

Constructing Content and Delimiting Choice: International Coverage of KAL Flight 007

DAVID L. PALETZ and C. DANIELLE VINSON

*Department of Political Science
Duke University
Durham, NC 27706, U.S.A.*

ABSTRACT: For more than two decades, international debate over a New World Communication and Information Order has called attention to the question of whether or not newspapers around the world are limited by the alleged dominance of the international news flow by the Western media. Looking at how six newspapers from around the world covered the 1983 downing of KAL Flight 007 by the Soviet Union, we find that papers are in fact able to shape their coverage of major international events through their choice of providers, their selection and interpretation of subjects and facts, and their use of headlines to emphasize and frame information. Thus, newspapers can delimit choice to suit their own needs and goals.

KEY WORDS: Media, New World Communication and Information Order, newspaper, choice, international incidents.

The international debate over a New World Communication and Information Order that has raged for almost two decades has called attention to the question of whether or not newspapers around the world are limited in the ways they cover international incidents by the alleged dominance of the international news flow by the Western media. To bring empirical data to bear on this issue, we look at how six newspapers – the *Durham Morning Herald* (North Carolina), the *Daily Times* (Lagos, Nigeria), *Dawn* (Pakistan), the *Times of India*, *Nuevo Diario* (Nicaragua), and *Pravda* – cover the downing of Korean Airlines Flight 007 by the Soviet Union in 1983. We analyze all the articles published in a one-month period, beginning with the shootdown. Our dissection of these articles is based on an elaborate content analysis code that includes headline orientation, story subjects and their placement. The subject that appears closest to the beginning of the article and/or most frequently is coded as the primary subject. We also distinguish between secondary and tertiary subjects.

We place particular emphasis on the orientation and prominence of the “facts” and assertions included in each paper’s coverage of the incident. Facts were coded as prominent if they appeared in the first third of the article, and they were labelled “included” if they appeared in the remainder of the article. Some “facts” of the incident, such as the number of passengers killed were undisputed. Other “facts” were agreed upon, for example the length of time the Korean airliner flew over the Soviet Union before it was shot down, but interpreted differently: for President Reagan it showed calculated brutality; for the Soviet

leaders, extraordinary forbearance. And there were areas of conflict where the "facts" were in dispute, such as weather conditions and resulting visibility.

Our research actually encompasses nineteen newspapers which we divide into six categories of coverage based on their headline orientation and what subjects and facts they include or omit as well as the language and context used to frame subjects and facts. Each of the six papers we have chosen to focus on in this article represents one of these categories of coverage. The *Durham Morning Herald* was favorable to the U.S. and unfavorable to the U.S.S.R. The *Daily Times* (Lagos) was unfavorable to the U.S.S.R. while de-emphasizing the role of the U.S. *Dawn's* coverage was unfavorable to both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. With the most balanced reporting, the *Times of India's* coverage is mixed with stories that were favorable and unfavorable to both superpowers. Nicaragua's *Nuevo Diario* was unfavorable to the U.S., eschewing many of the facts in favor of scathing rhetorical attacks. Finally, *Pravda* reported the incident in a way that was unfavorable to the U.S. and favorable to the U.S.S.R.

THE DURHAM MORNING HERALD

The *Durham Morning Herald* used headlines, subjects, and facts primarily to criticize the Soviet action while emphasizing the U.S. leadership role in responding to the incident. Coverage accepted the U.S. version of the event over the Soviet account.

The *Herald* ran eighty-eight stories during the month following the shootdown. Forty-three percent of its headlines were either favorable to the U.S. or unfavorable to the U.S.S.R. On the second day of coverage, the headline "Soviets Shoot Down Jetliner: Cool Pilot Fires Rocket at Craft" (Sept. 2) stretched across the top of page one. Later coverage focused on the negative reactions toward the Soviet Union: "Americans Express Outrage" (Sept. 4) and "US Demands Compensation" (Sept. 13). Headlines favorable to the U.S. highlighted American leadership of world reaction as in the case of "Reagan Seeks World Support" (Sept. 4).

Only six percent of the *Herald's* headlines were unfavorable to the U.S. or favorable to the U.S.S.R. Those that were dealt with the Soviet charges that the U.S. used the airliner to spy.

The remaining headlines were either neutral or ambiguous. Examples include "Decision High Level: Expert" (Sept. 3) which refers to the authorities who ordered the Soviet pilot to fire on the airliner and "Wreckage From Jetliner Sighted" (Sept. 9) which reports on the progress of the search operations.

