

# MEDIA AND WAR

Dissertation submitted to Jawaharlal Nehru University  
in partial fulfilment of the requirement  
for the award of the degree of  
**Master of Philosophy**

PANPIMON NARKNAWA



CENTRE FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL SYSTEMS  
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY  
NEW DELHI – 110067  
2004



जवाहरलाल नेहरू विश्वविद्यालय  
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY  
NEW DELHI 110 067

Centre for the Study of Social Systems  
School of Social Sciences

CERTIFICATE

Date: 12 July, 2004

Certified that the dissertation entitled "Media and War" submitted by Panpimon Narknawa in partial fulfillment of the Master of Philosophy has not been previously submitted for any other degree of this or any other University.

Panpimon Narknawa  
(Panpimon Narknawa)

We, recommend that the dissertation be placed before the examiner for evaluation.

Maitrayee Chaudhuri  
(Dr. Maitrayee Chaudhuri)

Supervisor  
Associate Professor  
Centre for the Study  
of Social Systems  
School of Social Sciences  
Jawaharlal Nehru University  
New Delhi.

Chairperson  
(Prof. Anand Kumar)  
CSSS/SSS  
Jawaharlal Nehru University  
New Delhi-110007

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In the completion of this dissertation, I am grateful to my supervisor, Dr. Maitrayee Chaudhuri who provided valuable guidance and constant support throughout the writing.

A support grant of Indian Council of Cultural Relations (ICCR) for my education in India and a full support of my colleagues in the department of Journalism, Faculty of Communication Arts, Chulalongkorn University are greatly appreciated.

I am also grateful to my teacher, Dr. Avijit Pathak and his wife, who kept my spirits high whenever I needed it the most.

Many thanks to Aisalkyn Berenbaeva, Prashant Shukla, Parul Parihar and Deepti Laroia who provided valuable time to edit the dissertation.

My special thanks to Yutthana Narknawa. His unconditional love and complete understanding kept my spirits firm and made the dissertation a reality.

*Panpimon Narknawa*

## CONTENT

	Pages	
Acknowledgement		
Chapter I	Introduction	1-28
Chapter II	The skewed nature of representation of war in the dominant media	29-65
Chapter III	War and its glamorization	66-88
Chapter IV	Representation of the Iraq War in the Thai Press: a study of some themes	89-141
Chapter V	Conclusion	142-146
Bibliography		147-149

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### I.1 RATIONALE FOR STUDY

Recent events have shown that the role of media in the coverage of war is as important as the war itself. This has been shown repeatedly in the Persian Gulf War 1991, the September 11, 2001 event, the Afghanistan War and most recently the Iraq War 2003. While in earlier wars people of the warring countries were directly involved others remained unaffected. Today war even in remote area, distant lands is all beamed into the bedrooms of ordinary people world over. The significance of media therefore cannot be over emphasized. I attempt here to briefly give the reasons why it is important to study the relationship between media and war.

The immediate context that led me to this study is the Iraq War. The coverage in this instance demonstrated the power of western media, which often presented the interest of the western country alone. This fact made it all the more important to look at the manner in which non western country's media like the Thai media represented the war. The study looks into this. This is the *first* reason for undertaking this study—i.e. to present a nonwestern perception. A second important trend in media representation of war has been trivialization of war making it look like an entertainment film. It

is important to sociologically understand this. This study also looks into this aspect of war as entertainment. This is the *second* reason for undertaking this study. The media during war also played an important role in legitimizing the war and putting forward the view of the invader worldwide. This legitimization has been aggravated by what has been called by "embedded journalism". This study also looks into this. This is the *third* reason. Finally many stereotype and cultural construction about a western world and about Islam is created by the media. This is the *fourth* reason that prompted this study.

## I.2 OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

With the significance that the contemporary war in Iraq has acquired on the making of international policy and the critical role of media during the period. This study intends to deal with :

- (i) The role of media in society and
- (ii) The specific issue of representation of war in the media

For the part concerning the media's role, the study intends to look into the content of warfare coverage and find out the following issues:

- (i) The skewed nature of representation of war in the dominant media
- (ii) War and its glamorization

For the study of media's role, the content of media will be referred to. The focus will be mostly on visual media according to the dominant character in

telecasting which provides live event through communication technology. War in this study means only contemporary war.

For the part dealing with the war issue, the objective is to find out the themes on Iraq War 2003 in Thai press. In order to understand this, I shall investigate the editorials, op-ed articles and perspective columns of three Thai newspapers, that is *Bangkok Post*, *Manager* and *Islamic Guidance Post*. The finding of the study will provide the knowledge of non western country's view on contemporary war.

### **I.3 METHOD**

In the study of "media and war", one of my objectives is to examine how the Thai press represented the Iraq War of 2003. For this, I shall be using the methodology of content analysis. The data has been collected from *Bangkok Post*, *Manager* and *Islamic Guidance Post* over a period of five months i.e. from January 2003 to May 2003. This period covers the timing before the US invasion of Iraq on March 20, 2003 and after US declared its victory in April 2003.

