

Framing Wars and Conflicts: Manipulation, Misrepresentation, and Distortion

Mohamed Kirat¹, Radouane Slamene²

Abstract

This paper discusses the crisis in media theory when interpreting the behavior of journalists and media institutions during times of war and crises. It observes a compromise of the principles of journalistic freedom and objectivity. It notes the divergence in media practices during war compared to normal circumstances, often aligning media coverage with the stance of the country involved in the war. Journalists become "patriotic" and biased towards their country, forsaking objectivity, neutrality, professionalism, integrity, and ethical standards in their work.

The study adopts the Market Model and the Manipulative Model as theoretical frameworks and relies on a case study approach, examining media coverage during the Second Gulf War (1990-1991), the Afghanistan War, the events of September 11, 2001, and finally, the Third Gulf War (2003) – the American-British war on Iraq. Key questions include the media coverage tendencies regarding the war on Iraq and the nature of pressures and violations imposed on journalists during their work.

The study's main hypotheses include the bias in favor of the home country in war coverage according to the Manipulative Model, as well as the blending and mixture between media, propaganda, public relations, psychological warfare, distortion, and a complete violation of the principles of media ethics and social responsibility.

The study's findings affirm that no media theory fully explains media practices during wars and conflicts. Additionally, the Manipulative Model explains how media institutions and communicators, during wars, are used by military, economic, and political powers for purposes of distortion, propaganda, psychological warfare, and disinformation.

Keywords: *distortion, propaganda, psychological warfare, disinformation. Framing, manipulation, press Government Coalition Theory.*

Introduction

It is said that a war without television is not a war, and a war without television is just an event. However, warfare on the screen is considered a live experience transmitted to millions in their homes. During America's war on Iraq, the media war began before the military takes in place in the battlefield. The United States waged an extensive media war through various channels such as newspapers, magazines, radio stations, TV channels, online journalism, and the internet against the Iraqi regime. On the other hand, most studies addressing the issue of covering crises and wars have concluded that the coverage

¹ Dean, College of Media, and Mass Communication, American University in the Emirates DIAC, Block 6, Dubai, UAE

² Associate Professor, Department of Journalism and Digital Media, Faculty of Communication & Media, King Abdulaziz University, P.O. Box 80200, Jeddah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

was characterized by bias, censorship, distortion, at the expense of the principles of fair and committed journalism, characterized by objectivity and freedom.

Like previous wars, the war on Iraq unveiled several myths and lies echoed by many advocates of democracy, press freedom, and human rights. Among the primary victims of the war were press freedom and the lives of journalists themselves. The war resulted in the deaths of thirteen journalists and photographers who sacrificed their lives to reveal the truth and present the facts of the war as they were to viewers worldwide. The measures and methods used by America in dealing with journalists and correspondents lacked etiquette, ethics, and respect for the profession, freedom, and independence. Simply put, America applied the principle of "if you're not with us, you're against us." This meant that anyone not aligned with the Pentagon's group of journalists was exposed to the risks of war. In other words, Americans might kill them themselves if they revealed certain truths and images that could expose the massacres committed against innocent children and civilians.

The theory of press freedom, glorified by America on every occasion, collapsed during the invasion of Iraq, as it had previously during international conflicts and disputes. The American media machine became no different in its subservience to authority, manipulation, and censorship from its counterparts in the world's dictatorships. Consequently, the First Amendment of the American Constitution, which enshrines the principle of protecting the press and journalists from the tyranny and arbitrariness of power for the sake of independence and objectivity, became a relic of the past and the archives.

America used all the means to silence all voices opposing the war and attempted to eliminate anyone presenting a different view of the war. Thus, the myth of objectivity fell, along with the myth of presenting opposing views and points of view. In the name of national security and American national interests, press freedom was violated, along with the principles of objectivity, integrity, impartiality, neutrality, and the pursuit of truth. All norms, values, and principles that should preserve freedom of speech, opposing views, and the principle of a free market of ideas were violated.

This paper aims to uncover the propaganda practices and manipulation techniques used by the media machine when covering wars and crises. Historically, the media has been characterized by its lack of objectivity and neutrality, using patriotism and national interests as justifications for deviating from fair and ethical media practices. From the Vietnam War to the Algerian War to the Falkland Islands to the second Gulf War, Afghanistan, the war on Iraq and the recent war on Gaza, various media outlets excelled in fabricating reality instead of covering and presenting it as it is to the public. Western media did not differ from the media of dictatorships and authoritarian regimes. Everyone succumbed to the will of politicians, war merchants, and arms dealers, violating the principles of objectivity, press freedom, integrity, neutrality, and the search for truth. What occurred in the battlegrounds and crisis hotspots was a blatant alliance between power and the media.

Problem Statement

Through war coverage, we notice the crisis of media theory in interpreting the behavior of journalists and media institutions. Crises present numerous challenges and become an integral part of the war itself. The conditions of war, therefore, undermine the principles of freedom and objectivity, altering media practices during wartime compared to peacetime circumstances. We observe the media institution's bias in its coverage of war, aligning with the stance of the state it belongs to regarding the war (Layadi, 2004; Boumaïza, 2004; Carruthers, 2000; Kirat, 1989).

Theoretical Framework

It can be argued that scholars studying media practices in different societies, as well as those examining the relationship between media, power, and political and economic institutions, have failed to establish standards and criteria to explain the practices of media institutions and journalists during war and crises. The Four Theories of the Press – the Authoritarian theory, the Libertarian theory, the Soviet theory, and the Social Responsibility theory (Siebert, Peterson, Schramm, 1956) – did not address the problem of the government's relationship with the media during times of war and crises, nor did they investigate the journalist's relationship with sources and officials. In this context, it can be said that media practices during times of war and crises do not differ from one media system to another or from one political system to another. They become similar, where media turns into a blend of journalism, public relations, psychological warfare, propaganda, manipulation, and distortion, whether in democratic states, dictatorships, advanced countries, developing nations, or any other political systems existing in the world. On the other hand, we note that media practices during peacetime and ordinary circumstances differ from those during times of war and crises, especially in democratic states with traditions of press freedom.

The Market Model

According to this model, news is considered a natural category of events that must be conveyed professionally and with the utmost objectivity. Journalists go out into the field to follow up on news and bring it back to their department heads. According to this model, objectivity is imperative in media work, and communicators seek news that interests readers and the community, regardless of other considerations (Cohen & Young, 1981:17).

