

Running head: EMBEDDED MEDIA AND THE MILITARY

Embedded Media And The Military

MSG Clarence Wilson

SGM Juergen Stark

SGM Ron Hambrick

SGM Arlene Horne

United States Sergeants Major Academy

Class 58

SGM Brian Olson

13 Nov 2007

Abstract

The Department of Defense and the military have found that building and maintaining a relationship with the media is critical to the management of information describing the War in Iraq. As a nation fighting the Global War on Terrorism, the U.S. Government as well as the U. S. Armed Forces must use powerful propaganda techniques to justify the war in Iraq. Specifically, embedded journalists have played a major role since their integration back in 2003. The horrors of war are being played repeatedly in living rooms throughout America and the enemy has certainly benefited in some instances from the airtime. Commanders and other military leaders have found it increasingly harder to manage and control what is being released. Embedded journalists provide the eyes and ears for the public to gain knowledge of the real life experiences that Soldiers face during military operations in a war zone. Public approval is an essential element to support a campaign the magnitude of the war in Iraq. The advances in technology have enhanced the media's ability to report events in almost real time. These journalists capture first hand the results of war as it happens.

## Haines Outline

Thesis Statement. Media presence on the battlefield allows the military to use propaganda to effectively control the public's awareness of warfare in Iraq.

- A. Media personnel on the battlefield throughout History – A brief look at all the Wars
  - A. Spanish American War
  - B. Korean & Vietnam War
  - C. Grenada & Panama
  - D. Saudi Arabia (Desert Storm/Shield)
  - E. Iraq
- I. Progression of the embedded journalist
  - A. Embedded media during combat
    - 1. Partnership between military and media
    - 2. Media safety in a hostile environment
  - B. Journalist assignment to Combat Unit
    - 1. Equipment needs
    - 2. Transportation needs
    - 3. Communication needs
- II. Military Control of the Media –Censorship or Not!
  - A. Censored media reporting
    - 1. Fairness and accuracy of information
    - 2. Use of propaganda
    - 3. Demonize the Enemy

4. Strategic reporting on the horrors of war
  5. Gaining public approval
- B. Sharing information with the enemy.
1. Real time war feeds
  2. Aiding the Terrorist Agenda
- III. Dangers to media and supporting unit.
- A. Distractions of media during a mission
  - B. Death or kidnapping of media personnel.
- IV. Adverse affects on public support and the image of the military

Conclusion- Media presence on the battlefield greatly influences the Department of Defense (DOD) and the military's use of propaganda to effectively control the public's awareness of warfare in Iraq.

### The Media Capturing the War Zone throughout History

Embedding the media on the frontlines of the battlefield alongside the troops allows maximum in depth coverage of the war zone whether good or bad to the American public. The media has been embedded on the battlefield longer than anyone can remember. Some journalists have risked their lives from the front lines of the battlefield in order to provide a vivid picture of the war zone to their readers and viewers. The military, at times, controlled what the media reported and wanted the media to present a different picture of the battlefield. As early as the Spanish-American War of 1898, and throughout World War I and World War II, journalists were on the battlefield. Most journalists considered themselves a part of the war effort, not independent observers (Catchpole, 2000).

In June 1950, the North Koreans invaded South Korea, beginning a war that continued for over three years and not ending until 1953. Because of the lack of public knowledge and understanding Korea was not a well-remembered war and it soon became known as “The Forgotten War.”

Propaganda leaflets were used during World War I and World War II. The leaflets were also heavily used during the Korean War to persuade Soldiers to surrender, especially during the holidays (Catchpole, 2000).

During the Korean War the media shifted in a different direction to regain independence. They wanted a sense of freedom to report the news on the battlefield without the restrictions that the military had imposed on them. The military wanted the media to paint a rosy picture, not show case the harsh realities of the war zone.

