

# **PROFILING GLOBAL EVENTS IN THE PRESS: OPERATION ‘ODYSSEY DAWN’**

Michał **WILCZEWSKI**, Ph.D.

Institute of Journalism and Social Communication

University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn, Poland

## **Abstract**

On the basis of the linguistic material excerpted from press articles, the “text — reality” relation in the process of creating media reality by the press was studied. The object of our interest was profiling events and describing and evaluating participants in these events. As an example, textual profiling of the operation called ‘Odyssey Dawn’ by the “Washington Post” and the “Washington Times” was discussed.

The “Washington Post” shows a considerable interest in the role of the U.S.A. in the conflict and also in the reaction of the Arab world to the events in Libya. On that basis, a polarization of participants emerges: the Western world vs. the Arab world. In the “Washington Times”, the main emphasis is put on the American viewpoint and opinions; standpoints of other coalition members appear to be of marginal importance.

The quantitative axiological analysis of the participants of the event showed that a majority of evaluating opinions are negative. The “Washington Times” concentrates more on negative aspects of participants, whereas the “Washington Post” counterbalances them with positive opinions.

**Keywords:** profiling events, textual worldview, Odyssey Dawn, conflict in Libya

## 1. Introduction

The following article discusses the issue of profiling global events. The military operation called ‘Odyssey Dawn’ will serve as an object of deliberation. It started on 19<sup>th</sup> March 2011 in Libya, when the forces of an international coalition (led by the U.S.A.) attacked Libya’s air defences to enforce a no-fly zone, which had been authorized by a U.N. Security Council resolution (see: “Resolution 1973”). This event has been chosen due to its global range and news value. Had it not been for these two factors, the news would not have appeared on the first page of the Monday issue of most dailies in the world.

The main motive for raising the topic is pseudo-events, persuasion and manipulation — constantly observable in the media. Based on the assumption that language constitutes a useful tool for achieving the aims established by the media, our task is to define the ways the press profiles political events and, as a result, shapes readers’ ideologies and attitudes to events and their participants.

The linguistic material encompasses four articles excerpted from Monday issues (21<sup>st</sup> March, 2011) of the liberal “Washington Post” (*WP*), and three articles from the conservative “Washington Times” (*WT*).

## 2. Text as an interface of events between the sender and reader

Press text is situated in the media discourse, which is considered here as a communicative event meant to transfer information from the individual or institutional sender to the global receiver. T.van Dijk emphasizes that the indirect character of the relationship between discourse and society is manifested in social, political and cultural reproductions, and such social mental representations as beliefs, views, opinions or ideologies serve language users as a *sui generis* interface. This interface links the level of interaction between the individual sender and text with social macrostructures (van Dijk, 1993: 107-126; cf. Wilczewski, 2010: 145-146).

Textual pictures of events are not homogenous, their limits are not well defined but they may overlap – though variously, depending on the level considered. For instance, if we agree that the most common demarking criterion for reading a certain newspaper is its profile, the outlook presented by the editorial staff and journalists, which is shared by the reader, we can *a priori* assume that facts, events and their participants will be described and commented on according to the ideological stance of the paper. The pragmatic aspect of communication,

which takes place between the journalist and reader, the journalist's will to incorporate, on the one hand, their views and opinions into the text and, on the other, the reader's subconscious expectations of the ideological shape of the information presented in the text, impose, to some extent, a mode of creating a textual image of events (acceptability, a consent given by the reader to the sender of information, who organizes the textual world, seems to be a crucial factor in the process of building this world; cf. Kajtoch, 2008: 14-15). What we mean here is, above all, the role of cognitive perspective presented by the receivers of information, the way they see and comprehend the world.

In the light of cultural pragmatics, we assume that this perspective does not have to correspond exactly to the objective picture of reality for such factors as egocentrism or anthropocentrism (in other words: a social and psychological feature of functional and pragmatic views of such a linguistic object as text, cf. Leszczak, 2008: 455-456) affect its particular, exceptional conceptualization and categorization (cf. Pachocińska, 2008: 104).

### 3. 'Odyssey Dawn' in the "Washington Post"

On Monday 21<sup>st</sup> March, *WP* published four extensive articles on 'Odyssey Dawn', which altogether totaled 4,953 words. The daily concentrated on four aspects of the Libyan conflict, which indicate polarization of the characters. The U.S. role in imposing a no-fly zone and the reaction of the Arab world to what is happening in Libya is exposed. Yet even if other countries' participation in the operation is mentioned, it is not treated in line with the significance of the U.S.A. (which is proven by the fact that the comments and opinions of other members of the international coalition are ignored in the process of profiling the event).