The Manipulative Model

In this model, media and journalists are seen as instruments to serve the interests of media institution owners, conflicting with the interests of the public and any objective and neutral presentation of global events. Journalists operate according to ideological criteria to serve the interests of media owners, distorting the truth and fabricating reality in line with their bosses' advertising needs. They create and disseminate a web of lies to manipulate the masses and mold public opinion based on political, economic, and financial considerations of those who control the means of production (moneyed interests). Thus, in the Market Model, news is the presentation of reality, whereas, in the Manipulative Model, news is the manipulation of reality, essentially an exploitation and fabrication of reality to serve the interests of powerful entities in society, far removed from the broader public in society (Cohen & Young, 1981:17-18).

Research Methodology

This research adopted a case study approach, studying the media coverage of the Second Gulf War (1990-1991), the coverage of the events of September 11, 2001, media coverage of the Afghan war, and finally, media coverage of the Third Gulf War (2003), the American-British war.

The First Case Study: The Second Gulf War (1990-1991)

During the Second Gulf War, the Pentagon exercised control over media coverage, utilizing mechanisms that allowed it to select and tailor news, events, and facts serving the viewpoints and goals of the United States. They used press pools, designating CNN as their official spokesperson, allowing America not only to control military operations but also the war's image and narrative. In times of crisis, many principles taught in journalism schools were overridden. Journalists became constrained by military authorities, directing them to specific areas and even intervening in the messages sent to their media

institutions. During the Second Gulf War, the world watched the war through American eyes. The media vanished, propaganda and psychological warfare dominated news reports and front pages worldwide. Journalists' reports to their media outlets were subject to Pentagon scrutiny, labeling anything conflicting with American perspectives as "not fit for publication due to security reasons."

The Second Gulf War was a battle of minds and opinions before it was a physical war. Through its expertise in propaganda and extensive misleading capabilities, the US managed to control perceptions by manipulating war images and events (Atkinson, 1994; Denton, 1993). Reporters covering the war relied on Pentagon directives, press conferences, and data, most of which concealed numerous aspects while emphasizing others that were not necessarily truthful, accurate, or objective. This subjugation did not allow journalists to maintain their integrity and objectivity; they found themselves manipulated and exploited by war merchants and arms dealers.

The American media colluded with the Pentagon during the Second Gulf War, allowing CNN, the psychological warfare network, to operate as desired without competition, as the US military learned from the lessons of Vietnam and other wars they lost in the battle of images. American and international media, whether in Vietnam or in the Second Gulf War, managed to expose the brutality of the US army and its massive losses.

Somalia cost America dearly in terms of media. Public opinion forced politicians to withdraw from the war and acknowledge defeat. This led military leaders within the coalition to adopt a strategy involving embedding journalists within military units (News Pool) to cover the war and its events. Consequently, these journalists became at the mercy of the military, controlling their movements, what they portrayed, and wrote. This precisely occurred during the Second Gulf War.

Arab media was weak during the Second Gulf War, and satellite channels were limited and in their infancy. America disregarded globally acknowledged values and principles concerning press freedom, objectivity, integrity, and neutrality. As a result, the world watched the events of the Second Gulf War through American eyes. Therefore, news was mixed with propaganda, psychological warfare, misleading information, and censorship. Arab media remained passive, consuming American propaganda, distortion, and manipulation. This subservience was shared by media in all countries worldwide, including Western and developed nations. This exploitation and submission would prompt a revolt or awakening among journalists, aligning with hundreds of thousands, if not millions, around the world who expressed and continue to express their anti-war stance and opposition to the American military trend (Hiebert, 1991; Jensen, 1992; Denton, 1993).

"Truth is the most valuable thing during wartime and requires personal protection from lies." This famous quote is attributed to the famous British politician Winston Churchill. It is also said that in wartime, the first casualty is the truth. History takes us back to Napoleon Bonaparte, who, upon invading Egypt, brought printing presses from Paris to publish a newspaper, supplementing his colonial efforts to control thoughts, minds, and engage in psychological warfare, propaganda, distortion, and censorship. In times of war, news intertwines with propaganda and psychological warfare. War without media remains stunted and crippled. The question that arises in this dilemma is how media is being perceived by viewers, readers, or listeners during the aggression against Iraq? Is there objectivity and freedom in conveying war atrocities and casualties, and is there independence in addressing issues about the war, especially when war is deceitful? In these times, viewers and readers find themselves amidst a flood of news and information characterized by contradictions, discrepancies, disinformation, and distortion. Psychological warfare imposes itself on the logic of objectivity and neutrality. Each party involved in the war works tirelessly to reveal what serves its interests and supremacy in the war, aiming to boost the morale of the army, supporters, and strike down the morale

of the opponent. On the other hand, we note that the other side in the war conceals its losses and casualties, focusing on the successes and achievements. In this context, Dr. Hiebert states:

"We witnessed during the Second Gulf War either the most sophisticated use of military weapons in human history or the smartest use of words and images as weapons of war, or both... The effective use of words and media today, in times of crisis, is as crucial as the effective use of cannons and bombs. It is not enough to be powerful. Now, it is necessary to communicate. To win today's war, the government does not need only to win the war in the field, but it also needs to win the minds of its masses" (Hiebert, 1991:107+115).

If war is deceitful, everything is permissible to harm the enemy, even if it requires lying, psychological warfare, propaganda, distortion, and censorship. The end justifies the means. Consequently, figures, information, and news conflict, and even the process of verification and scrutiny in press conferences and data presentation remains difficult and almost impossible.

The second case study: September 11th, 2001, events:

From the fourth estate to comprehensive deception: Many specialists, researchers, and theorists in journalism, media, and public relations still reiterate and affirm that journalism is the fourth estate that monitors the three powers in society: legislative, judicial, and executive. Some believe that journalism is the barometer of democracy and the foundation for justice for the poor, the needy, and the marginalized. It is the strategic means to uncover the truth and investigate reality, so much so that Americans called it the 'Watchdog Press.' However, the reality of the twenty-first century and the reality of the war on terrorism suggest that journalism has shifted from the fourth estate to a means of distorting reality, misleading awareness, and fabricating events and facts according to the dictates of money, business, and politics.