The *Durham Morning Herald* reported on subjects that were favorable to the U.S. or that were from the U.S. perspective more frequently than it covered those favorable to the U.S.S.R. The U.S. explanation of and response to the shootdown was reported slightly more often than the Soviet explanation and response. But even when the Soviet explanation was provided, it was discredited. In the article "Gromyko: Soviet Act Justified" (Sept. 8), Foreign Secretary Gromyko's claim

that "his government was perfectly justified in shooting down [the airliner which]... violated 'sacred' Soviet borders while on 'special duty' for Washington" was followed by a direct quote from U.S. Secretary of State Shultz: "Falsehoods have been continuous, and juggling of the facts is too mild a word for the way in which the Soviet Union has responded...."

Twenty-five percent of the coverage concerned world reaction, U.N. discussions and arms talks, and protests and boycotts which were depicted as unfavorable to the U.S.S.R. "Soviet Vodka Off Shelves in Protest" (Sept. 3) reported the anti-Soviet mood of the U.S., while "Pilots Want Service Halted" (Sept. 4) covered the Airline Pilots Association's request that service to Soviet airliners be stopped.

At the same time, subjects that might have reflected negatively on the U.S. – the presence of the U.S. spy plane in the vicinity of the Korean airliner and questions concerning how the plane wandered off course and why the U.S. was not aware of it – were the primary focus in only five percent of the articles.

In its coverage of the undisputed facts, the *Herald* included the facts favorable to the U.S. much more frequently and more prominently than those unfavorable to the U.S. That the Soviets shot the plane down was included in ninety-five percent of the articles, prominently in seventy-two percent. That the Soviet pilot aimed directly at the airliner was mentioned in sixty percent of the articles, and the number killed in seventy-five percent. In contrast, the Korean airliner's violation of Soviet airspace appeared in only thirty-five percent of the articles and that it flew over sensitive military areas received even less attention.

The *Herald* devoted little space to facts subject to interpretation; but when it did, they were usually presented from the U.S. perspective. One article quoted unnamed officials as saying "the Soviets had tracked it [the airliner] for 2.5 hours – ample opportunity to know it was a civilian flight."¹

Although the coverage of the areas of conflict appeared to favor the Soviet explanation with Soviet claims included more frequently than the U.S. positions, the *Herald* transformed these "facts" by refuting them or using language that calls them into question. Soviet assertions that the Soviet pilot fired 120 warning shots and that the Korean airliner flown with an American spy plane were called "absurd" by White House spokesman Speakes.² Gromyko's justification of the shootdown, which included claims that the airliner flew without lights and failed to respond to warnings, was deemed "totally inadequate" by Speakes in the article "Cool Pilot Fires Rocket At Craft" (Sept. 2). Thus, the *Durham Morning Herald's* coverage was favorable to the U.S. and unfavorable to the U.S.S.R.

THE DAILY TIMES (LAGOS)

The *Daily Times* was also very critical of the Soviet Union, but it paid little heed to the role of the U.S. in the incident; nor did it wholeheartedly embrace the U.S. explanation of the shootdown. Running only twenty-one stories on the incident, the *Daily Times's* headlines were either primarily unfavorable to the U.S.S.R.

(twenty-nine percent) or superficially neutral (sixty-one percent). Those unfavorable to the U.S.S.R. usually did not mention the U.S.. "South Korean Leader Accuses Russia" (Sept. 5) and "French Pilots To Boycott Moscow" (Sept. 9) placed nations other than the U.S. in the forefront of opposition to the U.S.S.R.

The neutral or ambiguous headlines became clearly unfavorable to the Soviet Union when read in the context of the article. For example, "Debris Found" (Sept. 6) topped a story about Japan's dissatisfaction with the Soviet response to the incident.

The primary subjects of the *Daily Times'* articles were generally unfavorable to the U.S.S.R. Thirty-eight percent of the stories concerned world reaction and protests and boycotts against the U.S.S.R.; but unlike the *Durham Morning Herald*, the *Daily Times* focused more on countries other than the U.S. In the article "South Korean Leader Accuses Russia" (Sept. 5), it was the South Korean President accusing the Soviet Union of a "most barbarous attack," not President Reagan. And "Protest Move Against Russia" (Sept. 15) provided an account of West Germany's ban on Aeroflot. The *Daily Times* did not get around to the topic of the U.S. as the leader of opinion until September 12 with "Reagan Retaliates Against USSR."