Congress and the Pentagon felt that giving the media independence and allowing them to roam freely on the battlefield would endanger Soldiers lives and sensitive information could fall into

the enemy hands. During that time there were few reports or incidents where the press jeopardized Soldier's lives or endangered military operations.

What happened in Vietnam between the military and the news media was thus symptomatic of what occurred in the United States as a whole. At the beginning of a conflict, the country had acquiesced as the Johnson administration had moved to contain Chinese and Soviet ambitions in Southeast Asia by going to war in South Vietnam. Although professedly suspicious of government as a matter of principle, the American news media had both reflected and reinforced the trend, replaying official statements on the value of the war and supporting the Soldier in the field if not always his generals (Hammond, 1996, p. 627).

During 1983, the military took full control over the media reporting the invasion of Grenada to the American public. The Pentagon had barred the media from the initial invasion, a bar that restricted the press for over two years. By the time invasion of Panama kicked off in 1989, the military had lifted the bar that restricted the media and selected a dozen to report the invasion but restricted them to the airport in Panama until the invasion was nearly completed (Woodward, 1993).

In 1990, during the Gulf War in Saudi Arabia, the Pentagon allowed the media to enter the war zone but not without a few restrictions. Most journalists were restricted to reporting from their designated spaces at the Dhahran International Hotel instead of being on the battlefield. The media had to observe these battlefield rules. Violations of the rules resulted in arrest, detention, revocation of press passes, and expulsion from the war zone (Constitutional Rights Foundation, 2006).

The rules declared by the Pentagon were necessary because they protected all parties involved including the Soldiers, the journalists and military operations. As the Pentagon stated,

“If the enemy wanted to know what the Americans were up to they only had to watch CNN to find out” (Constitutional Rights Foundation, 2006).

It is also the business of the media to offer their versions of the truth. Congress and Pentagon planners believe they must offer their version of the truth to the public in order to balance the media management (Woodward, 1993).

The media was outraged by the censorship and the control that the military had over them. Some media organizations filed lawsuits against the military declaring that they were violating their First Amendment rights for freedom of the press. The media argued that they had a right to be on the battlefield to capture the story as it unfolds and report it directly or live to the American public. NBC’s John Chancellor once reported, “It is not only the privilege of the American press to be present at moments of historic importance, it is the responsibility of the press to be there. The men who died were representing values in American life; one of those values is the right of the citizenry to know what their government is doing” (Woodward, 1993, p. 3). Even though these cases of freedom of the press have made it all the way to the Supreme Court, no determination has been made if the media should have access to the war zone.

The events of September 11, 2001 were heard and seen around the world. The media had the challenging task of reporting accurate information as events unfolded. The American public and people from nations around the world needed to understand the events and how this new war on terror affected them as well. The world needed to know how the enemy employed these attacks and the affects of these attacks. The United States role after the 911 attacks included retaliation against Bin Laden and against terrorists groups that followed his lead (Shah, 2006).

### History of Propaganda

The use of propaganda is not an invention of the modern world. The first use of propaganda dates back in ancient history. An example for ancient propaganda use could be the

Behistun Inscription (c. 515 BC). It describes the rise of Darius I. to the Persian throne. Another example is Livy (c. 59 BC – 17 AD). This Roman writing is a pro-Roman masterwork (wikipedia, 2007). The purpose of propaganda has and will always be the same. The sender of the message (Propagandist) aims to influence the behavior or the position of the receiver (large number of people). The most successful way of propaganda is to communicate the truth. However, to ensure the message is clear and understood, sometimes one must work on it. Instead of providing objective information, the propagandist selects facts and pieces to support a statement (Schwendinger, 2007).

### Propaganda in World War II

In 1933, shortly after Adolf Hitler came to power, he established the Ministry for Public Enlightenment and Propaganda. Adolf Hitler was a strong believer in the use of propaganda. He was convinced that the propaganda techniques used by the Allied in World War I had a large impact on the outcome of the war. Joseph Goebbels became the head of the Ministry and was in charge of the media. He controlled the press, radio, arts, film, literature, and music. Every journalist or writer had to get an approval by the Ministry before publishing his work. The censorship did not forbid writing anti-Nazis stories. However, every journalist who wrote against the regime was just punished or displaced. The Ministry made life miserable until the correspondent wanted to leave the country (Lavine and Wechsler, 1972).