Today's media, in the era of satellite TV, the internet, and the digital society, has become adaptive to events and facts according to the powers that control the system, whether that system is local or global. The war on Iraq revealed the serious mistakes, lapses, and violations that the media outlets around the world fell into, as they followed the arguments of arms dealers and warmongers without daring to attempt to expose the myths, lies, and other mechanisms of deception used by major news agencies and global media.

The events of September 11 and the war on Iraq left their repercussions and impacts on all areas of life not only in the United States but worldwide. After more than three years of striking at the symbol of American power in New York and Washington and hitting the world's largest power in its own territory, after hundreds of articles, reports, studies, and political talk shows in various media institutions worldwide, we question the high price paid by journalism and the harassment and violations it faced on one hand. On the other hand, we wonder about the deviations committed against the truth and objective media performance, aiming to provide the public opinion with facts and information.

The first loser of the September 11 events was media practice and press freedom, especially in countries renowned for their traditions of freedom of thought, opinion, and expression. However, the way the media dealt with the events of September 11 revealed that they abandoned their mission, failed to serve their audience, failed to serve public opinion at the local, regional, and international levels to know the truth behind the event, its backgrounds, dimensions, and goals. Did the media manage to dispel confusion, obscurity, manipulation, distortion, and stereotypes and present reality as it is? Or did they hasten and excel in fabricating this reality, the reality of September 11, according to their whims, goals, and interests, disregarding the ethics of objectivity, commitment, and presenting facts as they are? Journalist Taysir Allouni was imprisoned in Spain without a fair trial and without substantial evidence, and many others around the world, all justified

under the guise of fighting terrorism, national security, and various excuses of control, authority, censorship, and suppression.

Thus, there seems to be no difference between authoritarian states and those claiming democracy, freedom of thought, opinion, expression, and human rights.

The September 11 attacks prompted a flood of ink and an unprecedented media interest worldwide. Media institutions of all kinds, financial, ideological, and political, rushed to present news, comments, analytical programs, and studies about the crisis, its dimensions, backgrounds, and repercussions. The controversial and debatable question studied by academics, politicians, and interested parties is how did the media deal with the September 11 incident? Did they raise all the questions that occurred and occur to curious readers, listeners, and viewers? Did the media care to know why America was targeted? Who struck America? What were the backgrounds and dimensions? Did the media inquire about how Bin Laden was a hero in the 1980s and an ally then became an enemy? What was America's strategy in fighting the Soviet Union and communism? And how did the former ultimate ally of America become its enemy now? How did someone go from being a hero to a terrorist? Who created Bin Laden? What happened? What is the correlation between what happened and the exploitation, injustice, oppression, and economic and political inequality in international relations? What about terrorism practiced by many countries? And what is terrorism in the first place?

In the twenty-first century, media has become an industry that fabricates reality more than it explains and interprets it for the public. In the digital era, media has become a force that reads and interprets reality according to financial and political powers that control it. Analyzing the interaction of American media institutions with the events of September 11 yields the following conclusions:

Most Western media focused on Islam, Muslims, and Arabs, exploiting the event to mislead, distort, and obscure, reinforcing stereotypes against Islam, Muslims, and Arabs. This practice has been long-standing, leading to significant confusion and stirring hatred, resentment, and animosity among significant segments of public opinion in Western countries, especially in the United States, resulting in racist incidents victimizing many innocent Muslims and Arabs in various Western countries. The stark contradiction here is that most Western communicators and officials in various media institutions do not understand Islam well, never attempting to comprehend this religion and differentiate between its teachings and its application.

Western media focused on the consequences of 9/11 and its implications for international political relations and the global economic map, neglecting the reasons behind what happened and why America was targeted. The causes became secondary and unimportant, with the focus solely on Islamic fundamentalism and terrorism, attempting to link what happened in Palestine to the events of 9/11. It is noteworthy that Israel is the only country in the world that benefitted from 9/11 to continue its continuous terrorism against the Palestinian people, citing the fight against terrorism. Ariel Sharon and his propaganda machinery, widespread in major global capitals, exploited Western media to spread hatred against Arabs and Muslims and distort Islam.

Western media interpreted Islamic fundamentalism because of poverty, unemployment, and social injustice, completely disregarding the fact that the international system led by the United States is an unjust, unfair system that extorts and exploits oppressed peoples. The U.S. foreign policy and its role as a global police force are reasons why many people around the world hate this country.

Most Western media ignored others' hatred towards the United States, as Americans themselves were surprised by the results of polls conducted around the world. The reason naturally relates to the arbitrary and unfair behavior that the United States exhibits in its

dealings with other countries, especially its foreign policy in the Middle East and its unconditional support for Israel.

Most Western media ignored the Zionist lobby's control over the American Congress and, therefore, American foreign policy in the Middle East. They also ignored America's complete submission to the Zionist state, which practices state terrorism daily. America uses double standards in dealing with terrorism and in the principle of liberating land and determining destiny.

Western media relied on experts, research centers, and studies known for their hostility toward anything Arab or Muslim, while being loyal to the Zionist entity. They embraced extreme Western theses that do not believe in dialogue between civilizations, understanding, and communication among peoples. That is why scholars like 'Raja Gharbawi,' 'Noam Chomsky,' 'Robert Fisk,' and many others were not seen on the screens or pages of influential Western newspapers and magazines. The simple reason for this is that the arguments, opinions, and analyses of these writers would unveil the 'fabrication,' manipulation, forgery, and deception carried out by the Western media machine in presenting events according to its agenda rather than reality.

1. Western media did not attempt to present a background of international relations, or the bankrupt international system. They also did not try to reveal America's foreign policy from the Marshall Plan to the present day. They did not highlight the contradictions that emerged from American policy after the collapse of the Soviet Union, leading to the demise of bipolarity and America's monopoly on international leadership. The Western media was superficial in dealing with the events of 9/11, even what was written by some European journalists, notably the French journalist Thierry Meyssan, author of 'The Big Lie,' was not taken seriously but rather looked upon with ridicule and mockery. Thierry Meyssan believes 'the explosions were organized from within the command of the American army,' while Roger Garaudy sees 'the September events as a conspiracy involving intelligence agencies and state apparatus.'