The unit of analysis is newspaper articles, editorial pages, op-ed articles and perspective columns contributed by columnist and guests.

The procedure of doing content analysis for this study, will include a careful reading of the entire articles to determine the main issue in each . After the central issues are identified, I shall try to categorize them thematically. For example, the key issues that I have identified are: 1) US as a hooligan 2) the

conquest of Iraq is the US plan to plunder the Middle East 3) US violated the universal pillar 4) CNN becomes an unreliable media 5) criticize Western and Thai media role 6) war and ethics.

Finally, I shall place issue 1), 2) and 3) under the theme of **Criticism of US role**, issue 4) and 5) under the theme of **Distortion of the Western mass media**, and issue 6) under the theme of **War and ethics**.

To confirm the data interpretation and elaborate these themes objectively, I shall use excerpts from the articles referred.

The three newspapers have been chosen for this study on grounds of different perspective. *Bangkok Post* is the oldest English newspaper of Thailand, established in 1964. It is considered as a quality newspaper for the elite group of society, both Thais and foreigners. The perspective articles have been contributed by professional columnist, Thai academicians and international news sources. In other words, it provides both local and international perspectives on certain issues. *Manager*, establish in 1989, is the newspaper that covers business and political issues specifically. The perspective columns mainly rely on its sophisticated columnists. Most of the perspective articles decisively echo Asian voice. *Islamic Guidance Post*, established in 1983, is the alternative influential newspaper among Thai Muslim society and also for the Thai government. In this the perspective articles are contributed by Muslim scholars, religious leaders, and activists. These articles reflect Islamic ideology.



## I.4 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

For a review of literature on "Media and War", the relevant literature can be classified into two groups:

- (i) Media and sociology;
- (ii) Globalization and media

### (i) Media and sociology

For this part, my intention is to point out the significance of media for society and to look at media from the sociological point of view.

In the book "**Mass Communication Theory: An Introduction**" (1987), Dennis Mcquail points out the significance of media as an important institution in society which have acquired a stable form, structure and set of functions and related public expectations. According to Mcquail, the media institution is engaged in the production, reproduction and distribution of *knowledge*. This knowledge enables us to make sense of experience, shapes our perceptions of it and contributes to the store of knowledge of the past and the continuity of current understanding. This knowledge is distributed in the form of information, ideas, and culture both to responses to social needs as well as the demands of individuals.

Pierre Sorlin, in the book "**Mass Media**" (1994) observes media as the important mean of conveying information, which is regarded as the essential thing for human beings to interpret their lives and guide their actions. He points out that media provide the illusion of immediacy of the world around

us. Without media we would ignore what is happening beyond our immediate surroundings. In other words, media help individuals to make sense of reality.

The significance of media can also be noticeable from its role, especially in the contemporary era in which media plays the central role from everyday life to larger social context. In the book "The Global Media" (1998), Edward S. Herman and Robert W. McChesney examines the role of media in the globalisation context both positively and negatively.

According to the positive notion, they view the dissemination of dominant popular culture to other parts of the world by making linkage among peoples and the emergence of some kind of global culture. Some flow of information to the center and the horizontal flows within regions may open new views and enhance understanding of different cultures within dominant and subordinate states.

Another positive view focuses on the spread of fundamental values of the West, such as individualism, skepticism of authority, the rights of women and minorities which are partially conveyed through lyrics as well as drama. These messages can help serve humane causes and interrupt tyrannical governments and repressive traditional rules.

From the viewpoint of Herman and McChesney ,the negative aspect of media effect concerns the commercial feature of global media. This model rely on the force of competition pressures and advertiser support. The result

is that media outputs are produced for entertainment rather than for public issue. This tendency threaten the public sphere.

Mcquail notes that media as an object of enquiry could be investigated from several different perspectives, rather than as something which needs its own 'discipline' or body of theory. In the event, media were examined mainly in the light of sociological theory and research (Mcquail, 1987: xvi). Some sociological concepts concerning the media have been presented as follows:

#### *Media, Ideology, Stereotype and Representation*

Giddens (2001) notes that the study of media is closely related to the impact of ideology in society. Ideology refers to the influence of ideas on people's beliefs and actions. According to Thomson, Giddens notes, ideology is about the exercise of symbolic power- how ideas are used to hide, justify or legitimate the interests of dominant groups in the social order. Thomson believes that mass – media including not only news but all varieties of programme content and genre greatly expands the scope of ideology in modern societies. Giddens refers to the study of Glasgow Media Group about ideological aspects of TV news reporting. It was found that news tended to favor the government and management at the expense of the strikers.

In the book "Media Sociology" (1992), David Barrat observes that media formulate the stereotype of particular persons or groups, such as gender, race, class, and religion. He explains from the psychological point of view

that stereotypes were seen as a rigid and unchanging attitude that was locked within the individual. Stereotypes were characteristically seen as expressions of hostility towards particular minority groups such as 'blacks' or 'Jews'. Stereotyped views were thought to be held by individuals who had little direct and personal experience of such groups.