Adolf Hitler and Joseph Goebbels met nearly every day to discuss their propaganda techniques. The Ministry used mainly posters to spread the propaganda. The Nazis also produced a large number of films and books just for propaganda purposes. Another strong propaganda medium was the radio. Almost every household owned a radio and could receive the propaganda messages. Radios were still expensive at this time and most of the people could not afford to buy

one. However, Goebbels sponsored the radio manufactures to sell the radios cheaper (wikipedia, 2007).

### Cold War Propaganda

During the cold war both nations, the United States of America as well as the Soviet Union used a large amount of propaganda material to influence the beliefs of their people and some Third World countries. The United States and the Soviet Union published posters and produced films to demonize the other side. Both nations used several radio stations to spread propaganda. The “Voice of America” was an official government radio station operated by the United States Information Agency. The Central Intelligence Agency supported several radio stations to provide propaganda to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. The government of the Soviet Union used “Radio Moscow” and “Radio Peace & Freedom” to spread their propaganda (wikipedia, 2007).

### Why does Propaganda Work?

Propaganda is not new and a common tool for every government. It has worked in history and still works in today’s society. However, why does propaganda work in modern democracies? The people of democracies generally trust the government and are willing to believe that what the country does is right. Democracies or nations like the United States have fought for their independence and freedom. People in such countries have values and strong moral grounds. History has proved that propaganda works when people feel a threat to their independence and freedom. Very often propaganda works effective on the national audience but does not work on other audiences. To spread propaganda in your own country is a lot easier than in another country. The United States of America had more problems to convince the people in the United Kingdom about the reasons to go to war with Iraq. Germany did not believe all of the Nazi

propaganda but they believed by far more, what their Government said than the British, for example. Most people want to believe they live in a good country (Shah, 2005).

### Control of Information

The United States hired professional public relation (PR) firms for propaganda purposes. On April 9, 2003 when U.S. tanks rolled into Baghdad, the world had a chance to watch the fall of a gigantic statue. Every newspaper had the photos on the front page and the television stations replayed the images throughout the day. Saddam Hussein's statue was so big; the Marines put a chain around its neck and pulled it with an armored vehicle off its pedestal. It seemed like every Iraqi was on the street celebrating the downfall of a regime. People dragged the head of the statue through the streets and threw things at the body. The only problem was that the crowd shown on all the pictures looked a lot bigger than it actually was. A photo sequence from BBC shows about 200 people at the scene. The media made us believe there were thousands of Iraqis celebrating on the streets. Certainly, there were many people happy and celebrating but just 6 days later, 20,000 people were demonstrating for U.S. troops to leave the country. Public relation consultant John Rendon, who has worked for the Pentagon and the CIA for many years, describes himself as a "perception manager" (Rampton and Stauber, 2004).

### Demonize the Enemy

In 1990, the public relation firm Hill and Knowlton reported that Iraqi Soldiers have switched off hospital incubators in Kuwait City to kill babies. Maggie O'Kane, a media manipulation investigator interviewed nurses at the hospital who did not confirm these stories. After some research, it turned out, that the fifteen-year-old daughter of the Kuwaiti Ambassador to Washington was the source of the false information. She had never been a nurse and she had not been in Kuwait for years. This form of "war journalism" demonizes the enemy (Shah, 2003).

After September 11, the Pentagon wanted to establish a link between al-Qaeda and Saddam Hussein. The Central Intelligence Agency was not convinced that such a connection existed. The Office for Special Plans produced alternative intelligence assessments on the relationship between Iraq and al-Qaeda. The intelligence community had no proof of these links (Goldberg, 2007).