2. Western media did not inquire about how the United States exploited the events of 9/11 to reshape the world, turning the war on terrorism into a war against international law and human rights, suffering even within America's borders. Mary Robinson, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, asserts:

Since September 11, 2001, the United States has used the fight against terrorism as a pretext to violate human rights. Consequently, we are concerned about the erosion of civil rights in countries fighting terrorism.' A prime example of this is the terrorism law applied within the United States, which disregarded anything related to human rights and individual freedoms. What happens in Guantanamo and the cruel treatment of prisoners there is another facet of human rights violations. (Kirat, 2003).

Concealing the truth is the highest degree of crime and terrorism. Fabricating reality, distorting it, and manipulating the masses to please a ridiculously small group of war merchants surpasses in danger the greatest criminal and terrorist acts. Professional media conscience demands the use of professionalism, craftsmanship, ethics, and commitment to understanding, communication, understanding, and harmony among races, nations, and religions, so that the media becomes a source of disseminating human values, understanding, prosperity, and well-being worldwide, rather than igniting the fire of sedition, wars, crimes, hatred, racism, and bigotry.

Third case study: The war in Afghanistan

In the early days of America's war against the Taliban movement, Al Jazeera channel took the lead in providing the world with reports and images of what was happening in the mountains of 'Tora Bora' and 'Kandahar.' This did not fit well with Americans at all, as American media relied on what Al Jazeera provided. The only solution to break this dominance and get rid of the Arab perspective of the war was to 'mistakenly' bomb Al

Jazeera's office, as claimed by the Americans. When the Taliban were defeated, and the Americans strengthened their influence in the country, controlling every aspect, CNN expanded its influence through its usual alliance with the Pentagon, and thus America controlled military operations, images, news, and analyses. This is what war merchants seek. Americans usually do not settle for just military strategy; they focus on psychological warfare and propaganda to manipulate and control minds and opinions, and hence public opinion. This made them focus on the media for years to win people's minds. In times of peace or war, the public remains the pivotal factor in the communication process. The public has the right, according to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to communicate and receive news and information truthfully, objectively, and responsibly. The public has the right to know. Because what an individual receives in society in terms of news and information shapes their frame of reference and opinion, consequently influencing their behavior later. The issue here is, therefore, strategic, and important. Manipulating the profession of journalism and manipulating information can have significant impacts and effects people's perceptions and behavior. The media's responsibilities in times of war are far more critical than military operations on the battlefield, and the media's responsibilities in times of war are much more than its tasks and duties in times of peace. (Carruthers, 2000). So, it is about ideas, opinions, positions, and emotions. Goebbels' propaganda led the entire German population to engage in a war they did not need, but their stance, especially the media's stance, resulted in a world war whose repercussions and effects persist to this day. The same can be said about exploitative, colonial, and aggressive wars that humanity has suffered from for many centuries. Through it all, professional conscience reproaches every journalist worldwide who could have done something to avoid war but instead finds them silent or accomplice with forces driven solely by self-interest and material gains, even at the expense of tens of thousands of innocent children and civilians.

Commitment to respecting the profession, defending it, and protecting it from anyone trying to exploit it or use it for purposes other than the public and community's interest are the greatest challenges facing journalists worldwide. And when we say the public interest here, we may mean the interest of all humanity worldwide. The media can be a means of peace, dialogue, and rapprochement between peoples, but it can also be a means of destruction, propaganda, distortion, demolishing much more than building and serving humanity. Unfortunately, in the first quarter of the twenty-first century, we are still suffering from blackouts, and distortion of stereotypical images and psychological warfare. The public is exposed to media messages that depict the oppressed as oppressors and terrorists and portray the colonizers as peaceful, democratic lovers of peace and security worldwide. Thus, values and principles have deteriorated, morals have degraded, and the public watches innocent children in many countries exposed to killing, brutality, exploitation, with the human conscience absent or missing, and media machines and systems have turned into loudspeakers and propaganda tools justifying monstrous and barbaric actions for merchants of war and weapons. America, which allied with President Saddam Hussein three decades ago, incited him to wage a fierce war against the Islamic Republic of Iran, is presented and depicted by the media today as a liberating state that loves peace and democracy. America claimed that it invaded Iraq to liberate the Iraqi people from Saddam Hussein's tyranny. America created Bin Laden and turned him into a hero to liberate Afghanistan from the Soviet Union's communism, then later engaged in a war in Afghanistan to liberate the Afghan people from Bin Laden and the Taliban.

Fourth case study: The Third Gulf War: A war of airwaves between the Iraqi Ministry of Information and the American media

As usual, following the traditions of war, the United States of America began preparing for war long ago, and preparations intensified after the events of 9/11 and the declaration of war on terrorism. At times, Iraq was accused of ties with Al-Qaeda, and at other times, news was spread suggesting Osama Bin Laden was in Iraq. Moreover, Iraq had been

accused since the end of the Second Gulf War of possessing weapons of mass destruction, a claim that the numerous UN inspection teams failed to prove over the years. America justified its war on Iraq by attempting to spread democracy in the country, getting rid of the 'dictator' Saddam Hussein, and liberating the Iraqi people from this despot. Just a reminder, there are over 9,000 media personnel working in the American government apparatus and there are more than 27,000 media and public relations personnel in the Pentagon which spent 4.7 billion US dollars for propaganda in 2009. (<https://www.cato.org/blog/pentagon-propaganda-machine-rears-its-head>). Additionally, a media center at the American military base in Qatar, Al Udeid, has been equipped with hundreds of thousands of dollars (Chomsky, 2003). The American media machine has long been working to win over American public opinion first, then global opinion second. The bet this time was tough since the American media machine failed in its deceptive and propaganda operations. Each time, we notice thousands of Americans protesting in various cities across the United States, condemning the war, questioning its effectiveness, and the possibility of avoiding it through peaceful and diplomatic means. Yet, despite all these, we observe the insistence of the White House hawks, war merchants, and weapons dealers on continuing their pursuit of implementing plans to control and dominate Iraqi oil and strategic locations in the region.

Here we see the complicity of "Fox News" and other global media institutions in preparing the atmosphere for global capital, extreme Christian right, and global Zionism to exert influence and control over wealth and strategic areas in the world, despite the opposition of millions of people and public opinion worldwide in distinct parts of the world.