In media, some particular groups have been portrayed as occupying a subordinate position in society. Barrat notes that in many films, women typically find themselves in the roles that are seen as less intellectually demanding. Women are often defined in terms of their physical attractiveness to men.

In the book "**Global Sociology**" (2000), Robin Cohen and Paul Kennedy point out that women are narrowly portrayed in the following three ways:

- 1) as wife, mother and housekeeper;
- 2) as sexual referents who confer their sexual attractiveness onto a prosaic object;
- 3) as sex objects to be used by men

In the book "**Media Making: Mass Media In A Popular Culture**" (1998), Grossberge et al explain the concept of representation. They assert that representation means "re-presentation." To re-present something means to take an original, mediate it, and "play it back." This process almost alters the reality of the original. Representation involves making a claim on and about reality; but it is not the same as realism.

In the book “**Mass Communication Theory: An Introduction**”, Dennis Mcquail says that a Marxist approach states:

The media are a means of production, conforming to a general type of capitalist industrial form, with factors of production and relations of production. They are likely to be in the monopolistic ownership of a capitalist class, nationally or internationally organized and to serve the interests of that class. They do so by materially exploiting cultural workers (extracting surplus labor value) and consumers (making excess profits). They work ideologically by disseminating the ideas and worldviews of the ruling class, denying alternative ideas, which might lead, to change or to a growing consciousness by the working class of its interests and by preventing the mobilization of such consciousness into active and organized political opposition.

(Mcquail,1987:63)

The Marxist approach has many versions and formulations. Broadly the political-economic, the Frankfurt school and the hegemonic approach are all inspired by Marxist analysis.

### *Political-Economic Media Theory*

This theory focuses more on economic structures rather than on the ideological content of media. It asserts the dependence of ideology on the economic base and direct research attention to the empirical analysis of the structure of ownership and to the way media market forces operate. From this point of view, the media institution has to be considered as a part of the economic system though with close links to the political system. The predominant character of the knowledge about society produced by the

media can be well accounted by the exchange value of different kinds of content and by the underlying economic interests of owners and decision makers. These interests relate to the need of profit from media operations and to the profitability of other branches of commerce as a result of monopolistic tendencies and processes of vertical and horizontal integration (e.g. into oil, paper, telecommunications, leisure, tourism, etc) (ibid: 64).

Mcquail points out the weakness of the political-economic approach to the fact that elements of media under public control are not so easy to account for in terms of the working of the free market. While the approach centers on media as an economic process leading to the commodity (content), there is an interesting variant of the political-economic approach which suggests that media really produce audiences, in the sense that they deliver audience attention to advertisers and form the action of media publics in certain distinctive ways (ibid: 65).

### *The Frankfurt School and Critical Theory*

The emphasis that the School placed on the media as a powerful mechanism for containment of change has survived and links it with the 'hegemonic' approach. The idea is that the whole system of mass production of goods, services and ideas had more or less completely sold the system of capitalism, along with its devotion to technological rationality, consumerism, short-term gratification, and the myth of 'classlessness'. The commodity is the main ideological instrument of this process since it seems that fine art and even critical and oppositional culture can be marketed for profit at the cost of losing critical power (ibid: 65-66).

Mcquail comments on Marxist critical theorists and members of the Frankfurt School that it can be represented as combining of media-centered view with one of class domination. However, they do not neglect social and material forms and their general view of media power is the one, which emphasizes conservation of the existing order rather than change.

### *Hegemonic Theory of Media*

This theory has concentrated less on the economic and structural determinants of a class-biased ideology and more on ideology itself, the forms of its expression, its ways of signification and the mechanisms by which it survives and flourishes with the apparent compliance of its victims (mainly the working class) and succeeds in invading and shaping their consciousness. The difference from Marxist and political-economic approach lies in the recognition of a greater degree of independence of ideology from economic base (ibid: 66).

Anthony Giddens in his book “**Sociology**” (2001) chronologically explains some influential theories of communication media from the sociological point of view. Harrold Innis (1950, 1951) argued that the character of media strongly influences the organization of a society. He cites the stone hieroglyphics – writing carved on stone – found in some ancient civilizations. Stone carvings last for a long time, but it is not easy to transport them. They are a poor means of keeping in touch with distant places. Hence societies, which depend on this form of communication, cannot become very large.

**Marshall McLuhan** (1964) developed some of Innis's ideas, and applied them particularly to the media in modern, industrialized societies. According to McLuhan, 'the medium is the message.' That is, the nature of the media found in a society influences its structure much more than the content, or the message, which the media convey. Television, for instance, is a very different medium from the printed book. It is electronic, visual and composed of fluid images. Everyday life is experienced differently in a society in which television plays a basic role compared with the one, which only has print. Thus, the TV news conveys global information instantaneously to millions of people. The electronic media, according to McLuhan, are creating a global village – people throughout the world see major news events unfold and hence participate in them also. Millions of people in different countries, for example, followed the intrigue involving the American President Bill Clinton and the former White House intern Monica Lewinsky. After a full year of revelations and relentless media coverage, the scandal finally subsided after a bid to impeach Clinton failed.