#### *Profile 1. Imposition of a no-fly zone over Libya*

<b>Superstructure categories</b>	<b>Content</b>
<b>Author</b>	Finn P. & Jaffe, G.
<b>Superheadline</b>	<i>Turmoil in the Middle East</i>
<b>Headline I</b>	<i>U.S. jets strike Gaddafi's ground forces</i>
<b>Headline II</b>	<i>Jets strike Libyan troops advancing on Benghazi</i>
<b>Subheadline I</b>	<i>Air defences are pummeled</i>
<b>Subheadline I</b>	<i>Libyan leader promises 'long, drawn-out war'</i>
<b>Main Event</b>	U.S. and allied warplanes pound Libya's air defenses on Sunday and launch deadly strikes against Gaddafi's ground forces.
<b>Global sense</b>	While coalition forces continue an effective attack on Libya's air defenses, the aims and objectives of the mission are being broadly discussed.
<b>Commentary</b>	<u>R. M. Gates' words (U.S. Secretary of Defense):</u> According to Gates, the intervention should not target Gaddafi personally and exceed the

	mandate given by the U.N. Security Council. A primary objectives to impose a no-fly zone over Libya and to prevent Gaddafi from killing “his own people”. Libyans will have to solve this problem themselves.
--	---

The first aspect of the Libyan operation refers to actions aimed at imposing a no-fly zone. In the strategic elements of textual superstructure, the reader gets to know about the fight between the U.S. forces and Gaddafi’s forces; the support of British and French air forces is only mentioned. This is why the United States perceived as the most important Western character, responsible for the success of the mission. The course of the bombardments, their efficiency and power, and the deaths of Libyan civilians (the last argument is advanced by the Arab League) raise questions about the objectives of the intervention. This matter sets the operation’s supporters and American politicians at variance, especially Republicans who criticize Obama’s administration. Arguments against the coalition’s actions are either rebutted by American military officials (who assure the media that the operation is being conducted according to the guidelines of the U.N.’s resolution), or Gaddafi’s threats are quoted, so that an atmosphere of constant danger and threat is created, which de facto legitimizes the intervention. Moreover, the high efficiency of the coalition’s actions in Libya, resulting in the paralysis of the Libyan air defense system, proves that the operation is being conducted according to the plan, as it is believed to stabilize the situation in the region.

*Profile 2. The U.S. role in the operation*

<b>Superstructure categories</b>	<b>Content</b>
<b>Author</b>	Deyoung, K. & Finn, P.
<b>Superheadline</b>	<i>The U.S. Mission</i>
<b>Headline I, p. A1</b>	<i>Questions are raised about involvement, goals</i>
<b>Headline II, p. A14</b>	<i>U.S.’s ‘supporting role’ is questioned after strong attacks against Libya</i>
<b>Main Event</b>	Members of Congress, outside experts and reporters ask President Obama and his administration questions about criteria of the U.S. involvement in the mission in Libya and its objectives.
<b>Global sense</b>	Administration officials come under a barrage of questions about the extent of the involvement in the operation and its duration. In spite of official assurances of limiting the mission in scope and duration, experts claim it will expand.
<b>Commentary</b>	Some analysts note that former administrations also assured Americans of a short scope of wars in Afghanistan or Iraq, and claim that saying that the mission is going to be quick is the worst thing to do. Probably its range will expand as the coalition will not be satisfied unless Gaddafi’s regime is removed from power.

The matter of the ambiguity of objectives is discussed further in the second article. Congressmen, American journalists and experts ask Obama's administration about the factual role the U.S.A. performs in the intervention, which is indicated via "ironic inverted commas" (see: Klemperer 1983) in the heading: *U.S.'s 'supporting role' is questioned after strong attacks against Libya*. In this article, three areas of interest for American public opinion are discussed in the context of the U.S.'s participation in the intervention, namely: 1) level of involvement, 2) mission objectives and 3) communication not only between Obama's administration and Congressmen, but also society. The context of the events presented in the text shows that explanations given by administration and military officials seem satisfactory for Democrats:

(1) Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman Carl Levin (D-Mich.), on "Meet the Press", said Obama had allayed early concerns about possible "mission creep". The operation, he said, "has been very carefully limited", Levin said.