During the outbreak of aggression on Iraq, a conflict arose in the domain of voice and image between the Iraqi Minister of Information on one side, and the Pentagon spokesperson on the other. The war of statements between the two sides began, and the world witnessed on air a different type of war - psychological warfare of deception and blackout. Due to the strength and dominance of the American side, the Pentagon exerted various pressures, intimidation, and even physical elimination (Mansour, 2003; Al Nadeem, 2001; Abu Al Noor, 2003). This made the war of data and images, as well as press conferences, much more important than what was happening in the field of operations, intensifying the conflict over who controls and manipulates the war in terms of news, information, and images. This led Americans to set up a media center in Al Udeid, Qatar, responding to the event's importance and strategy. The Pentagon directed over six hundred journalists, 80% of them Americans, and the rest from coalition countries and other nations, overseeing and guiding them to places they desired and interfering with what they wrote, published, and broadcasted.

Thus, the war was a media war before it was tactical military operations and strategies on the battlefield. American experts have a history in this field, starting from propaganda wars and psychological warfare. Studies and research on media influence, content analysis, emerged from the womb of war media, propaganda, conflicts, and the Cold War. In Vietnam, Americans received a lesson they would never forget; the lesson lay in their inability to control and manipulate the news and images of the war, as the American public saw horrific images and received news that motivated them to organize marches and protests, ultimately leading to the American defeated withdrawal from the Vietnam war (Braestrup, 1994). The same happened in Somalia when the world witnessed images expressing the humiliation of American soldiers' pride.

America bombed the Iraqi television and communication facilities, isolating Iraq from the world and silencing it from presenting the truth and expressing its views and positions on events and facts. America also bombed Al Jazeera and Abu Dhabi TV and shot journalists for no reason other than presenting news and images revealing the brutal and criminal acts of the American military machine. America aims at controlling the world in terms of media and information using whatever images, news, and facts it desires while preventing

others from informing the world. The American logic is to have double standards, where the Geneva Convention applies to Iraqis but not to Americans. It's the right for Americans to humiliate prisoners at Guantanamo and treat them as criminals and terrorists before trial, and it's the right for Americans to prevent journalists from covering their invasion. For Grenada, the secrecy surrounding the assassination of Salvador Allende, support for the Contras in Nicaragua, the toppling of the government there, and the attempt to overthrow Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez—all demonstrate that the rest of the world lacks the right to exercise its freedom of information, communication, and dissent. This contradicts the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and international norms and treaties, both in principle and in detail.

Moreover, subsequent lies emerged regarding the alleged control over Umm Qasr, Basra, and other locations claimed to have been liberated and fully under coalition control. The deliberate bombing and destruction of the Iraqi Television, Al Jazeera, and Abu Dhabi TV, along with the intentional killing of journalists, constitute aggressive crimes against freedom of expression, opinion, and journalism. The images and truth troubled Americans and mobilized American and global public opinion against the brutality of the White House hawks, driven by the interests of oil companies and global Zionism.

Curiously, Americans use the Geneva Conventions when it comes to images of their captured soldiers but quickly ignore these conventions when they censor Iraqi media through force and violence, bomb the Iraqi television station and communication facilities, and deliberately target journalists.

The Arab media, represented by channels such as Abu Dhabi, Al Jazeera, and Al Arabiya, exposed the American-British alliance and debunked the false claims of clean and swift wars lasting only few days. This time, the Arab media imposed its presence and managed to reveal that what is happening on the battlefield proves that the aggression aims to destroy Iraq without distinguishing between civilian and military targets. The bombing of the television building is unambiguous evidence of this. The Geneva Conventions prohibit striking civilian targets and emphasize that "attacks must be limited to military targets only." The Arab media, this time, succeeded in asserting itself, providing an alternative perspective and uncovering the truth.

The decline of the fourth estate and the need for the fifth estate

The events in Fallujah during the third Gulf War and the subsequent global repercussions following September 11, 2001, suggest serious developments that could undermine democracy, human rights, and freedom of the press, even in the most established democracies worldwide. What was once known in media and political circles as the fourth estate—media acting as a watchdog over the executive, legislative, and judicial powers—is now history. The current happenings in the global media landscape are far from portraying the media as a counterforce or a power monitoring the war profiteers, manipulators, and arms dealers. The media covering the events and massacres in Fallujah are drumming up support for the war more than exposing its horrors, illegitimacy, and inhumanity. The media as a fourth power has become a legend, an empty theory lacking any basis. Media outlets have become part of the influential forces in society and part of the superstructure controlled by the forces of finance, profit, and politics. The media, which was supposed to expose major flaws, transgressions, and dangerous manipulation of public opinion, has become part of the game, justifying, explaining, misleading, and being biased in favor of the status quo and the influential forces in society, at the expense of the people, objectivity, freedom, and truth.

George W. Bush lied to the American people and the world at large, justifying his war on Iraq with weapons of mass destruction and Saddam's link to bin Laden. The American people and the world believed the lie, and America invaded Iraq under the pretext of the war on terror. Lies were repeated, and America took drastic measures under the pretext of the Blue Color and terrorists in Fallujah, this resistant city. The American, global, and

Arab media watched without action. The European Union also distinguished itself with its silence and implicit complicity, at the expense of truth-telling, human rights, and individual freedoms.

In Darfur, the world moved in the direction dictated by America and the global media machine. The issue was raised with the Security Council. However, what happens in Fallujah does not concern the European Union, the United Nations, or the media, which are supposed to fight and sacrifice for objectivity, freedom, and truth, whatever the cost. Media practices in this era of information technology, the digital age, and globalization confirm the decline of the fourth estate and the collapse of the media's argument as a counterforce and an effective power in society to monitor, investigate, and reveal truths.

Even in democratic countries where governments come through democratic elections and have a clear separation of powers, especially between the judicial and the executive, we notice a violation of many principles, notably the right to information and the intrusion on individual freedoms and privacy. The Patriot Act in America is considered a blatant violation and interference in the privacy and rights of American citizens, especially those of Arab or Islamic origin.

Since globalization, the principle of the fourth estate has become devoid of content and does not mean much in the world of media monopolies and global cultural industries that mold and shape media messages according to a specific perspective and pre-defined logic. Massive media institutions have imposed themselves on the media industries, monopolizing voice, image, and text. Companies with capitals estimated in hundreds of billions of dollars like News Corp, Viacom, AOL Time Warner, General Electric, Microsoft, Bertelsmann, United Global Com, Disney, France Telecom, Telefonica—these companies' primary focus is profit, expansion, reputation, and global reach, at the expense of the "fourth estate" which has become a faded trend overshadowed by events in the era of globalization.