Facts unfavorable to the U.S.S.R. were used more often than those favorable to the U.S.S.R., or the latter were refuted or discredited in some way. The coverage stressed that the Soviets shot down the plane (ninety-five percent) and that 269 people were killed (sixty-seven percent). The airliner's venture into Soviet territory appeared in only twenty-nine percent of the articles.

The interpretable facts included in the *Daily Times* were used against the U.S.S.R. The reference to a similar 1978 incident and the fact that KAL 007 was tracked for two and one half hours came in a report of President Reagan's televised address.³ In the statement, Reagan prefaced his reminder of the 1978 shooting with "This is not the first time the Soviet Union has shot and hit a civilian airliner when it overflowed its territory." And he described the KAL as flying "a straight line course at 30–35,000 feet" for the two and half hours the Soviets tracked it and claimed that "[o]nly civilian airliners fly in such a manner."⁴

In areas of conflict, the *Daily Times* often used assertions from the U.S. description of events. However, it did not appear to be completely convinced that the U.S. version was true. For example, the involvement of a U.S. spy plane was reported from the Soviet perspective with no U.S. counterclaims. Furthermore, the *Daily Times* avoided many of the contradictory aspects of the incident by leaving them out completely – clear vs. cloudy night and plane's light on vs. lights off debates were most notable for their absence.

DAWN (PAKISTAN)

Dawn's coverage was critical of both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. and skeptical of their explanations for the incident so that neither account was presented as convincing.

Of its twenty articles, thirty percent were unfavorable to the U.S.S.R., fifteen percent were unfavorable to the U.S., and fifty-five percent were neutral or ambiguous. Those unfavorable to the Soviet Union were generally related to world reaction: "Anti-Soviet protest in South Korea" (Sept. 5). Headlines concerning the U.S. spy plane were inherently critical of the U.S. as in the case of "US admits its spy plane's presence" (Sept. 6). "Urgent UN Council meeting today" (Sept. 3) was characteristic of the neutral headlines which did not provide enough information to determine their orientation. *Dawn* framed its subjects in ways that were critical of the superpowers. Twenty percent of its coverage was devoted to world reaction that condemned the Soviet Union. And when the Soviet explanation and reaction was reported, the paper undermined the Soviet credibility. In "Urgent UN Council meeting today" (Sept. 3), *Dawn* reported that President Reagan "has rejected Moscow's account of the incident" before the paper printed the Soviet explanation in the same article.

Unlike the other two papers, *Dawn* was highly critical of the U.S. on aspects other than the spy plane. Going beyond the Soviet claims that the U.S. was "fanning hysteria over the [loss of the airliner]"⁵, *Dawn* criticized the U.S. action in the United Nations discussions. "USSR vetoes resolution" (Sept. 14) highlighted the inability of the U.S. to gain more than the minimum number of votes to pass a UN resolution condemning the Soviets and chastised U.S. Ambassador Jeanne Kirkpatrick for failing to consult with non-aligned diplomats.

While its coverage of the undisputed facts and those open to interpretation did not significantly differ from the previous papers, *Dawn* did deal with the areas of conflict in a different way. On the issue of whether or not the airliner was spying or thought to be spying, *Dawn* reported the unconfirmed, contradictory claims of both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. Where the superpowers directly contradicted each other concerning KAL's lights, warning shots, and whether or not the airliner responded to its pursuers, the Soviet perspective⁶ was followed by a U.S. claim that the Soviets were aware of two planes on radar and that they should have been able to distinguish the airliner. And in later articles, the Soviet accusations that the U.S. was spying were called lies by the U.S. Secretary of State.⁷ Neither version of the incident appeared trustworthy.

THE TIMES OF INDIA

The sixty-seven articles in the *Times of India* reported information that was favorable and unfavorable to both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. The headlines were often unfavorable to the U.S., especially on the subject of the spy plane and to the U.S.S.R., particularly in terms of world reaction.

Where the paper differed from others was in the greater percentage of headlines that were favorable to one side or the other. Some headlines emphasized the U.S. leadership: "Reagan still willing for summit" (Sept. 13); other headlines justified the Soviet Union's action. For example, "KAL jet was spying: Soviet army chief" (Sept. 10) and "KAL 007: Not such a cold blooded

kill" (Sept. 14) indicated that the Soviets had cause for suspicion, while other headlines like "Border violation will be rebuffed: Russia" (Sept. 7) pointed to the U.S.S.R.'s right to defend its airspace.