In turn, a substantial part of the allegations are leveled at the president by Republicans:

(2) Sen. Richard G. Lugar (R-Ind.) said that Obama should seek a declaration of war from Congress and questioned who would emerge in control of Libya. "We really have not discovered what is in Libya that we are trying to support [...]. Obviously, the people that are against Gaddafi, but who?"

(3) Rep. Howard P. "Buck" McKeon (R-Calif.), chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, voiced concern about "the absence of clear political objectives for our country" and the risk of "entrenching the United States in a humanitarian mission whose scope and duration are not known at this point and cannot be controlled by us".

In the light of all the arguments provided by both sides it is clear, beyond any shadow of doubt, that American involvement in the operation has become a bone of contention in American politics; in any case, this conclusion is supported in the comments of both Democrats and Republicans. Yet we have to note that opinions of experts are mentioned in a commentary. These suggest that quick ending of the mission is not advisable, which eventually again legitimizes the actions of the American administration:

(4) "Low-balling expectations is probably penny-wise and pound-foolish," said Thomas Donnelly, director of the Center for Defense Studies at the American Enterprise Institute. "The worst thing you can do, like Afghanistan or like Iraq, is say that this is going to be short, sweet and easy. That's a possibility, even a probability," in Libya, he said, "but it's not a certainty."

*Profile 3. Military activity of the West in Libya from the Arab viewpoint*

Superstructure categories	Content
<b>Author</b>	Cody, E.
<b>Superheadline</b>	<i>Turmoil in the Middleeast</i>
<b>Headline</b>	<i>Arab group decries West's broad air campaign in Libya</i>
<b>Subheadline</b>	<i>Intense bombings go far beyond scope of no-fly zone, league says</i>
<b>Main Event</b>	The Arab League secretary general, Amr Moussa, deplors the broad scope of the U.S.-European bombing campaign in Libya, and calls a meeting to reconsider Arab approval of the intervention.
<b>Global sense</b>	Both the Arab League and some of the world's leaders condemn the intervention in Libya and suggest that the West wants to take control over Libya's oil reserves.

The third aspect of the intervention refers to the point of view of the Arab League. This organization denounces the operation, as it exceeds the U.N.'s mandate, which is signaled in the heading: *Arab group decries West's broad air campaign in Libya*, and elucidated in the subheading: *Intense bombings go far beyond scope of no-fly zone, league says*.

The events presented in the text show how the League's supporting attitude towards the mission changed. The main reason for reconsidering Arab approval of the intervention are media war releases on Arab television which prove bombings and missile attacks to be too intense and exceeding the mandate provided by the resolution. *WP* suggests that a shift away from the support may help the League not "lose face" in the eyes of the Arab world. Nevertheless, it is stressed that this part of the world had not taken responsibility for the situation in Libya, and that was used by the Western coalition as justification:

(5) "The fact that most Arab and Muslim leaders did not take responsibility opened the way for Western intervention in Libya," declared Hasan Nasrallah, Hezbollah's leader, in a video speech Sunday to his followers. "This opens the way for foreign interventions in every Arab country. It brings us back to the days of occupation, colonization and partition."

*Profile 4. The operation and the reaction of Gaddafi's supporters*

Superstructure categories	Content
<b>Author</b>	Sly, L.
<b>Superheadline</b>	<i>Turmoil in the Middle East</i>
<b>Headline</b>	<i>Missile strikes building in compound where Gaddafi lives</i>
<b>Subheadline</b>	<i>Attack fuels anger among supporters of Libyan leader</i>
<b>Main Event I</b>	A missile strikes a building on Sunday night in the compound where Gaddafi lives.
<b>Wydarzenia poprzedzające</b>	The U.N. Security Council votes on Thursday for a resolution allowing to enforce a no-fly zone. Earlier the same day, Gaddafi warns on state television that the Western and Arab countries (against him) will face a "long war".
<b>Main Event II</b>	Libyan state media report that 48 people were killed and many injured in allied strikes overnight Saturday. Among them were people who died when civilian buildings were hit.