### **Jürgen Habermas: The Public Sphere**

The German philosopher and sociologist Jürgen Habermas belongs to the Frankfurt School of social thought. The Frankfurt School was a group of authors inspired by Marx who nevertheless believed that Marx's views needed radical revision to bring them up to date. Among other things, they believed that Marx had not given enough attention to the influence of culture in modern capitalist society.



The Frankfurt School made a broad study of what they called the 'culture industry', meaning the entertainment industries of film, TV, popular music, radio, newspapers and magazines. They argued that the spread of the culture industry, with its undemanding and standardized products, undermines the capacity of individuals for critical and independent thought.

Habermas has taken up some of these themes, but developed them in a different way. He analyses the development of media from the early eighteenth century up to the present day, determining the emergence – and subsequent decay – of the 'public sphere' (1989). The **public sphere** is an arena of public debate in which issues of general concern can be discussed and opinions formed.

The public sphere, according to Habermas, developed first in the salons and coffee houses of London, Paris and other European cities. People used to meet to discuss issues of the moment, the subjects for debate often arising from the newsheets and newspapers, which had just begun to emerge. Political debate became a matter of particular importance. Although only small numbers of the population were involved, Habermas argues that the salons were vital to the early development of democracy, for they introduced the idea of resolving political problems through public discussion. The public sphere – at least in principle – involves individuals coming together as equals in a forum for public debate.

However, the promise offered by the early development of the public sphere, Habermas concludes, has not been fully realized. Democratic debate in modern societies is stifled by the development of the culture industry. The

spread of mass media and mass entertainment causes the public sphere to become largely a sham. Politics is stage-managed in Parliament and the media, while commercial interests triumph over those of the public. 'Public opinion' is not formed through open, rational discussion, but through manipulation and control – as, for example, in advertising.

### **Baudrillard: The World of Hyperreality**

One of the most influential current theorists of the media is the postmodernist French author Jean Baudrillard, whose work has been strongly influenced by the ideas of Innis and McLuhan. Baudrillard regards the impact of modern mass media as being quite different from any other technology. The coming of the mass media, particularly electronic media such as television, has transformed the very nature of our lives. TV does not just 'represent' the world to us, it increasingly defines what the world in which we live actually is.

Just before the outbreak of hostilities in the Gulf in 1991, Baudrillard wrote a newspaper article entitled 'The Gulf War cannot happen'. When war was declared and a bloody conflict took place it might seem obvious that Baudrillard had been wrong. After the end of the war, Baudrillard wrote a second article, 'The Gulf War did not happen'. What he meant is that the war was not like other wars that have happened in history. It was a war of the media age, a televise spectacle, in which, along with other viewers throughout the world, George Bush and Saddam Hussein watched the coverage by CNN to see what was actually 'happening'.

Baudrillard argues that, in an age where the mass media are everywhere, in effect a new reality – hyper reality – is created, composed of the intermingling of people's behavior and media images. The world of hyper reality is constructed of **simulacra** – images which only get their meaning from other images and hence have no grounding in an 'external reality'.

### **John Thomson: The Media And Modern Society**

Commenting on some part of the writings of Habermas, John Thomson has analysed the relation between the media and the development of industrial societies (1990, 1995). From early form of print through to electronic communication, Thomson argues, the media have played a central role in the development of modern institutions. The main founders of sociology, including Marx, Weber and Durkheim, Thomson believes, gave too little attention to the role of media in shaping even the early development of modern society.

Thomson is also critical of some Habermas's ideas, as he is of the Frankfurt School and of Baudrillard. The Frankfurt School's attitude towards the culture industry was too negative. The modern mass media, Thomson thinks, do not deny us the possibility of critical thought; in fact, they provide us with many forms of information to which we couldn't have had access before. In common with the Frankfurt School, Habermas treats us too much as the passive recipients of media messages. In Thomson's words:

Media messages are commonly discussed by individuals in the course of reception and subsequent to it... [They] are transformed through an ongoing

process of telling and retelling, interpretation and reinterpretation, commentary, laughter and criticism...By taking hold of messages and routinely incorporating them into our lives... we are constantly shaping and reshaping our skills and stocks of knowledge, testing our feelings and tastes, and expanding the horizons of our experience.

(Thomson 1995: 42-3 cited in *ibid*: 463)

The mass media, Thomson suggests, changes the balance between the public and the private in our lives. Contrary to what Habermas says, much more comes into the public domain than before, and this quite often leads to debate and controversy.

## **(ii) Globalization and Media**

In this part, I intend to draw on the pattern of global media ownership in order to indicate the relationship between the ownership and media role in contemporary society.