These giant companies do not care about transgressions against press freedom, freedom of speech, and truth-telling. They cannot be a fourth or counterforce against the selfishness of the moneyed elite and political influence in society. Media institutions have sadly taken the side of money and politics at the expense of the fourth estate and the counterforce. They are now part of the game where media institutions intertwine with industrial, military institutions, all integrating, colluding, and cooperating for money, regardless of means or methods used, or the cost or principles usually set aside. (Chosky,2003).

With the decline of the fourth estate, both locally and internationally, it becomes necessary for society to look forward to establishing the fifth estate to confront the various forms of propaganda and manipulation of people's minds. The fifth estate resides in civil society, which must organize itself to face the power of the media that has sided with the three authorities in society, especially the authority of money and politics. What happened in Venezuela between the media and President Hugo Chavez, what transpired in Chile's media leading to the overthrow of Salvador Allende, and the events in Fallujah and Iraq - all shameful evidence confirming the bankruptcy of various media systems, aligning themselves with the holders of wealth, politics, war merchants, and arms dealers at the expense of innocent masses and a helpless public opinion, manipulated as propaganda, obscured, and misled at will. (Ramonet, 2003)

The media in the twenty-first century, the era of globalization and digital age, is nothing but strategic means of dominance, control, and manipulation of intellectual output, opinion, and ideology. In other words, it is the observer, justifier, and interpreter of the world as it stands today, a world monopolized and controlled by a handful of "hawks" and financial and political magnates. The media in our world today, according to Ignacio Ramonet, is marked by pollution, poisoning through all kinds of lies, rumors, distortions,

manipulation. What is required is to purify this media industry of all these impurities and pollutants.

Hence, the global system must consider establishing a global media observatory to monitor transgressions and manipulation by an institution that plays a strategic role in shaping public opinion, locally and globally. Similarly, civil society in every country should form a national-level observatory to monitor distortion, blackout, and manipulation of truth in favor of a handful of powerful figures in finance and politics.

The state of media in the twenty-first century indicates a grave danger that must be studied and addressed as soon as possible because it concerns the manipulation of public opinion globally, at the expense of the fundamental principles of truth, human rights, and the right to know. What happened in Iraq, in the name of combating terrorism, and in Palestine and Afghanistan is nothing but a direct violation, aired publicly, of human rights, freedom of expression and individual freedoms. (Aday, 2005, Atkins 2014, Bennett et al.2007. Carrutters, 2011)

The most dangerous thing humanity suffers from is the pollution of thought, and its greatest crime is deception, distortion, hiding the truth, promoting lies and myths, violating the right to know, and the right of expression for people worldwide. (Chomsky, 2003). The world today needs a fifth estate to halt the collusion and alliance of the media with war merchants and arms dealers, and to restore the right to knowledge, media, communication, opinion, and differing opinions to the people of the world. Humanity cannot enjoy stability, security, tranquility, and peace during polluted, deceitful, myth-filled, and manipulative media. The dialogue of civilizations cannot succeed in the presence of media practices far removed from integrity, objectivity, professionalism, and commitment. (Ramonet,2003).

This study illustrates the absence of a media theory that explains the reality of media practice and malicious and irresponsible coverage and reports in times of wars and crises. Deception, distortion, and manipulation is what imposes itself on media practice. The Fourth Estate thesis, which monitors the three estates in society, has become mere rhetoric with no validity. Financial and political powers have another opinion on how media institutions deal with facts and events in times of wars and crises. (Carrutters, 2011) The media coverage of the Second and Third Gulf Wars was driven by political, military, and financial forces, rather than the logic of objectivity, neutrality, and seeking truth. Journalists were at the mercy of the military and under constraining pressure, sometimes leading to physical elimination. Journalists, backed by media institutions, reflected the positions of their governments and countries at the expense of professionalism, objectivity, integrity, and commitment. Michal Hastins reveals:

The U.S Army illegally engaged in “psychological operations” with the aim of manipulating various high-level U.S. government officials into believing that the war was progressing to gain their continued support. The list of targets includes members of Congress, diplomats, think tank analysts, and even Adm. Mike Mullen, Chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. (<https://www.cato.org/blog/pentagon-propaganda-machine-rears-its-head>.)

The manipulation model explains the use of media institutions during wars and crises by economic and political forces for the purpose of distortion, propaganda, and psychological warfare. (Cohen, and Young 1974, Chomsky 2003). This supports the first hypothesis of this study: 'According to the manipulation model, media coverage of the Iraq war is biased towards the position of the home country.' The study's results also confirmed the second hypothesis: 'The four journalism theories and the market model fail to explain the media coverage of the Iraq war.' One of the case studies highlighted by the research reaffirmed the third hypothesis, stating: 'In war coverage, media blends with propaganda and psychological warfare, entirely departing from the principles of objectivity and freedom.'

During the Third Gulf War, the American propaganda machine established working relationships with the media by organizing daily press conferences in Al-Udeid in Qatar, the Pentagon, the State Department, and the White House. Americans employed high profile war veterans, celebrities, cinema stars, and famous singers, using all auditory, visual, and digital means to convey their opinion and vision, not only to the American people but to the world at large. Propaganda and public relations techniques will be a central part of any war soon. Governments will use all slogans, means, and techniques to manipulate local and international public opinion to serve their interests and goals, at the expense of truth, objectivity, neutrality, media ethics, press freedom, the right to know, and human rights. (Hiebert 2003, Kirat 1989, 2003).

Conclusion:

To sum up, News organizations are driven by the logic of profit, power, war merchants, and experts in propaganda and psychological warfare in times of wars and crises. Thus, we observe rhetoric on the airwaves in the name of liberation, fighting terrorism, dictators, and despots and bringing in democracy. America claims it came to establish democracy and freedom in Iraq. Amidst these contradictions, we find media institutions justifying violence, aggression and war against peoples, their cultures, and civilizations for the sake of peace, security, and harmony among nations of the world.

Is it time to question the journalistic professional conscience? Is it time to debunk the myth of media objectivity, freedom, and independence? Is it time for introspection and to boldly state that the media profession in our days has deviated from its initial path, straying from the principles and mission it was meant for—serving the truth and serving noble humanitarian goals, serving peace, coexistence, and human values instead of serving weapons manufacturers.