<b>Global sense</b>	On Sunday, the building where Gaddafi lives was struck with a missile fired by coalition forces, which resulted in the death of Libyan civilians and caused anger among Gaddafi's supporters.
---------------------	---

The last aspect of military actions in Libya is the reaction of Gaddafi's supporters. The reason for their rage is presented in the heading: *Missile strikes building in compound where Gaddafi lives*. Nonetheless, it is stressed in the text that air strikes result from the U.N. resolution which, apart from patrolling the sky over Libya, gives authority to a military intervention.

The article informs us about the Libyan state media which report that many civilians are killed and wounded in the attacks. However, this news is depreciated as it is noted that the state media are used by Gaddafi's propaganda. All in all, the reasons for the rage of Gaddafi's supporters are called into doubt.

#### 4. 'Odyssey Dawn' in the "Washington Times"

On Monday (21<sup>st</sup> March), *WT* published three articles on 'Odyssey Dawn', totaling 3,608 words. Three major aspects of the operation are presented: 1) imposition of a no-fly zone over Libya (under the American command), 2) the point of view of American politicians, and 3) the Arab viewpoint.

As in *WP*, profiling of the intervention in *WT* results in the polarization of a scene whose main participants are the United States and the Arab League. In other words, we observe a conflict between the Western world, embodied by the U.S., and the Arab world, represented metonymically by the Arab League. This picture of the conflict seems to be simplified, limited, as the role of European countries is merely mentioned.

##### *Profile 1. Imposition of a no-fly zone over Libya (under U.S. command)*

<b>Superstructure categories</b>	<b>Content</b>
<b>Author</b>	Waterman, Sh. & Gertz, B.
<b>Superheadline</b>	<i>Libya</i>
<b>Headline I, p. 1</b>	<i>Coalition batters Libyan's defenses</i>
<b>Headline II, p. A15</b>	<i>Libya</i>
<b>Subheadline</b>	<i>U.S. leads 1<sup>st</sup> phase of military campaign</i>
<b>Main Event</b>	U.S.-led military forces destroy most of Libya's air defenses when imposing a no-fly zone.
<b>Global sense</b>	Operation 'Odyssey Dawn', led by the U.S., results in a success, i.e. the no-fly zone is enforced.

The first aspect of the Libyan operation refers to the way it is being performed, i.e. by imposing a no-fly zone. However, unlike *WP*, where the leading role of the U.S. is stressed, not only does *WT* emphasize (in the initial part of the news from the first page) the American role in military action, but also the British one.

Senses included in subsequent elements of superstructure show a leading, positive role of the U.S.A. in the mission. In the background of the event, the actions of the Americans are strongly legitimized, as they are authorized by the U.N. resolution (paragraph 6), reduce the threat in Benghazi, and are aimed to protect Libyans from Gaddafi (paragraphs 7, 8), and support humanitarian efforts in Libya (paragraph 8). Moreover, full involvement of coalition members is expected to help the Americans accomplish their objectives (paragraph 9):

(6) Adm. Gortney said U.S., French and British aircraft had already struck Col. Gaddafi's ground forces near Benghazi. It was the dictator's promise to show "no mercy, no pity" to the population there that triggered the U.N. Security Council resolution last week that authorized "all means" against Libyan forces engaged in targeting civilians.

(7) "Benghazi is not completely safe from attack, but it is certainly under less threat than it was yesterday," Adm. Gortney said, noting that there were no reports of civilian casualties.

(8) "The goals of this campaign right now again are limited, and it isn't about seeing [Col. Gaddafi] go," Adm. [Mullen](#) said. "It's about supporting the [United Nations](#) resolution, which talked to limiting or eliminating his ability to kill his own people as well as support the humanitarian efforts."

(9) Adm. Gortney said more Arab nations are expected to announce their role in the military action, called Operation Odyssey Dawn, and that an international coalition command would take control in the next several days.

Besides, in the description of the events preceding the air-raid, Obama's moral obligation to protect Libyans against Col. Gaddafi is pointed out:

(10) In announcing the strikes a day earlier he [Obama — M.W.] said the operation was launched reluctantly and with limited objectives. "We cannot stand idly by when a tyrant tells his people there will be no mercy," Mr. Obama said, [...].