Some amounts of writing on media in the context of globalization focuses on the relationship between changes in global communications networks and the media, the impact of globalization on mass media and communication, and on the emergence of global media institutions. In this study, the relevant issue is based on the latter point.

The term "globalization" does not only describe changes in international relationships, particularly in economics and international trade, but also has been related to society and culture changes including media and communication.

According to the works of Herman and McChesney (1997), Taylor (1999), Giddens (2001) and Gorman and McLean (2003), media industry has seen enormous changes under conditions of globalization. The major shifts in media operation can be noticed as the following:

1. *Increasing concentration of ownership.* The global media is now dominated by a small number of powerful corporations. Small-scale, independent media companies have gradually been incorporated into highly centralized media conglomerates. Ten dominates the global media market or so vertically integrated media conglomerates, most of which are based in the United States. Another thirty or forty significant supporting firms round out the meaningful positions in the system (Herman and McChesney, 1998: 104).

The example of this model is News Corporation's Star Television, which broadcasts to more than 50 countries in Asia with an audience of 220 million viewers, and the Cable News Network (CNN)-part of the huge AOL-Time Warner conglomerate since 2000-that provides news services to more than 200 countries

2. *A shift from public to private ownership.* Traditionally, media and telecommunications companies in almost all countries were partially or fully owned by the state. In the past few decades, the liberalization of the business environment and the relaxing of regulations have led to the privatization (and commercialization) of media companies in many countries.

3. *Transnational corporate structures.* Media companies no longer operate strictly within national boundaries. Likewise, media ownership rules have been loosened to allow cross border investment and acquisition. The evidence presenting in the work of Gorman and McLean (2003: 211) pointing out that the deregulation policy in telecommunications in United States in 1980s and 1990s, stimulated the greater consolidation in media industries and greater integration into global media markets. The result, for example, is that AT&T, which had previously controlled nationwide telephone services, lost its monopoly, opening the way to competition. It also diversified into other areas, buying a cable television company and an Internet company, and extended its international operations. Besides, the easing of rules that had restricted cross-media ownership opened the way to enormous concentration of media ownership. Thus a single global corporation such as News Corporation was able to increase extensive interests in newspapers, the film industry, and both network and cable television (Gorman and McLean, 2003: 211).

4. *A growing number of corporate media mergers.* There has been a trend towards alliances between companies in different segments of the media industry. Telecommunications firms, computer hardware and software manufacturers, and media 'content' producers are increasingly involved in corporate mergers as media forms become increasingly integrated. Some examples are the merger of American Online and Time Warner, or the case of Japanese electronics giant Sony's take-over of the US-based CBS record label in 1987; the international record industry is now largely owned by five labels- Sony-CBS, RCA, Warner, Thorn-EMI and Polygram – each of which is owned by a multinational corporation.

It can be noted that, the factors that have facilitated global communication and the global spread of media are:

1. The occurrence of new technologies such as the extension of fiber-optic, cable systems, of satellite links, of Internet communication networks made possible greater geographical reach.
2. The deregulation policies in many areas including telecommunication systems among Western states to reach free trade market opened up media markets to highly integrated global corporations. In other words, changes in national policies have contributed to globalization.
3. Commercial media at the global level have been encouraged by international organizations because media is seen as central to the world economy (Gorman and McLean, 2003: 213). Organizations such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Trade Organization (WTO) have supported global media in the service of the market economy.

With the benefit of globalization context, in the 1990s the growth of giant media corporations exploited the possibilities of multiple media ownership and of commercial concerns that transcended national boundaries. Media companies, responding to the market situation, moved toward being larger, global, and vertically integrated so that they could achieve cost savings and take advantage of cross-selling and cross-promotion opportunities. Many media business became part of global conglomerates producing

entertainment, media products and computing software with global distribution networks (ibid.)

In this part, I shall raise some examples of the world's influential media corporations, which expanded about cross media ownership, and the power of transnational media. The information below will provide the picture of media controller.

### *News Corporation*

Rupert Murdoch, the head of News Corporation expanded the media business from his native Australia into the global market. News Corporation operates in nine different media on six continents. Herman and McChesney in their book "**The Global Media**" (1998) identify the News Corporation's significance of media holding, and it includes the following:

- Some 132 newspapers (primarily in Australia, Britain, and the United States), making it one of the three largest newspaper groups in the world;
- Twentieth Century Fox, a major film, television, and video production center, which has a library of over 2,000 films to exploit;
- The U.S. Fox broadcasting network;
- Twenty-two U.S. television stations, the largest U.S. station group, covering over 40 percent of U.S. TV households;
- Twenty-five magazines, most notably *TV guide*;
- Book-publishing interests, including HarperCollins;



- A 50 percent stake in several U.S. and global cable networks, including fX, fXM, Fox Sports Net;
- Fox News Channel;
- Asian Star Television, satellite service and television channels;
- Controlling interests (40 percent) in British Sky Broadcasting (BskyB) (1996 sales: \$1.6 billion);
- BskyB has a 40 percent stake in U.K.'s Granada Sky Television satellite channel group;
- A 49.9 percent stake in Germany's Vox channel;
- A 30 percent stake in Sky Latin America digital satellite service;
- A 40 percent stake in U.S. Sky Television, a digital satellite joint venture with Echostar and Concert;
- A 50 percent stake in Japan Sky Broadcasting digital satellite service;
- Australian Foxtel cable channel:
- A 49.9 percent stake in India's Zee TV;
- The Spanish-language EL Canal Fox in Latin America;
- U.K. Sky Radio;
- A 15 percent stake in the Australian Seven networks;
- India Sky Broadcasting digital satellite service;
- A 50 percent stake in channel V, Asian music video channel;
- A 45 percent stake in Hong Kong-based Phoenix Satellite television Company.

