea, "The Perception of Islam in Western Debate," in *The Next Threat:
        Western Perceptions of Islam*, ed. Hippler, Jochan, and Andrea Lueg. Colorado:
        Pluto Press, 1995.

Luttwak, Edward, "New Fears, New Alliance," *New York Times*, October 2, 2001,
        accessed September 16, 2011,
        http://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/02/opinion/new-fears-new-
        alliance.html?scp=1&sq=new+fears&st=nyt.

MacFarquhar, Neil, "To U.S., a Terrorist Group; To Lebanese, a Social Agency," *The
        New York Times*, December 28th, 2001, accessed September 15, 2011,
        http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/28/world/to-us-a-terrorist-group-to-
        lebanese-a-social-agency.html?scp=10&sq=terrorist+group&st=nyt.

Malinkina, Olga V. and Douglas McLeod, "From Afghanistan to Chechnya: News
        Coverage by Izvestia and The New York Times," *Journalism and Mass
        Communication Quarterly* 77, no. 1 (2000): 37-49.

Massing, Michael, "Now They Tell Us", *New York Review of Books,* LI:3, February 26
        2004, accessed October 18, 2011. http://www.nybooks,com/articles/ 16922.

Melvin, Jasmin, "U.S. Leads World in Foreign Weapon Sales: Report," *Reuters*,
        September 6, 2009, accessed October 10, 2011.
        http://www.reuters.com/article/2009/09/06/us-arms-usa-
        idUSTRE5851XH20090906.

McClung, Lee, *The Daily Newspaper in America*. New York: Macmillan, 1937.

McCombs, Maxwell, and Donald Shaw, "The Agenda Setting Function of the Mass
        Media," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 36, no. 2, (1972).

McCombs, Maxwell, "A Look at Agenda-Setting: Past, Present, and Future,"
        Journalism Studies 6, no. 4, (2005).

McFarquhar, Neil, "A NATION CHALLENGED: DAMASCUS; Syria Repackages Its Repression of Muslim Militants as Antiterror Lesson, *New York Times*, January 14, 2002, accessed October 23, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2002/01/14/world/nation-challenged-damascus-syria-repackages-its-repression-muslim-militants.html?scp=2&sq=Syria&st=nyt.

MacFarquhar, Neil, "Hezbollah Becomes Potent Anti-U.S. Force," *New York Times*, December 24, 2002, accessed October 24, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2002/12/24/world/hezbollah-becomes-potent-anti-us-force.html?scp=2&sq=Hezbollah&st=nyt.

McNeil, Donald, "The Nation: Afterlife; Can Al Qaeda Rise If Bin Laden Falls?," *New York Times*, December 2, 2001, accessed October 21, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/02/weekinreview/the-nation-afterlife-can-al-qaeda-rise-if-bin-laden-falls.html?scp=2&sq=rise&st=nyt.

Mian, Hanan, "War in Iraq: Comparative Coverage of the *Toronto Star* and the *New York Times," Canadian Journal of Media Studies* 3 no. 1 (2003).

Miller, Judith, "A NATION CHALLENGED: THE INVESTIGATION; U.S. SET TO WIDEN FINANCIAL ASSAULT," *New York Times*, October 1, 2001, accessed September 20, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/01/us/a-nation-challenged-the-investigation-us-set-to-widen-financial-assault.html?scp=1&sq=assault&st=nyt.

Miller, Judith, "Illicit Arms Kept Till Eve of War, An Iraqi Scientist Is Said To Assert," *New York Times*, April 23, 2003, accessed October 20, 2011

Mills, C. Wright, *The Power Elite*. Oxford University Press, 1956.

Mitchell, P. and J. Schoeffel, *Understanding Power: The Indispensible Chomsky*. New York: New Press, 2002.

Mousa, I., *The Arab Image in the US Press*. New York: Peter Lang, 1984.