### *Profile 2. 'Odyssey Dawn' from the point of view of American politicians*

<b>Superstructure categories</b>	<b>Content</b>
<b>Author</b>	McLaughlin, S.
<b>Headline I</b>	<i>Lawmakers concerned about U.S. role in Libya</i>
<b>Headline II</b>	<i>Congress</i>
<b>Main Event</b>	Members of Congress comment on the military intervention in Libya.
<b>Preceding Events</b>	President Barack Obama states on Saturday that he advocates the operation. He emphasizes that he has no choice and has to back up the U.N. resolution. He calls the mission



	‘supporting’.
<b>Global Sense</b>	Members of Congress criticize the Obama administration for the intervention in Libya.

The second text from *WT* presents Congressmen’s opinions about the participation of American forces in the conflict, which is, anyway, indicated in two headlines (*Lawmakers concerned about U.S. role in Libya* and *Congress*). In the background of the main event, i.e. in the discussion on the intervention, Republican and Democrat arguments are advanced. Not surprisingly, most negative opinions are stated by Republicans — political opponents of President Obama.

The sender presents Obama’s potential counter-arguments to political allegations in a relatively objective way, since in the preceding events the President’s motives for his decision are explained. Political allegations and questions suggest that Republicans support broadening U.S. participation in the mission and the President is mainly criticized for ineffective communication with Congress:

(11) But the main focus of concern on Capitol Hill is the level of the American commitment — with some saying the President has acted too slowly and must expand the U.S. role, while others, including [GOP House Speaker John A. Boehner](#), arguing that the President must “better explain” what kind of conflict he has committed the U.S. to fight.

(12) “The President is the commander in chief, but the administration has a responsibility to define for the American people, the [Congress](#) and our troops what the mission in [Libya](#) is,” said [Mr. Boehner](#), Ohio Republican. “Before any further military commitments are made, the administration must do a better job of communicating to the American people and to [Congress](#) about our mission in [Libya](#) and how it will be achieved.”

(13) But [Mr. Obama](#) also faced criticism from [Sen. Lindsey Graham](#), South Carolina Republican, who said the President had been tardy to date in acting against Col. Gaddafi, and that Washington should assert more leadership of the international coalition patrolling the skies over [Libya](#).

### *Profile 3. ‘Odyssey Dawn’ from the Arab viewpoint*

<b>Superstructure categories</b>	<b>Content</b>
<b>Author</b>	Sen, A. K.
<b>Superheadline</b>	<i>Libya</i>
<b>Headline</b>	<i>Arab League reconsiders action against Libya</i>
<b>Main Event</b>	The leader of the Arab League condemns military action and calls a meeting to reconsider Arab support for the mission.
<b>Global Sense</b>	The course of the intervention is broadly commented on, owing to certain purposeful actions of Gaddafi’s supporters, and raises serious doubts, according to Secretary General Amr Moussa. The Arab League intends to reconsider the mission and its objectives.
<b>Commentary</b>	Ali Aujali says that Gaddafi’s regime has been collecting the bodies of Libyan victims and placing them at “strategic points” to blame international forces.

The last aspect of the operation highlights the Arab League's viewpoint on the course of military actions in Libya. In the headline *Arab League reconsiders action against Libya*, the author notes that this organization criticizes the idea of a no-fly zone and revises its support for the U.N. resolution. However, the commentary, closing the textual frame, disowns the relevance of arguments provided by the Secretary-General of the League as Libya's ambassador in Washington, Ali Aujali, says that:

(14) The regime had been collecting the bodies of its victims since the start of the uprising and was now placing them at "strategic points" in order to blame the deaths on the international coalition.

Moreover, he points out that Amr Moussa speaks for himself, not in the name of the whole League, which in fact endorsed a U.N. resolution and authorized the attacks against Gaddafi's forces.

## 5. Textual axiologization of the characters

Textual image of events, treated as a variant part of the linguistic worldview, may be considered within the framework of a method which allows us to reconstruct, on the basis of recurrent word collocations used by a particular social group in a specific communication area (Kiklewicz, 2006: 334), a subjective, individual manner of perceiving reality.

This subjective way of watching a section of reality, which in that case is the event discussed, is regarded as the perspective in which the dailies *WP* and *WT* conceptualize the event. We assume that the textual axiologization of characters gives a clue to the author's attitude towards participants in a certain event or towards his/her intentions to present them to the reader. Obviously, it exerts a considerable impact on the way events are profiled, which may either serve to sustain some characters' actions in a discourse, their legitimization, or quite the contrary — their depreciation or disaffirmation.