TH-11647



### *AOL-Time Warner*

In January 2000 two of the world's most influential media companies joined together in the largest corporate merger the world had ever seen. In a deal worth 337 billion dollars, the world's biggest company, *Time Warner*, and the world's largest internet service provider, *America Online* (AOL), decided to create the 'world's first fully integrated media and communications company for the internet Century'. The merger brings together the enormous media 'content' owned by *Time Warner* including newspapers and magazines, film studios and TV stations – with the powerful internet distribution capabilities of AOL, whose subscription base exceeded 25 million people in fifteen countries at the time of merger (Giddens, 2001: 476).

The merger of two giant media companies has been viewed as the combination between old and new media. "This example of converging media provided institutional confirmation that the barrier between television and personal computers was disappearing, and that old and new media convergence could make available content from traditional media (newspaper, television, and film) to leading companies of the information age" (Gorman and McLean, 2003: 218).

For one of *Time Warner*'s components, Cable News Network (CNN), the media merger meant that the cable news could integrate its news operations amid converging technologies. No longer relying only on cable and satellite delivery, CNN journalists and technicians in the field were able to send image and sound files via satellite phones instantaneously to the CNN.com website (ibid.). Herman and McChesney point out that *Time Warner* is a

major force in virtually every medium and on every continent. Some of its holding includes the following:

- Twenty-four magazines, including *Time*, *People*, and *Sports Illustrated*;
- The second largest book-publishing business in the world, including Time Life Books (42 percent of sales outside of the United States) and the Book of the Month Club;
- Warner Music Group, one of the largest global music businesses with nearly 60 percent of revenues from outside the United States;
- Warner Brothers film studio, also a major producer of television programs;
- Global leading motion picture theater company, with over 1,000 screens outside of the United States;
- HBO, the largest pay cable channel in the world;
- Cinemax pay cable channel;
- Warner Brothers Movie World theme park in Germany;
- A library of over 6,000 films, 25,000 television programs, books, music, and thousands of cartoons ripe for commercial exploitation;
- Several U.S. and global television channel including CNN, Headline News, Cnnfn, the Airport Channel, TBS, TNT, Turner Classic Movies, The Cartoon Network, as well as the new CNN-SI all-sports news channel.

The emerge of multimedia conglomerates poses questions about the role and responsibilities of media in contemporary societies. The concentration is put on the centralized control by few media ownerships over the global. This increases the dominant role of the conglomerates in the new global economy of information and communication.

The expansion of Rupert Murdoch's News Corporation provoked concern about cross-media ownership and the power of transnational media. Critics of News Corporation maintain that it represents an enormous concentration of power in the hands of one man. This undermines the capacity for media within this giant corporation to fulfill traditional expectations about objectivity in news and information delivery, and for unlimited journalistic independence, including the critical role in society, contributing to, or reflecting, national culture. Furthermore, the extent of News Corporation control over certain media markets has reduced diversity and limited the variety of information available to the public because policy decisions about media content have been based purely on commercial consideration (Gorman and McLean, 2003: 217).

Within the globalization context, news becomes just another product sold by big media companies. It is regarded simply as a commodity. Moreover, it tends to be more entertainment-based, and traditional values such as objectivity and regard for accuracy are lost (ibid: 219).

According to Giddens, the important role of the media as a forum for free speech, expression and debate will be also diminished. A single company that controls both the content – TV programs, music, films, new sources and

the means of distribution is in a position of greater power. It can promote its own material (it has made famous the singers and the celebrities), and it can exercise self-censorship (omitting news stories that might cast its holdings or corporate supporters in negative light) (Giddens, 2001: 478).

According to Herman and McChesney (1998) the growth of media globalization and the tendency toward centralization of media control and the spread of commercialization tends to erode the public sphere and to create a 'culture of entertainment' that is incompatible with a democratic order. "Media outputs are commodities and are designed to serve market ends, not citizenship needs." they state.

## **1.5 CHAPTERISATION**

In order to understand the study of "media and war" systematically, I shall briefly provide the overview of each chapter as following:

### **Chapter I: Introduction**

I shall present the reason why it is important to study the relationship between media and war. The objective of study and the method used for studying as well as the review of literature are presented in this chapter.