Comparing the leader of a rogue country to Adolf Hitler is always a good start to justify war. Doubtless Saddam Hussein was an evil dictator who killed many innocent people. Although this was a well-known fact for many years, there were times when he received major support from the United States. Time has changed and after 9/11, the American Government needed a different strategy to justify war with Iraq. Once again, pictures of brutal violence and the killing of innocent people were all over the news. Propaganda was a great success. The majority of the population believed that Saddam Hussein was in possession of weapons of mass destruction and a supporter of al-Qaeda.

#### Progression of the Embedded Journalist

The Evolution of embedded media on the battlefield enabled the military to manage the information released by journalists to support the Iraqi War campaign. The Department of Defense (DOD) as well as the U.S. Military has revisited its past relationship with media in regards to reporting on warfare. From the Vietnam War throughout Desert Shield/ Desert Storm, military and media barriers of communication made it difficult to cover military operations without the likelihood of compromising the mission. Not until March 2003, at the beginning of Operation Iraqi Freedom, did the DOD decide to try a new approach to wartime reporting. Some 600-700 media personnel from around the world were assembled and integrated into combat units to provide real-time coverage of the war. The new program paves the way for the prospect of a partnership between the media and military.

### *Why Embed Media?*

It is in our interest to let people see for themselves through the news media, the lies and deceptive tactics Saddam Hussein used (Kurtz, Howard 2003). Prior to their tour of duty as an embedded journalist, training had to be completed at what was called an “Embed Boot Camp.” Essentially, journalists had to endure about a week of physical and mental preparation which gave them some first hand knowledge of how Soldiers lived on a daily basis while in hostile territory. Media personnel were not housed in a five star or some extravagant living quarters, but in barracks. Field packs and kevlar helmets were issued to each potential embed. In the initial three days of training, they learned about critical tasks and safety aboard the USS *Iwo Jima*, spent five days at Quantico, Virginia being familiarized with direct fire, chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN) attacks, minefields, first aid, tactical marches, actions if captured, and of course military lingo.

### *Journalists Unit Assignment*

Needless to say, while it was necessary to have journalists trained on certain aspects of combat units and their operations, the concern for their safety and protection was clear. The military ensured that journalists were equipped with the personal and protective equipment needed for operations with the unit they were assigned to. Some commanders allowed Journalists to bring their own vehicles which enabled them to move their required equipment for the best possible coverage. They were restricted to traveling with coalition units. Those journalists without personal transportation were assigned in wheeled or armored vehicles, dependent on the makeup of the organization they were attached to. Journalists were not armed with weapons to defend or protect themselves, so they had to place their security and well-being in the hands of Soldiers. Media, as well as the Coalition, used satellite phones or “satphones” for communication

purposes. The Thuraya Satphone is the satellite phone used most often in the region until the intelligence community suspected that the Iraqis maybe using the global positioning capability to target coalition forces.

### Allies in Reporting

The DOD and military commanders understood the sensitivity of information that journalist would be exposed to. The advantage to having these personnel under operational unit control meant that Public Affairs Officers (PAO) were able to monitor the activity of journalists with the commanders. The role of the media was to bring the relevant story of courage and commitment through the collection, editing and reporting of news. Control of media personnel is necessary to ensure control of information released to the public. Operational goals and mission requirements affect the degree of access to battlefield information. Many news executives and reporters see no difficulty with a limited degree of censorship as long as the guidelines are developed in (Aukofer, Lawrence 1995).

### *Fair and Accurate Reporting*

Fairness in reporting battlefield information is also important, both in military-media relations and the public interest. Journalists are charged with a certain level of responsibility through the press, yet are somewhat obligated to have some objectivity while serving in a capacity to be privileged to very sensitive matters. Though the military doesn't want the enemy to have access to any information about our forces that they can't see on the ground, leaders understand that for the sake of credibility in the eyes of the people, certain aspects of battle have to be reported. More importantly, quick and accurate depictions of coalition actions counter any enemy propaganda attempts.