In *WP*, 35 excerpts have been specified in which event participants are assessed; in *WT*, there are 43 such excerpts. Table 1 shows number and type of axiologization (positive vs. negative). We need to note here that if several axiological opinions of the same kind on the same character appeared in a given excerpt, even though expressed by different means (e.g. via lexis, implication, presupposition, etc.), only one assessment was marked then — like in the example below:

“He’s a thug. He’s a cagey guy. He’s a survivor. We know that,” Mullen said (Finn/Jaffe, *WP*, p. A1) (emphasis — M.W.).

However, if both positive and negative cases of axiologization occurred in one fragment, then — regardless of the number of rhetorical devices — only one positive and one negative assessment were marked. We could thus treat a paragraph as a demarcation criterion of axiologization. This procedure was meant to objectify the analysis results so that any assessing devices that had not been noticed (e.g. those expressed implicitly) could not affect the final result. The object of our interest was not in the least the number of all possible opinions, assessments (both explicit and implicit), but excerption of the most evident ones for a common reader.

Numerical presentation of the assessed cases serves to show which characters are exposed, highlighted in textual reality, and which ones are rather downplayed by the author.

Table 1. Axiologization of all the characters in *WP* and *WT*

Characters	Axiologization		Total
	Positive	negative	
Assessed in both dailies			
	<i>WP/WT</i>	<i>WP/WT</i>	<i>WP/WT</i>
Gaddafi	0/0	10/15	10/15
International coalition	5/5	2/5	7/10
Obama and his administration	2/1	4/11	6/12
Arab League	3/1	0/2	3/3
Assessed only in <i>WP</i>			
The West	0	4	4
U.S.A.	1	1	2
Arab leaders	0	1	1
Qatar	1	0	1
Libyan media	0	1	1
Assessed only in <i>WT</i>			
Turkey and Arab countries	0	2	2
Moussa	0	2	2
Libyan rebels	1	0	1
Total	<i>WP/WT</i>	<i>WP/WT</i>	<i>WP/WT</i>
	12/8	23/37	35/45

Most evaluating opinions pertain to Muammar Gaddafi, the international coalition and its leader, President Obama. Not surprisingly, Gaddafi is assessed entirely negatively and the coalition mostly positively. However, it is interesting that axiologization of the U.S.A. is rather ambivalent but that of Obama is pejorative, especially in *WT*, which is a conservative daily. Apparently, the reason for that may be the fact that even though ‘Odyssey Dawn’ is regarded as a desirable event (especially if we take outcries in Egypt or Tunisia into consideration), Obama

is criticized for ineffective communication to Americans and to Congress about the operation and its objectives. Anyway, this point is raised by Republicans and reiterated by *WT*.

Although negative opinions prevail in both dailies, *WT* displays a greater tendency to highlight pejorative aspects of event participants, as the proportion of positive assessments to the negative ones is: in *WP* +12/-23 (+34,28%/-65,71%) and in *WT* +8/-37 (+17,77%/-82,22%).

## 6. Conclusions

A textual analysis of news allows the researcher to gain an insight into a text structure and to excerpt both explicit and implicit strategies employed by the sender to, first, provide the receiver with already “profiled” information and, second, keep it up or amplify it in such a manner that all the values and norms accompanying the information be incorporated into the receiver’s value system, outlook, and, third, to reproduce these values and norms in the discourse. The profiled information serves as a powerful tool for transmitting an image of the event perceived by the sender but read, deciphered and acquired by the receiver via certain discursive mechanisms.

Except for specific images of the operation ‘Odyssey Dawn’, resulting from the processes of profiling events and axiologizing its participants, we may also draw a few conclusions of a more general nature:

1. We observe a relationship between category cohesion (within the limits of textual superstructure) and transparency of a given event profile (i.e. a specific sender’s attitude towards the event and its participants or a viewpoint the receiver ought to take when observing the event and its participants). The greater correspondence between categories, the more the profile is amplified and its role reinforced in the textual image of the event and in discourse itself because accepting and adopting a given viewpoint may influence the way we perceive other events with the same participants (this is the reason, *inter alia*, for ascribing the adjective *opinion-forming* to some newspapers or media in general).

2. If the senses of subsequent categories do not correspond with one another, the profile transparency is distorted, which affects its reception negatively or may even challenge it. In that case, we deal with persuasion as other senses are postulated in the elements of textual superstructure (headline, lead, main event, etc.) and others add up to a global sense.