Mullen, Andrew, "Twenty years on: the second-order prediction of the Herman-Chomsky Propaganda Model," *Media, Culture, and Society* 32, no. 673, 2010.

Nagourney, Adam, "Two Democratic Contenders Clash on Universal Health Coverage," *New York Times*, April 28, 2003, accessed October 26, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2003/04/28/us/two-democratic-contenders-clash-on-universal-health-coverage.html?scp=1&sq=contenders&st=nyt.

Naiman, Robert, "The New York Times Misleading Public on Iran," *Al Jazeera*, January 12, 2012, accessed January 13, 2012. http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2012/01/20121872656281735.html.

Narwani, Sharmine, "Did Clinton Just Change U.S. Policy on Hezbollah," *The Huffington Post*, November 12, 2009.

Nasr, Vali, *The Shia Revival: How Conflicts Within Islam Will Shape the Future*. W. Norton August 2006

Norton, Augustus, *Amal and the Shi'a: The Struggle for the Soul of Lebanon*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1987.

Norton, Augustus, "The Future of Civil Society in the Middle East," *Middle East Journal* 47, no. 2 (1993).

Norton, Augustus, *Hezbollah: A Short Story*. NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009.

Novick, Akiva, "New York Times execs visit West Bank city," *ynetnews.com*, October 29, 2010, accessed November 13, 2011, http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3976644,00.html.

Opell-Rome, Barbara, "U.S.-Israel to Develop David's Sling Missile Defense," *Defense News*, August 7, 2011, accessed October 18 2011. http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?i=3664531.

Owen, Bruce, and Ronald Braeutigam, *The Regulation Game: Strategic Use of the Administrative Process*. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger, 1978.

Palestine: Information with Provenance (PIWP database), "Arthur Ochs Sulzberger Jr.," October 30, 2010, accessed November 13 2011, http://cosmos.ucc.ie/cs1064/jabowen/IPSC/php/authors.php?auid=11163.

Perle, Richard, "The U.S. Must Strike Saddam Hussein," *New York Times*, December 28, 2001, accessed October 22, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/28/opinion/the-us-must-strike-at-saddam-hussein.html?scp=1&sq=strike&st=nyt.

Pexton, Patrick, "Getting Ahead Of The Facts On Iran," *The Washington Post*, December, 9, 2011. http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/getting-ahead-of-the-facts-on-iran/2011/12/07/gIQAAvvCjO_story.html.

Power, Samantha, "The Everything Explainer," *New York Times*, January 4, 2004.

Pincus, Walter, "United States Needs to Reevaluate its assistance to Israel," *Washington Post*, October 18, 2011, accessed October 18 2011, http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/united-states-needs-to-reevaluate-its-assistance-to-israel/2011/10/15/gIQAK5XksL_story.html

Qassem, Naim, *Hizbullah: The Story from Within*. London: Saqi Books, 2005.

Quandt, William, *Peace Process: American Diplomacy And The Arab-Israeli Conflict Since 1967.* University of California Press, 2005.

Richieri, Kenneth, "The New York Times Proxy Statement," March 11, 2009, pg. 5, 13, http://www.nytco.com/pdf/2009_Proxy_Statement.pdf.

Robinson, Piers, "Theorizing the Influence of Media on World Politics 2001," *European Journal of Communication* 16, no. 1, (2001): 523-544.

Rothstein, Edward, "CONNECTIONS; Exploring the Flaws in the Notion of the 'Root Causes' of Terror," *New York Times*, November 17th, 2001, accessed October 21, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/11/17/arts/connections-exploring-the-flaws-in-the-notion-of-the-root-causes-of-terror.html?scp=1&sq=flaws&st=nyt.

Record, Jeffrey, *Bounding the Global War on Terrorism*. U.S. Army War College: Strategic Studies Institute, December 01, 2003.