### *Use of Propaganda*

The military sought to incorporate media personnel where they could best project an

image contrary to that of the Iraqi government. Of course propaganda from enemy media would present death and destruction by coalition forces, along with information that is contrary to coalition news reports. Atkinson (2004) wrote about leaflet messages dispersed over Najaf that read; “We are only here to destroy military targets, not the Iraqi people. The messages were written in English and Arabic. Embedded media present real-time access to the war and coalition humanitarian efforts. The domestic and international support for the war is dependent on media reports that humanize Soldiers. The stories filed by the embedded media gave the public something to hold onto at the ‘mom & pop’ level (Christopher Paul, James J. Kim 2004).

It’s not easy to convince family members of deployed Soldiers that war in Iraq or any other area of operation is necessary. The U.S. government, military, embedded and independent journalists are often at a divide when it comes to coalition and specifically U.S. military deaths. Impartiality plays an important role in the response to any type of atrocity against friendly forces. The relationship between the military and journalists will determine the level of censorship to which the information will be reported to the nation and world. Embedded journalists are the conscious eyes, ears and minds of the people. Their influence across the battlefield encompasses strength, patience, trust, loyalty, morality, and obligation. At their disposal are the most sensitive elements of war. War is an ugly and violent picture of different worlds as they travel a collision course of death and destruction. Many embedded journalists find themselves struggling with the moral obligation of reporting the complete truth and the scaled down version that the government and military has convinced them is reality.

### *Strategic Reporting*

One must recognize that embedded journalists entered the program on the basis of following certain policies outlined prior to being inserted into units on the ground. All sides have an understanding and an obligation, of sorts, to one another. Sometimes in the heat of battle,

lines are crossed which alters the rules as security becomes more essential to the mission. Censorship also became more apparent since exposure to information is limited. As time progressed journalists became more than just elements of the media trying to get a story, but a force multiplier.

### *Public Approval*

Public support is an essential element to support a campaign the magnitude of the war in Iraq. These journalists capture first hand the results of war as it happens and brings it home to the living rooms of ordinary everyday people like you and me. The public's view of the destruction of family life and way of living at the hands of their own leaders strengthens the level of support by the people.

### Media on the Battlefield

The use of embedded reporters on the battlefield is not a new concept. Indeed, this has been a common practice for a very long time. The curiosity of man would not allow it to be any other way. The writer will focus on the affects of the media, during a few of the major wars and conflicts of the modern era, on the American population.

### World War I and II

During the first and second World Wars, reporters were embedded with units but their roles were vastly different than what we are accustomed to today. These reporters were a part of the war effort. Their reports and photographs were designed to strengthen the resolve for war. In short, the reports could easily be characterized as pro-war propaganda. During World War II, the United States drafted 735 war correspondents to cover the action for the three largest new agencies. Of this number, 500 were United Press, 125 were William Randolph Hearst's International News Service, and 110 were Associated Press (Collier, 1989, p. 1). War correspondents wore uniforms and were granted a status similar to that of an officer. They were

subject to the Articles of War and similar legislation that ensured accountability for their actions and good judgment (Braestrup, 1985). Censorship was not a dirty word and all parties involved saw the need to support national security. In short, the needs of the nation outweighed the need for ratings.