While the *Times of India* reported a wide range of subjects associated with the incident, world reaction, including protests and boycotts and the UN discussions, received the most coverage, appearing in 37 percent of its articles. As in other papers, much of this reaction was against the Soviet Union: "Travel curbs by West on Soviets likely" (Sept. 4). But in contrast to other papers, the *Times of India* did not portray world opinion as unified. It reported the difficulty the U.S. encountered in gaining cooperation for the boycotts and the U.N. resolution.⁸

Initially, the *Times of India* gave significant attention to the U.S. reaction and explanation (18 percent) and featured much of the U.S. rhetoric and some explanations, all of which were unfavorable to the U.S.S.R. Subsequently, however, the paper began to present the Soviet response as well. With the introduction of the Soviet perspective, the portrayal of the U.S. became less favorable. Articles like "Tass accuses U.S. of anti-Soviet campaign" (Sept. 5) recast the positive leadership role of the U.S. found in earlier coverage as a more sinister plot to "[mount] a 'world-wide rabid anti-Soviet campaign.'"

Both superpowers' explanations and reactions were reported thereafter with neither receiving purely favorable or unfavorable coverage. The *Times of India* did this by covering one country's explanation of an aspect of the incident and following it several days later with the other country's response. There were also stories in which the superpower reaction or explanation was challenged by criticism from other sources within the same article. "U.S. reprisals against Russia" (Sept. 7) referred to Reagan's reaction, which was reported in the first three paragraphs, as a "non-response."

Points of controversy, the main subject of several articles, also produced mixed impressions of the superpowers. "Contradictions in reports of Korean airlines" (Sept. 10) was an attempt to sort out the information on both sides of the controversy, including evidence that supported and contradicted each explanation. Another story that addressed the unanswered questions in the incident, "Washington failure & Soviet incompetence" (Sept. 13), painted an unflattering picture of both countries.

The *Times of India* included most undisputed facts and those subject to interpretation from both the Soviet and the American perspectives. Likewise, most of the assertions made by the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. in their respective accounts were also reported. Often these contradictory "facts" appeared in the same article. Thus, one story reported the Soviet claims that a U.S. RC-135 was in the same area as the airliner which caused the Soviets to misidentify the KAL as a spy plane; then three paragraphs later quoted U.S. administration officials as saying, "They [the Soviets] could have easily identified it [KAL 007] as an airliner – unless they are so thoroughly incompetent".⁹ There were also articles that assessed the evidence to support or disconfirm the "facts" associated with the points of controversy: "Contradictions in reports of Korean airliner" (Sept. 10). The result was that certain aspects of both versions were validated by

coverage in this category, while other parts of each country's explanation were dismissed as implausible or even untrue.

NUEVO DIARIO (NICARAGUA)

Nuevo Diario obsessively reported stories that created a negative impression of the U.S. Overwhelmingly, its twenty-two headlines were unfavorable to the U.S. Many referred to the Soviet spying charges – “US spy plane flew near 747” (Sept. 6), “US has spied with Airforce One” (Sept. 8), and “USSR accuses: the plane was planned for US to augment tension” (Sept. 12). Others introduced new issues unfavorable to the U.S. – “US could have saved the boeing” (Sept. 4) and “In USA, people doubt Reagan's version of the South Korean plane” (Sept. 18).

The few ambiguous headlines became clearly unfavorable to the U.S. in the overall context of *Nuevo Diario*'s coverage. “Now the looks converge towards US” (Sept. 12) disclosed that Europeans did not believe the U.S. story.

This paper is conspicuous by what it emphasized and omitted. *Nuevo Diario* gave more primary attention to the presence of the U.S. spy plane than any other paper. It pointed out that the U.S. originally omitted this detail from its explanation of what had happened and called this “one more time that the US sacrifices civilians for its ‘strategic’ interests in the hegemonic dream of world domination”.¹⁰

Presenting the Soviet reaction and explanation in eighteen percent of its coverage, *Nuevo Diario* focused on the Soviet charges that the plane was violating Soviet territory in order to spy.¹¹

Nuevo Diario's reporting of world reaction was radically different from that found in previous papers. It looked at world reaction and public opinion that did not support the U.S. instead of reporting negative reaction toward the U.S.S.R. Likewise, coverage of the United Nations discussions was also unfavorable to the U.S.