In times of war and conflicts, there is an alliance—whether hidden or apparent—between the media and the state. This might lead us to propose an alternative theory to classical media theories, explaining the behavior and practices of the media during wars and crises under the label of the Press Government Coalition Theory. Regardless of the owner or founder and irrespective of the political and economic system, the level of democracy, or freedom in society, according to this theory, the media completely aligns with its government during times of wars and crises. Whether it pertains to democratic Western countries, developing nations, or dictatorial regimes and authoritarian systems, we observe the complete obedience of the media to ideology and the government, patriotism, during the process of news production, gathering, and diffusion to fabricate, shape, and adapt both local and international public opinion to the interests and goals of the powers in control in the country.

References

- Abdullah, K. (2001) "Media Freedom in the West Belongs Only to Those Who Control It", *Al Bayan - Political File "Media and War: The Image Before the Cannon Sometimes"*, Issue 554, December 28, p. 52.
- Abu Al-Nour, MF. (2003) "American Media in Service of the Pentagon: Misinformation Strategy and Psychological Warfare in the Iraq Battle", *Al Bayan - Political File "War... New Concepts for Media"*, Issue 625, May 9, p. 13.
- Adams, V. (1986) *The Media and the Falklands Campaign*. London: Macmillan.
- Aday, S. 2005. *The Real War Will Never Get on Television: Casualty Imagery in American Television Coverage of the Iraq War*. In: Seib, P. ed. *Media and Conflict in the Twenty-First Century*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Aday, S. et al. (2005). *Embedding the Truth: A Cross-Cultural Analysis of Objectivity and Television Coverage of the Iraq War*. *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*. 10(1), pp.3-21.
- Ahmed Mansour (2003) "Psychological Warfare on Journalists in Baghdad", *Al Bayan*, Issue 8314, March 24, p. 29.
- Al Haroub, K. (2003) "Regarding Arab and Western Media Compliance with the Regime in Iraq Before the War", *Al Itihad*, May 21, p. 24.
- Al Nadeem, H (2001) "American Media, The Largest Brainwashing Apparatus in Human History", *Al Bayan - Political File "Media and War: The Image Before the Cannon Sometimes"*, Issue 554, December 28, p. 55.
- Al Rostomani, Najla (2003) "How Objective and Free is War Coverage?" *Gulf News*, March 22, p:9.
- Alali, O. and Eke, K. (1991) *Media Coverage of Terrorism: Methods of diffusion*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Alexander, Y. and Latter, R. (1990) (eds.) *Terrorism and the Media: Dilemmas for Government, Journalists, and the Public*. Washington, DC: Brassey's.
- Alexander, Y. and Picard, R. (1991) (eds.) *In the Camera's Eye: News Coverage of Terrorist Events*. Washington, DC: Brassey's.
- Alterman, Eric (2003) "Il Parait que les Medias Americains sont de Gauche", *Le Monde Diplomatique*, Mars.
- Atkinson, R. (1994) *Crusade: The Untold Story of the Gulf War*. London: HarperCollins.
- Aulich, J. (1992) *Framing the Falklands War: Nationhood, Culture, and Identity*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Bazak, N. (2001) "American Media Did Not Raise the Real Questions for Fear of Shocking Answers", *Al Bayan - Political File "Media and War: The Image Before the Cannon Sometimes"*, Issue 554, December 28, p. 68.
- Beauregard, C., Canuel, A., Coutard, J. (2003) *Les Medias et la Guerre: de 1914 au World Trade Center*. Paris: Edition du Meridien.
- Bennett, W. and Paletz, D. (1994) (eds) *Taken by Storm: The Media, Public Opinion and US Foreign Policy in the Gulf War*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bennett, W.L. (1990). *Toward a Theory of Press-State Relations in the United States*. *Journal of Communication*. 40(2), pp.103-127.
- Bennett, W.L. et al. (2006). *None Dare Call It Torture: Indexing and the Limits of Press Independence in the Abu Ghraib Scandal*. *Journal of Communication*. 56(3), pp.467-485.
- Bennett, W.L. et al. (2007). *When the Press Fails: Political Power and the News Media from Iraq to Katrina*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Berkowitz, B. (2003) *The New Face of War: How war will be fought in the 21st Century*. New York: The Free Press.
- Boumaïza, S. (2004) "Media Deception and the Decline of the Fourth Estate", *Algerian Journal of Communication*, Issue 18, January-June, pp. 87-115.
- Carruthers, S.L. (2011). *The Media at War*. 2 ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chomsky, N. (2003) "Freedom of Expression Manipulated: A Vast Media Mechanism Used in the War on Iraq", *Al Bayan* 2, Issue 478, May 18, p. 14.
- Cohen, S., and Young, J. (1974) (eds.) *The Manufacture of News: Social Problems, Deviance, and the Mass Media*. Beverly Hills, CA.: Sage Publications.
- Cottle, S. (2006). *Mediatized Conflict: Developments in Media and Conflict Studies*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Denton, R) (ed.) (1993) *The Media and the Persian Gulf War*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