### Vietnam War

When the Vietnam War rolled around, television was the primary form of media and many networks such as ABC, CBS, and NBC provided coverage on the war. Television created a feeding frenzy for information as one network attempted to out-cover the other. Vietnam was the first time in American history that news agencies felt the necessity to remain impartial during wartime media coverage. The resulting news coverage proved too much to handle for the military. Even with its best effort to limit uncensored information from leaving the country, overzealous reporters were still able to get their stories out. A large portion of these reports were from Soldiers on the front lines that were not willing to tow the party line that the Pentagon was touting. The uncensored images and stories that made their way back to America had a devastating effect on an already volatile social climate. The civil rights revolution was in full swing as was the hippie movement and many were already distrusting of the government. The war coverage fueled the fire and added to that mistrust. Politicians and celebrities alike, flocked to Vietnam to sensitize the American public to the hardships of the enemy. The Soldiers of this war were not viewed as heroes. Instead, they were labeled baby killers and suffered many insensitive, vulgar tags. Although the media cannot be accused of putting Soldiers or missions at risk with the information that was being published, the negative press fueled anti-war and anti-military sentiments in America. The Soldiers called to serve their country bore the brunt of those sentiments. The nation was sick and the media had the power to help heal it. Instead, it chose to

cash in on the freedom that this great nation affords them at the expense of the men and women that afford them those very same freedoms. When the war ended, many believed the press played a major role in losing Vietnam.

#### Saudi Arabia (Desert Storm)

During Desert Storm, the press once again enjoyed the privilege of great coverage. The advances in technology changed the playing field for this and every war to follow. Satellite link-ups, smaller cameras, laptop computers, fax machines, and many other technological advances facilitated the streaming of information into homes across America in near real time. The war was dubbed the “CNN War”. The networks produced almost 24-hour coverage and the American public was fascinated with the face of war. The administration was determined not to repeat the sins of the past with the media. The major differences between the coverage during this war and the travesty during Vietnam, was that President Bush established clear rules for the press that would prevent the perceived mistakes of Vietnam. The Pentagon accredited all American journalists and required them to observe the following battlefield press rules:

1. No reporters could visit an U.S. military unit or travel outside of Dhahran or Riyadh except in a press pool.
2. No pool was permitted in the field without an escort, usually a U.S. military public affairs officer (PAO).
3. No interviews of U.S. military personnel were permitted without an escort present.
4. All pool dispatches must first pass through the military security review system. PAOs at pool locations reviewed all dispatches and could delete or change any

“military sensitive information.” Reporters could appeal any censorship to the military pool coordinating office in Dhahran and then to the Pentagon.

5. Violations of the above rules could result in arrest, detention, revocation of press credential, and expulsion from the combat zone (Constitutional, 2007, p. 2).

The results were impressive and the war was very successful militarily. It also garnered incredible public support and America once again embraced its veterans. A large reason for this support was the coverage by the media that operated under the constraints of the censorship rules. Rear Admiral John Bitoff’s remarks sum up the sentiment of the military and the nation at the time, “There is a clear and present danger in today’s instant communications age, which may put our troops at risk. Our enemies are watching CNN-TV” (Constitutional, 2007). For the most part Americans supported the military’s control of the press during the Gulf War. In a Roper public opinion poll after the war, 68 percent of those surveyed believed military control of the news was about right, 17 percent wanted more control, and only 13 percent wanted less (Constitutional, 2007). Still there were some disturbing trends developing within the media. One of these trends was the military analyst. These experts attempted to pinpoint enemy locations and predict courses of action (COAs). Now instead of just reporting the news, the media is interpreting the news with hired experts. In the writer’s opinion, this practice is dangerous and poses a definite dilemma for Soldiers today. As Rear Admiral Bitoff said, “Our enemies are watching CNN-TV”. Now instead of armchair quarterbacks, we have a whole generation of armchair military leaders that like their non-athletic predecessors know the right play to call.

### Operation Enduring Freedom/Operation Iraqi Freedom

With Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, the press continued to enjoy the benefits of technological advances. The problems with containing or controlling reports from the battlefield were amplified. Cell Phones were a major reason for the added problems. Media personnel and some Soldiers were phoning in news, some of which may have contained information of national interest. The world watched as Geraldo Rivera was shut down for drawing a map in the sand depicting troop movement. He was then forced to leave the combat theater. This was only the beginning; there would be additional, unforeseen problems on the horizon with this war.