Moreover, *Nuevo Diario* completely ignored several subjects. It provided no primary coverage of the U.S. explanation and reaction. The search, the victims and victim compensation, and the actual shootdown – which were usually unfavorable to the U.S.S.R. – were never the primary subjects in *Nuevo Diario*, indicating the paper's dedication to negative coverage of the U.S. without regard for the Soviet role in the incident.

Nuevo Diario's coverage of the undisputed facts was the exact opposite of the other papers. That the Soviets shot down the plane and the number killed were the lowest percentages in any coverage of the incident. By contrast, the fact that the airliner violated Soviet airspace was included in sixty-four percent of its stories, prominently in fifty percent.

Nuevo Diario, unlike the previous papers, overwhelmingly reported the “facts” favorable to the Soviet perspective and unfavorable to the U.S. The Soviet claims that the airliner acted like a spy plane, evaded the Soviet fighter planes, and was, therefore, thought to be a spying were accepted as true.¹² Related to the charges

of espionage, *Nuevo Diario* reported that a U.S. reconnaissance plane was in the vicinity. In other papers this was often claimed to be routine procedure, but in this paper, it was described as another example of the U.S. "walking on the edge of the knife and putting in danger the stability of the world".¹³

Another assertion not favorable to the U.S. that received extensive attention in *Nuevo Diario* was that there was little chance of the airliner's navigational system malfunctioning, and thus, by implication, the overflight was intentional.

Other "facts" from the Soviet account – warning shots were fired, KAL did not signal, and KAL's lights were off – were presented as true, without any mention of the U.S. counterclaims. And much attention was also given to claims that the U.S. could have contacted the airliner to prevent the disaster but did not because it wanted to exacerbate Cold War tensions.¹⁴

PRAVDA

Like *Nuevo Diario*, *Pravda* was very critical of the U.S., going so far as to blame the U.S. for the incident. However, it went beyond the coverage in *Nuevo Diario* to support and defend the Soviet action.

Pravda's headlines were usually favorable to the U.S.S.R. or unfavorable to the U.S. (seventy-six percent of its thirty-four articles). The remaining headlines, apparently ambiguous or neutral, were clearly unfavorable to the U.S. in context. For example, "Provocateurs Sweep Clues Under the Carpet" (Sept. 6) reported the U.S. coverup of the airliner's supposed espionage mission.

For thirty-two percent of *Pravda's* articles, the Soviet reaction and explanation was the primary subject. Managing to avoid the fact that the plane had been shot down for five days, *Pravda* reported that Soviet fighter pilots tried to help an unidentified plane, but it just flew away (Sept. 2). *Pravda* also emphasized the Soviet claim that the airliner violated Soviet borders (Sept. 2). When the U.S.S.R. finally admitted its action, *Pravda* focused on the fact that the U.S.S.R. had acted within the limits of international law (Sept. 6).

Another primary subject was world reaction and protests, and like the coverage in *Nuevo Diario*, this topic was reported as unfavorable to the U.S. *Pravda* cited world opinion that supported the Soviet claims that KAL was on an espionage mission. Some of the focus on world opinion was directed specifically against the U.S. reaction to the incident. *Pravda* maintained that "[h]onest people all over the world are extremely frustrated by hypocrisy of the US and are strongly repulsed by the provokers" (Sept. 8).

Pravda occasionally made the U.S. reaction and explanation the central focus of its articles. However, the attention was not favorable to the U.S. Explanations from the Pentagon and the U.S. State Department were highlighted when they corrected previous statements or changed the U.S. account of the incident, thus revealing the hypocrisy and inaccuracy of the U.S. (Sept. 16).

Pravda avoided subjects that were inherently unfavorable to the U.S.S.R., such as the victims or compensation.

In stark contrast to other papers, *Pravda* mentioned that the plane was shot down prominently in only six percent of its articles. The number killed was never reported prominently and was included in only eighteen percent of the stories. However, the fact that the airliner violated Soviet airspace appeared in more than half of the coverage. And it was the only paper not to mention U.S. Congressman Larry McDonald's (D-Ga) death in the shootdown.

Pravda covered all the "facts" concerning areas of conflict from the Soviet account often ignoring the U.S. rebuttals. The U.S. assertion that the violation of Soviet territory was unintentional was never mentioned, but the Soviet claim that there was little chance of malfunction and thus the flyover had to be intentional was reported in sixty-two percent of the articles.