### **Chapter II: The skewed nature of representation of war in the dominant media**

This chapter analyses the skewed nature of media representation of war. *First*, it looks at the role of media in major international conflict. The idea is to

point out the common aspects of war representation and identify the themes that emerge. *Second*, it looks at the media representation of war in order to bring out 1) the absent story and the 2) implication of this coverage.

### Chapter III: War and its glamorization

In this chapter, I seek to show how the dominant media glamorize war and to specify some factors involved. This kind of glamorization suggests the feeling that there is no actual loss. It is like a computer game. This also leads to desensitization, thereby helping the agenda of dominant actors in warfare.

### Chapter IV: Representation of the Iraq War in the Thai press

In this chapter I shall study the manner that the Thai press represents the Iraq War. This chapter is based upon newspapers articles, editorial pages, op-ed articles and perspective columns contributed by columnist and guest columns. The newspaper articles analyzed in this study case drawn from 3 newspapers. The newspapers selected are:

- 1) The Bangkok Post
- 2) The Manager
- 3) The Islamic Guidance Post

I chose each of these as representative of different perspectives. *Bangkok post*, English newspaper for the elite group of society. Its articles provide both local and international perspectives on certain issues. *Manager*, most

of the perspective articles decisively echo Asian voice. *Islamic Guidance Post*, the perspective articles reflect Islamic ideology.

## Chapter V: Conclusion

In this chapter, I shall summarize the previous chapter and briefly report the main finding.

## REFERENCE

- Barrat, David (1992) **Media Sociology**. London: Routledge.
- Cohen, Robin and Kennedy, Paul (2000) **Global Sociology**. London: Macmillan.
- Giddens, Anthony (2001) **Sociology**. Delhi: Polity.
- Gorman, Lyn and McLean David (2003) **Media and Society in Twentieth Century: A Historical Introduction**. Malden,USA: Blackwell.
- Grossberg, Lawrence; Wartella, Ellen and Whitney, Charles D. (1998) **Media Making: Mass Media in Popular Culture**. London: Sage.
- Herman, Edward S. and McChesney, Robert W. (1998) **The Global Media: The New Missionaries of Corporate Capitalism**. India: Madhyam Books.
- Mcquail, Dennis (1987) **Mass Communication Theory: An Introduction**. London: Sage Publication.
- Sorlin, Pierre (1994) **Mass Media**. London: Routledge.
- Taylor, Steve (ed.) (1999) **Sociology: Issues and Debates**. London: Macmillan Press.



## CHAPTER II

### THE SKEWED NATURE OF REPRESENTATION OF WAR IN THE DOMINANT MEDIA

#### II. 1 Introduction

This chapter analyses the skewed nature of media representation of war. *First*, it looks at the role of media in major international conflicts including the Rwanda crisis of 1994. The idea is to point out the common aspects of war representation and identify the themes that emerge. The themes that appear to be constant are:

- (i) The “other” is bad
- (ii) Islam is synonymous with violence
- (iii) Men are heroes, women are victims of war

*Second*, I shall be looking at the media representation of war carefully in order to bring out the following:

- (i) The absent story and the
- (ii) Implication of this coverage

## II. 2 Major International Conflicts and Media Coverage: Analysis of Certain Themes

For the major international warfare coverage, we can see the model of representation in the following themes. These themes I was able to formulate and put forward after a careful examination of literature in the area of media studies. In that sense this chapter can be read as a review of literature in the field. This literature includes books and journals as well as popular magazines. The identified themes are put forward below:

### (a) The “other” is bad

In the Persian Gulf War 1991 and the recently Iraq War 2003, Iraq and its leader, Saddam Hussein, were represented negatively. The global media that often belong to the countries that led war to Iraq has been questioned the professional objectivity due to presentation of negative view of the opposition. What media depicted the other, has been observed by scholars and columnists.

Bhaskar Ghose writes:

...Our worlds have been made up for us with other images and ideas, and we have, unquestioningly, accepted it as the real world. The world of the Iraq war, the world of the villainy of Saddam Hussein, the world from which Osama bin Laden has suddenly vanished, as have the Taliban captives in the US Army base in Guantanamo Bay... Again, just think of the manner in which the attack

on Iraq is being covered and presented to viewers and the truth of this is evident. The bad guys are the ones with beards.

(Ghose, *Frontline*, April 25, 2003: 83)

Arundhati Roy confirms the viewpoint that media picture the other as uncivilized by raising the double standard regarding the treatment of Prisoners of War (POWs):

When invading American soldiers are taken prisoner and shown on Iraqi TV, George Bush says it violates the Geneva Convention and “exposes the evil at the heart of the regime”. But it is entirely acceptable for U.S. television stations to show the hundreds of prisoners being held by the U.S. government in Guantanamo Bay, kneeling on the ground with their hands tied behind their backs, blinded with opaque goggles and with earphones clamped on their ears, to ensure complete visual and aural deprivation. When questioned about the treatment of these prisoners, U.S. government officials don’t deny that they’re being ill treated. They deny that they’re “prisoners of war”! They call them “unlawful combatants”, implying that their ill treatment is legitimate! (So what’s the party line on the massacre of prisoners in Mazar-e-Sharif, Afghanistan? Forgive and forgot? And what of the prisoner tortured to death by the Special Forces at the Bagram air force base? Doctors have formally called it homicide.)