Saad-Ghorayeb, Amal, *Hizbullah: Politics and Religion*. Pluto Press, 2002

Safire, William, "Essay; Enemy Of My Enemy," *New York Times*, November 29, 2001, accessed October 24, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/11/29/opinion/essay-enemy-of-my-enemy.html?scp=1&sq=Enemy&st=nyt.

Saffire, William, "The Irrelevant Man," *New York Times*, December 17, 2001, accessed October 24, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/17/opinion/the-irrelevant-man.html?scp=1&sq=man&st=nyt.

Said, Edward, *Covering Islam: How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1981.

Salisbury, Harrison, *Without Fear or Favor: The New York Times and its Times*. Times Books: 1980.

Sankari, Jamal, *Fadlallah: The Making Of A Radical Shi'ite Leader.* Saqi Books, 2005.

Schlesinger, Philip, *Culture and Power: Media, Culture, and Society*. London: 1992, Sage.

Schmemann, Serge, "Aftermath: The Target; Israel as Flashpoint, not Cause" *New York Times*, September 23, 2001, September 19, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/23/weekinreview/aftermath-the-target-israel-as-flashpoint-not-cause.html?scp=3&sq=aftermath&st=nyt.

Schmitt, Eric, "A NATION CHALLENGED: REGIONAL POLITICS; IRAN EXERTS SWAY IN AFGHAN REGION, WORRYING THE U.S," *New York Times*, January 10, 2002, accessed September 16, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2002/01/10/world/nation-challenged-regional-politics-iran-exerts-sway-afghan-region-worrying-us.html?scp=2&sq=Afghan&st=nyt.

Schmitt, Eric, "THREATS AND RESPONSES: THE MILITARY; Pentagon Draws Up a 20-to-30-Year Antiterror Plan," *New York Times*, January 17, 2003, accessed October 24, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2003/01/17/world/threats-responses-military-pentagon-draws-up-20-30-year-antiterror-plan.html?scp=1&sq=20-to-30-Year+Antiterror+Plan&st=nyt.

Sciolino, Elaine, "A NATION CHALLENGED: IRANIANS; Tehran Aide Assails Terror But Opposes U.S. Attack," *New York Times*, October 1st, 2001, accessed October 23, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/01/world/a-nation-challenged-iranians-tehran-aide-assails-terror-but-opposes-us-attack.html?scp=1&sq=Tehran&st=nyt.

Sciolino, Elaine, "Saudi Charges Bush With Failure to Broker Mideast Peace," *New York Times*, November 9th, 2001, accessed October 21, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/11/09/world/saudi-charges-bush-with-failure-to-broker-mideast-peace.html?scp=2&sq=Saudi&st=nyt.

Sciolino, Elaine, "U.S. to Use Reward Ads In Hunting Palestinians," *New York Times*, December 13, 2001, accessed October 20, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/13/world/us-to-use-reward-ads-in-hunting-palestinians.html?scp=1&sq=reward&st=nyt.

Sciolino, Elaine, "IRAN CHIEF REJECTS BIN LADEN MESSAGE," *New York Times*, November 10, 2001, accessed October 23, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/11/10/world/iran-chief-rejects-bin-laden-message.html?scp=2&sq=Iran&st=nyt.

Scott, A.O. "Overflowing with Opinions, Lacking in Minced Words," *New York Times*, November 22, 2002.

Shapiro, Julia B., "The Politization of the Designation of Foreign Terrorist Organizations: The Effect of the Separation of Powers" *Cardoza Public Law, Policy and Ethics Journal,* (Spring 2008).

Shea, Danny, "Ben Stein Hints: I was fired from New York Times for criticizing Obama," *Huffington Post*, May 5, 2011, accessed October 16, 2011, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2009/08/10/ben-stein-hints-i-was-fir_n_255897.html.

Sheikh, K. V. Price and H. Oshagan, "Press Treatment of Islam: What Kind of Picture do the Media Paint?," *Gazette* 56, no. 1 (1995).