### A different Enemy

The counterinsurgency (COIN) fight that developed in Iraq changed everything with respect to the military's relationship with the media. The primary weapon of this new enemy was not an AK-47 or an armored vehicle. The news would be their weapon of choice and the unbiased world media would be their bullets. The terrorists became masters at media manipulation. Knowingly or unknowingly, the media have repeatedly aired stories that drew sympathy and aid to the insurgent cause. Iraq is full of "Freedom Fighters" from other countries that want a crack at the American infidels.

### Adverse affects

It is undeniable that the media have an affect on the world and for the context of this study, American opinion. Reports on Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib did little to support the war effort and everything to generate support and sympathy for the enemy. The secondary affects were the damage to the image of the American Soldier and the countries disenchantment toward the war.

### Guantanamo Bay

The Guantanamo Bay story claimed disrespectful handling of the Koran. It was later retracted because Newsweek could not substantiate the story. The single source for the information did not hold up to professional scrutiny. This is just another example of a news agency attempting to get “the scoop” at any cost. The cost for this unfounded report was innocent lives that were lost during riots in Afghanistan spurred by the story.

### Abu Ghraib

The Abu Ghraib coverage went on for months and culminated with the trials of the accused. This should show the world that when there is a problem identified in the Army, the Army makes every effort to correct the situation. Some, mainly the terrorist organizations and sympathizers throughout the world, see it as another example of how the infidels treat the true believers. So much coverage on what goes wrong and so little coverage on what is going right. Very few people know the great successes that the war on terror has achieved. Five of the top six Al Qaeda leaders are dead or captured. Bin Laden has not been heard from, meaning he is dead or isolated as to be irrelevant. Free elections have been held in Afghanistan and Iraq. Hussein is out of power. All great successes, which are largely ignored (Kannafoot, personal communication, Oct 14, 2007, p. 3).

Public opinion is also swaying due to the continued coverage. The American public is waning in its support of the war. Funding for the war is being held hostage to the president’s plan for withdrawal. Just as with Vietnam all those years ago, the images of Americans in body bags or in rehabilitation facilities with missing or damaged limbs, is too much for Americans to stomach. The news agencies should be promoting the fact that America is at war with terrorism. As Americans, these same media personnel are at war with terrorism. Instead of negotiating with

terrorists to obtain footage of an American Soldier being shot and killed, as CNN did, the media should be creating ways to show America how dedicated and professional the Soldiers that serve this country really are. There is a saying that is used quite often in the military, “ruck-up or get out of my way”. The translation is either be part of the solution or don’t be part of the problem.

In conclusion, when it comes to war reporting, the news media should be more propaganda than factual. The media should be championing American successes in war, not over-emphasizing the failures. The media should be practicing self-imposed censorship as patriots of this country. Morale plays a big role in the success of any war effort, both on the troop level and the national level (Kannafoot, personal communication, Oct 14, 2007, p. 2). Freedom is not free and to truly win this war on terrorism, we have to stop giving the enemy what it wants. If war is hell, why does everyone want a front row seat?

### Conclusion

Media presence on the battlefield greatly influences the Department of Defense (DOD) and the military’s use of propaganda to control the public’s awareness of warfare in Iraq. Though the enemy may possibly gain access to any information about our forces through the media campaign, leaders understand that for the sake of credibility in the eyes of the people, the military makes exceptions to accommodate the “freedom of press”. Independent media personnel, as well as some of our embedded journalists are sometimes overwhelmed with the information of battle damage and destruction. The moral obligation to report what they observed versus censorship becomes an issue. Unfortunately, the pendulum swings both ways and often the wrong message is sent home to televisions around the world. Policies are set in place for all involved with reporting the war efforts. The media has the right, based on the First Amendment, to report the truth to the American public, without the military controlling the story. Safety and security issues will continue to influence the outcome.