3. The kind of axiologization of participants creates their image in the eye of the reader, but it can also indicate the sender’s desire to attract the news. For example, we have noted in

the material analyzed a prevailing number of negative opinions (in the case of evaluating the participants), which proves the rule “bad news is good news”.

4. Axiologization of event participants reflects the sender's attitude towards them but also (indirectly) towards the event discussed — as they take part in it. We can thus conclude that the kind of profile which the sender chooses is dependent on their emotional and ideological attitude towards particular characters. Projecting positive images of characters frequently results in a positive image of events they participate in and, on the contrary, their role in an event may be depreciated through a negative image and may also legitimize actions taken against them by other participants.

### References:

- Cody, E. (2011): “Arab group decries West's broad air campaign in Libya”, *Washington Post* 21.03.2011: A13.
- Deyoung K. & Finn, P. (2011): “Questions are raised about involvement, goals”, *Washington Post* 21.03.2011: 1, A14.
- Dijk, van T. (1993): “Discourse and Cognition in Society”, in D. Crowley & D. Mitchell (eds): *Communication Theory Today*. Oxford: Pergamon Press: 107-126.
- Finn P. & Jaffe, G. (2011): “U.S. jets strike Gaddafi's ground forces”, *Washington Post* 21.03.2011: 1, A12.
- Kajtoch, W. (2008): *Językowe obrazy świata i człowieka w prasie młodzieżowej i alternatywnej. Vol. 1*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Kiklewicz, A. (2006): *Język. Komunikacja. Wiedza*. Mińsk: Prawo i Ekonomika.
- Klemperer, V. (1983): *LTI. Notatnik filologa*. Kraków — Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Leszczak, O. (2008): „Ontologia antropologiczna funkcjonalizmu pragmatycznego: doświadczenie językowe — działalność językowa — dyskurs — język — mowa — wydarzenie mowne — działalność mowna — tekst”, in A. Kiklewicz & J. Dębowski (eds): *Język poza granicami języka. Teoria i metodologia współczesnych nauk o języku*. Olsztyn: Instytut Dziennikarstwa i Komunikacji Społecznej UWM w Olsztynie: 453-463.
- McLaughlin, S. (2011): “Lawmakers concerned about U.S. role in Libya”, *Washington Times* 21.03.2011: 1, A15.

- Nowak, P. & Tokarski, R. (2007): "Medialna wizja świata a kreatywność językowa", in P. Nowak & R. Tokarski (eds): *Kreowanie światów w języku mediów*. Lublin: UMCS: 9-35.
- Pachocińska, E. (2008): "Problemy współczesnej pragmatyki", in A. Kiklewicz & J. Dębowski (eds): *Język poza granicami języka. Teoria i metodologia współczesnych nauk o języku*. Olsztyn: Instytut Dziennikarstwa i Komunikacji Społecznej UWM w Olsztynie: 101-116.
- "Resolution 1973". (2011): *Security Council Approves 'No-Fly Zone' over Libya, Authorizing 'All Necessary Measures' to Protect Civilians, by Vote of 10 in Favour with 5 Abstentions*. [Retrieved on 9<sup>th</sup> Dec., 2011]. <<http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2011/sc10200.doc.htm>>.
- Sen, A. K. (2011): "Arab League reconsiders action against Libya", *Washington Times* 21.03.2011: A15.
- Sly, L. (2011): "Missile strikes building in compound where Gaddafi lives", *Washington Times* 21.03.2011: A13.
- Waterman, Sh. & Gertz, B. (2011): "Coalition batters Libyan's defenses", *Washington Times* 21.03.2011: 1, A15.
- Wilczewski, M. (2010): "Tekstowa rekonstrukcja opozycji liberalny-konserwatywny w prasie polskiej i amerykańskiej na przykładzie wiadomości relacjonujących problem sekularyzacji szkół", *Zeszyty Prasoznawcze 3-4 (203-204)*:145-160.

**The author**

**Michał WILCZEWSKI** works in the Institute of Journalism and Social Communication at University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn, where he has graduated from English Philology (M.A.) and linguistics (Ph.D.). Main scientific and research interests: cognitive semantics, ethnolinguistics and discourse analysis of the press. Email: [michal.wilczewski@uwm.edu.pl](mailto:michal.wilczewski@uwm.edu.pl)