When the U.S. explanations were included in *Pravda*, they were usually overshadowed by Soviet counterclaims as was the case with the spy plane: the U.S. statement that the RC-135 was far away was mentioned in one article while the Soviet accusation that the spy plane was nearby appeared in six stories. Some "facts" that were favorable to the U.S. in coverage from other newspapers were discredited in *Pravda*: when *Pravda* discussed the recording of the Soviet pilot's conversation with his base, it was in the context that the tapes were false (Sept. 12) and unintelligible (Sept. 13).

Thus, the U.S. explanation was portrayed as wrong and the Soviet version was reported as the credible account of what happened.

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The papers we have examined presented widely and sometimes wildly divergent accounts of the downing of KAL 007. This was accomplished in several ways. First, newspapers had a variety of providers to choose from. The *Durham Morning Herald* relied on the Associated Press for eighty-one percent of its stories, supplementing these with articles from other U.S. services. One fourth of *Dawn's* coverage was supplied by Reuters, while most of the rest of its stories consisted of its compilations of reports from the wire services. Thirty-nine percent of the *Times of India's* articles were taken from the Associated Press, Reuters, or Agence France Presse, and 15 percent were provided by the paper's own correspondent. Its remaining articles came from various news agencies, mostly in the West. *Nuevo Diario's* stories came primarily from Prensa Latina and from compilations of wire reports. *Pravda* took most of its news from Tass (59 percent), with some articles supplied by correspondents and staff writers. The *Daily Times* (Lagos) did not state providers for its stories, but comparisons with other papers indicate that it took most of its articles from the major transnational news agencies. The variety of providers available to these papers accounts for some of the differences in their coverage.

But even when newspapers had to rely on the same agencies, the people controlling the newspapers were able to select, edit, combine, and change stories and information that they received from providers to suit their own needs. Thus,

the *Durham Morning Herald* and the *Daily Times* (Lagos) both reported the U.S. explanation and response as the primary subject in fourteen percent of their articles. But the *Herald's* coverage through headlines and the language in the articles emphasized the leadership role of the U.S., while the *Daily Times's* headlines and language focused attention on other countries.

The language that papers used to frame the facts and to characterize each country's account of the incident and the decision about which facts to use created different impressions about the validity of the explanations for the each paper's readers. The *Durham Morning Herald's* acceptance of the U.S. account and constant challenges to the Soviet explanation implied that the U.S. was telling the truth and the Soviets were not. The *Daily Times* and *Dawn* were less trusting of the U.S. version. And their uncertainty about which account was accurate was evident in their decisions to omit many of the claims by both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. concerning the areas of conflict. *Nuevo Diario* and *Pravda* left no doubt that they believed the Soviet explanation was true and the Americans were lying.

The *Times of India* provided its readers with a wide range of choice. By reporting both the Soviet and the American explanations, accusations, and counterclaims and by including the evidence to support or to challenge these accounts, the *Times of India* presented the most objective view of the incident that allowed its readers to make their own determinations about which aspects of the various explanations were accurate.

Newspapers around the world do have alternatives in how they cover international incidents despite the domination of Western news services. Through their selection and interpretation of subjects and facts and their use of headlines to emphasize and frame information, newspapers can shape, even construct their content and thereby delimit choice to suit their own objectives.

NOTES

¹ "Cool Pilot Fires Rocket At Craft; Kills All Aboard," *Durham Morning Herald*, Sept. 2, 1983.

² "Soviets Ready To Fire Again," *Durham Morning Herald*, Sept. 10, 1983.

³ "Reagan On Air Disaster," *Daily Times*, Sept. 29, 1983.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ "US admits spy plane's presence," *Dawn*, Sept. 6, 1983.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ "Gromyko defends shooting of plane," *Dawn*, Sept. 8, 1983.

⁸ "Bonn opposed to sanctions," *Times of India*, Sept. 9, 1983; "UN Council puts off vote on resolution," *Times of India*, Sept. 11, 1983.

⁹ "U.S. spy plane was flying near KAL jet," *Times of India*, Sept. 6, 1983.

¹⁰ "US spy plane flew near 747," *Nuevo Diario*, Sept. 6, 1983.

¹¹ "Tass: it was a planned provocation!" *Nuevo Diario*, Sept. 3, 1983; "British experts: Jumbo plane was spying," *Nuevo Diario*, Sept. 7, 1983.

¹² "US has spied with Airforce One," *Nuevo Diario*, Sept. 8, 1983.

¹³ "US spy plane flew near 747," *Nuevo Diario*, Sept. 6, 1983.

¹⁴ "US could have saved the boeing," *Nuevo Diario*, Sept. 4, 1983.