## Reference

- Atkinson, R. (2004). *In The Company of Soldiers*. New York: Henry Holt and Company
- Aukofer, Frank, and Lawrence. (1995). *America's Team- Odd Couple: A Report on the Relationship Between the Media and the Military*. Abstract retrieved Nov 5, 2007 from <http://www.carlisle.army.mil/usacsl/publications/EmbeddedMedia3.pdf>
- Braestrup, P. (1985). *Battle Lines: Reports of the Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on the Military and the Media*. New York: Priority Press.
- Catchpole, Brian (2000). Propaganda and Public Opinion. In *The Korean War* (pp. 255-269). New York, NY: Carroll & Graf Publishers.
- Collier, R. (1989). *Fighting Words: The War Correspondents of World War Two*. New York: St. Martin's.
- Constitutional Rights Foundation. (2007). *Press Freedom vs. Military Censorship of the Media*. Available from [http://www/crf-usa.org/Iraqwar\\_html/Iraqwar\\_press.html](http://www/crf-usa.org/Iraqwar_html/Iraqwar_press.html)
- Dionne, E. J. (09101991). Are the Media Beating the War Drums or Just dancing to Them. *The Washington Post National Weekly Edition*, p. 23.
- Goldberg, S. (2007) Pentagon unit defied CIA advice to justify Iraq war. *The Guardian*. Retrieved November 09, 2007 from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/Iraq/Story/0,,2010014,00.html>
- Hammond, William C. (1996). Conclusion. In Jeffrey J. Clarke (Ed.), *The Military and the Media* (p. 627). Washington, DC: Library of Congress Cataloging.
- Katovsky B. and Carlson T. (2003). Introduction. In Katovsky W., *Embedded, the Media at War in Iraq* (p. XI – XIX) Guilford, The Lions Press
- Koop, T. (1946). *Weapon of Silence*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Lavine, H. and Wechsler, J. (1972). Inside the word factories. In Dr. C. H. Sterling, *War, Propaganda and the United States* (p. 168) New York: Arno Press
- Quoted in Kurtz, H. (2003). “*Media Notes: A Battle Plan for the '03 Campaign,*” Washington Post. Abstract retrieved Nov 06, 2007  
from [http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2004/RAND\\_MG200.pdf](http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2004/RAND_MG200.pdf)
- Rampton S. and Stauber J.(2004) How to Sell a War. Retrieved November 06, 2007  
from [http://www.inthesetimes.com/comments.php?id=299\\_0\\_1\\_0\\_C](http://www.inthesetimes.com/comments.php?id=299_0_1_0_C)
- Schwendinger C.(2007). Was ist Propaganda? Retrieved November 03, 2007, from  
[http://www.rheton.sbg.ac.at/rhetonneu/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id](http://www.rheton.sbg.ac.at/rhetonneu/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id)
- Shah A. (2005). Mainstream Media. War, Propaganda, and the Media. Retrieved November 05, 2007 from <http://www.globalissues.org/HumanRights/Media/Military.asp#>
- Shah, A. (09092006). *Media, Propaganda and September 11*. Retrieved 09092006, from  
<http://www.globalissues.org/HumanRights/Media/propaganda/911.asp>
- Shah A. (2003). Building the Case for a New War. Media Spin and Official Propaganda During Gulf War 1991. Retrieved November 09, 2007 from  
[www.globalissues.org/Geopolitics/MiddleEast/Iraq/BuildingTheCase.asp#MediaSpinandOfficialPropagandaDuringGulfWarin1991](http://www.globalissues.org/Geopolitics/MiddleEast/Iraq/BuildingTheCase.asp#MediaSpinandOfficialPropagandaDuringGulfWarin1991)
- Starnes, G. (2004). Leveraging The Media: The Embedded Media Program In Operation Iraqi Freedom. Volume S04-06.
- Wikipedia (2007). Propaganda. Retrieved November 03, 2007 from  
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Propaganda>

Woodard., G. C (1993). The Rules of the Game: The Military and the Press in the Persian Gulf War. In Robert E Denton, Jr. (Ed.), *The Media and the Persian Gulf War* (pp. 1-26). Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.