- Entman, R.M. (1993). Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm. *Journal of Communication*. 43(4), pp.51-58.
- Entman, R.M. (2004). *Projections of Power: Framing News, Public Opinion, and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Girardet, E (1995). (ed.) *Somalia, Rwanda and Beyond: The Role of the International Media in Wars and Humanitarian Crises*. Dublin: Crosslines Global Report.
- Goddard, P. et al. (2008). Patriotism meets plurality: reporting the 2003 Iraq War in the British press. *Media, War & Conflict*. 1(1), pp.9-30.
- Halimi, S. et D. Vidal (2000) "Lecons d'Une Guerre: Medias et Desinformation", *Le Monde Diplomatique*, Mars.
- Hallin, D. (1989) *The 'Uncensored War': The Media and Vietnam*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hallin, D.C. (1994). Images of the Vietnam and the Persian Gulf Wars in U.S. Television. In: Rabinovitz, S. and Jeffords, S. eds. *Seeing through the Media: The Persian Gulf War*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers. pp.45-58.
- Hamdi, M. (2003) "Media Enlisted in the Army: Journalistic Integrity... The First Victims of Wars", *Al Ittihad*, August 26, p. 4.
- Hammond, W. (1998) *Reporting Vietnam: Media and Military at War*. Lawrence, KA: University of Kansas Press.
- Hanania, Ray (2003) "Embedded Journalists Parrot Military Brief", *Gulf News*, March 30, p.14.
- Haqi, M. (2001) "CNN as a Model: American Media Wavers", *Al Bayan - Political File "Media and War: The Image Before the Cannon Sometimes"*, Issue 554, December 28, p. 51.
- Henry Michaels (2003) "The Pentagon and Collaborative Media Seize Free Coverage", *Al Khaleej*, Issue 8713, March 28, p. 10.
- Hiebert, R. E (1991) "Public Relations as a Weapon of Modern Welfare", *Public Relations Review*, 17(2):107-116.
- Hiebert, R. E (2003) "Public Relations and Propaganda in Framing the Iraq War: A Preliminary Review", *Public Relations Review*, 29(3):243-255.
- Hoffman, S. (2003) "American Media Loses Its Freedom and Echoes the Voices of New Conservatives", translated by Mariam Jumaa Faraj, *Al Bayan* 2, Issue 512, June 21, p. 14.
- Hooper, A. (1982) *The Military and the Media*. Aldershot: Gower.
- <https://www.cato.org/blog/pentagon-propaganda-machine-rears-its-head>. (Accessed 22/12/2022)
- Jaha, M. (2003) "For Marketing Its Policies in Iraq: The United States Launches New Media", *Al Ittihad*, May 25, p. 27.
- Jeffords, S. and Rabinowitz, L. (1994) (eds.) *Seeing through the Media: The Persian Gulf War*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Jensen, R. (1992) 'Fighting Objectivity: The Illusion of Journalistic Neutrality in Coverage of the Persian Gulf War', *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 16, I, 20-32.
- Kellner, D. (2004). The Persian Gulf TV war revisited. In: Allan, S. and Zelizer, B. eds. *Reporting War: Journalism in Wartime*. London: Routledge. pp.136-154.
- Kirat, M. (1989) "Partiality and Biases: The Coverage of the Algerian Liberation War (1954-1962) by Al-Ahram and Le Monde", *Gazette* 44:155-175.
- Kirat, M. (2003) "Much Propaganda... Few Facts: War and Media... Questioning Theories and Debunking the Myth of Objectivity and Freedom", *Al Bayan - Political File "War... New Concepts for Media"*, Issue 625, May 9, p. 10.
- Kirat, M. (2005) "From Seeking the Truth to Falsification and Misleading", Part 1/2 and 2/2, *Al Bayan Newspaper*, January 7 and 14, 2005.

- LaRouche, L. (2001) "CNN Practices Organized Brainwashing and We Should Stop Watching It", *Al Bayan - Political File "Media and War: The Image Before the Cannon Sometimes"*, Issue 554, December 28, p. 53.
- Layadi, N. (2004) "Some Assumptions for Studying the Relationship Between Media and War", *Algerian Journal of Communication*, Issue 18, January-June, pp. 116-128.
- MacArthur, J. (1993) *Second Front: Censorship and Propaganda in the Gulf War*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Massing, M. (2003) "American Planning Succeeded in Blocking the Iraq War from the Eyes of Journalists", translated by Darrar Umair and Mariam Jumaa Faraj, *Al Bayan* 2, Issue 484, May 24, p. 14.
- Mowlana, H., Gerbner, G. and Schiller, H (1992) (eds.) *Triumph of the Image: The Media's War in the Gulf, a Global Perspective*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Nadia Sultan, N. (2003) "Western Journalists Admit to Pressure from the US Administration on the Press", *Al Khaleej*, Issue 8908, October 9, p. 8.
- Nayar, K (2003) "Western Media Turns into a Willing Tool", *Gulf News*, April 19, p:8.
- Parenti, M. (1993) *Inventing Reality: The Politics of News Media*. New York: St Martin's Press.
- Ramonet, Ignacio (2003) "Armes d'Intoxication Massive: Mensonges d'Etat", *le Monde Diplomatique*, Juillet.
- Robinson, P. (2002). *The CNN Effect: The Myth of News, Foreign Policy, and Intervention*. London: Routledge.
- Robinson, P. et al. (2010). *Pockets of Resistance: British News Media, War and Theory in the 2003 Invasion of Iraq*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Rochat, Jocelyn (2000) "Les spin Doctors: Le triomphe des Manipulateurs des Medias", *le Quotidien d'Oran*, Jeudi 11 Novembre.
- Rowling, C.M. et al. (2011). *Some Dared Call It Torture: Cultural Resonance, Abu Ghraib, and a Selectively Echoing Press*. *Journal of Communication*. 61(6), pp.1043-1061.
- Rushti, J. (2003) "The War Proved Western Media Freedom Is Just a Myth!", *Al Bayan - Political File "War... New Concepts for Media"*, Issue 625, May 9, p. 7.
- Schoemaker, E. and Stremlau, N. (2014). *Media and conflict: An assessment of the evidence*. *Progress in Development Studies*. 14(2), pp.181-195. Seib, P. ed. 2005. *Media and Conflict in the Twenty-First Century*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Shahin, T. (2003) "The Confrontation Between the Journalist and the General... Or the Other War", *Al Ittihad*, May 16, p. 25.
- Shaw, M. (1996). *Civil Society and Media in Global Crises: Representing Distant Violence*. London: St Martin's Press.
- Siebert, F., T. Peterson, and W. Schramm (1956) *Four Theories of the Press*. Urbana, ILL: University of Illinois Press.
- Taylor, P. (1992) *War and the Media: Propaganda and Persuasion in the Gulf War*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Tumber, H. and Palmer, J. (2004). *Media at War: The Iraq Crisis*. London: Sage.
- Young, P. and Jesser, P. (1997) *The Media and the Military: From the Crimea to Desert Strike*. London: Macmillan.
- Zaller, J. and Chiu, D. (1996). *Government's little helper: U.S. press coverage of foreign policy crises, 1945-1991*. *Political Communication*. 13(4), pp.385-405
- Zogby, J. (2003a) "TV Networks Bring War Realities Home", *Gulf News*, March 31, p:9.
- Zogby, J. (2003b) "U.S Media Dances to White House Tune", *Gulf News*, May 5, p:9.
- Zogby, J. (2003c) "Writing in the Present by Ignoring the Past", *Gulf News*, May 19, p:9.