Sigal, Leon, *Reporters and Officials: The Organization and Politics of Newsmaking*. D.C. Heath, 1973.

Singer, Peter, "America, Islam, and the 9-11 War," *Current History* (December, 2006).

Sobelman, Daniel, *New Rules of the Game: Israel and Hizballah after the Withdrawal from Lebanon*, Tel Aviv: Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies, Tel Aviv University, 2004.

States Air Force, "Fact Sheet: The United States Air Force Information Program" (March 1979).

Suleiman, M., *Arabs in the Mind of America*. Brattleboro, VT: Amana Books, 1988.

Sunday Times, "History, but not as America knows its", February 6, 2005.

Tifft, Susan, *The Trust: The Private and Powerful Family Behind the New York Times*. Back Bay Books, September 20, 2000.

Tuchman, Gaye, "Objectivity as Strategic Ritual: An Examination of Newsmen's Notions of Objectivity," *American Journal of Sociology* 77, no. 2 (1972).

Turow, Joseph, *Media Industries: The Production of News and Entertainment*. New York: Longman, 1984.

UPI, "Raytheon-Rafael get boost for Iron Dome," August 23, 2011, accessed October 15, 2011, http://www.upi.com/Business_News/Security-Industry/2011/08/23/Raytheon-Rafael-get-boost-for-Iron-Dome/UPI-18551314128093.

Urbina, Ian, "O.A.S. to Reopen Inquiry Into Massacre in El Salvador in 1981," *New York Times*, March 8th, 2005.

U.S. Council on Foreign Relations, *Collateral Damage: Iraq and the Future of US – Syrian Relations*, New York, 24 April 2003.

U.S. Department of State. Office of the Coordination for Counterterrorism. *Patterns of Global Terrorism: 1997*. Released April 1998.

U.S. Department of State, Office of the Coordination for Counterterrorism. *Country Reports on Terrorism 2010*. August 18, 2011.
http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2011/08/170695.htm

U.S. House of Representatives, 109th Congress, (2005-2006).

Vance, Lynn, "Freedom of the Press for Whom," *Virginia Quarterly Review* (Summer 1945).

Vann, B. "*New York Times* Reporter Judith Miller Accused of "hijacking" Military Unit in Iraq", *World Socialist*, June 27 2003, accessed October 24, 2011. wsws,org/arHcles/2003/jul2003/.

Vaughn, Stephen, *Holding Fast the Inner Lines*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980.

Vega, Tanzina, "Online Ad Revenue Continues to Rise," *New York Times*, April 13, 2011, accessed October 12, 2011, http://mediadecoder.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/04/13/online-ad-revenue-continues-to-rise/.

Wiarda, Howard J., *American Foreign Policy: Actors and Processes.* Amherst, MA: HarperCollins, 1996.

Wolf, Louis, "Accuracy in Media Rewrites News and History," *Covert Action Information Bulletin* (Spring 1984).

Wolfsfeld, Gadi, *Media and Political Conflict: News from the Middle East*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Worth, Robert, "Bomb In Syria Kills Militant Sought as Terrorist," *New York Times*, February 14, 2008, accessed October 24, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/14/world/middleeast/14syria.html?scp=1&sq=Bomb&st=nyt.

Young, Kevin, "Colombia and Venezuela: Testing the Propaganda Model," *MALA,* November/December 2008.

Zernike, Kate, "The Most Wanted To Face of Terrorism," *New York Times*, May 2, 2011, accessed October 26, 2011,

      http://learning.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/05/02/what-is-your-reaction-to-the-death-of-osama-bin-laden/?scp=1&sq=face+terrorism&st=nyt.

Zunes, Stephen, "Jihad Against Hezbollah," *Foreign Policy in Focus* (August, 2006).

"An Open Letter: The Hizbollah Program," *The Jerusalem Quarterly*, No. 48, (Fall 1988): 15.
      http://www.standwithus.com/pdfs/flyers/hezbollah_program.pdf.