(Roy, *Frontline*, April 25, 2003: 20)

In the Persian Gulf War 1991, Fred Halliday also finds that Iraq was represented as the only regime which maltreat Prisoners of War:

...When captured British pilots were shown on Iraqi TV making confessions, it appeared that they had been badly beaten up, and this later turned out to be

the case. But the manner in which the POW issue was presented was none the less distorted, and for wartime purposes: the message put across was that Iraqi treatment of POWs was singularly evil, with the further suggestion that the Arabs, perhaps like the Japanese, behaved in an especially barbarous manner towards white prisoners.

(Halliday, 1999: 138)

Halliday recalls the US treatment of POWs that "One need only think of the U.S. murder and mutilation of the corpses of Vietnamese prisoners in the Vietnam War, or of the systematic starving to death of German prisoners after the Second World War" (ibid: 138).

In the viewpoint of Halliday, he considers that the implication of one-sided manner coverage lead to misinformation of history record. He gives the example of such implication that Iraq was viewed as the barbarian because of being the first country to carry out ecological crimes:

That Iraq did commit serious ecological crimes is beyond doubt, most noticeably by blowing up over 600 Kuwaiti oil fields, with consequent damage to land, atmosphere and subterranean areas. However, as the story of oil slick provoked by Western bombing of storage tankers reveals, not all-ecological damage was committed by the Iraqis. Moreover, as was later revealed, the US Armed forces used highly dangerous radioactive depleted uranium shells, the consequences of which for soldiers and, subsequently, civilians are extremely serious.

(Ibid: 137)

He notes in discussion of Iraq's ecological crimes that it was quite unwarranted that Iraq was the first country to conduct such crime in war:

One has only to think of the first and Second World Wars, or of the US use of 11 million gallons of the defoliant Agent Orange in Vietnam, destroying 4.5 million acres of countryside, to see that those excoriating Saddam for his ecological crimes were presenting a partial historical record.

(Ibid.)

In the case of the eight-year Iran-Iraq war, 1980-1988, although the countries in which western media operated is not directly involved the battlefield of warfare, some critics observe that western media supported Saddam's regime and depicted Iran as fanatic. The reason is that it protected Western interests in the Persian Gulf by preventing the spread of the Islamic Revolution from Iran to the rest of the region. The critic notes:

The Western media's silence during the eight-year imposed war against Iran, in which more than 1 million people were killed on both sides, was replaced by a campaign against Ayatollah Imam Ruhollah Khomeini, Iran's spiritual leader and the Western world's most detested political figure in the modern era. Iranians who were defending their country against Saddam Hussein's onslaught were pictured as brutal, uncaring, fundamentalist Shiite zealots who dispatched the country's youth to die on the Gulf War battlefields. Stated another way, patriotism was associated with secularism, and defense of one's land under Islamic tenets and ideology was termed *fundamentalist* and *fanatical*.

(Mowlana, 1992: 32)

The model of "the other is bad" can be seen not only in the global media level, but also in the level of internal media. Ed Vulliamy comments the role

of internal media in the Rwanda crisis 1994 that their enemy was depicted as a mad:

... Ravaging tyrant has been part of the stock-in-trade of propagandists since wars began, and the role of the media in inciting these feelings is part of twentieth-century warfare. Day after day the Bulgarians were represented in the Greek press as a race of monsters...and public feeling was roused to a pitch of chauvinism which made it inevitable that war, when it should come, should be ruthless...Deny that your enemies are men and you will treat them as vermin.

(Cited in Seaton, 1999: 46)

It can be said that the framework of media to consider the event is lead to misinterpretation and misrepresentation. For example, in the case of war and genocide Of 1994 in Rwanda, the Western media use the framework of "ethnic conflict" to justify Western intervention. The fact is that some crisis derives from economic or political problem not because of racial or tribal hatred. And the solution demands for political response rather than humanitarian aid.

As the result, such framework distorted public perceptions of the war and depicted African people as "they are mad, we are sane, we must save them from themselves." And media became "accomplices in the power politics of external actors with interests in the region (McNulty, 1999).

McNulty further points out the impact of media role on international politics as a result of media's misinterpretation of event:

...The following formula of cause and effect may be offered in response to prevalent interpretations of the media's role in African conflict, and the 'humanitarian intervention' agenda: in response to a crisis, the media portray the conflict as ethnic (i.e. a crisis not of our making, caused not by political or economic circumstances but by ancestral hatred beyond our ken); a media focus on human suffering rather than its political causes provoke demands for a presumed apolitical response - to freeze the situation if not solve it - which equals forcible "humanitarian" intervention; intervention by a powerful state into a weak state (and particularly by European states in Africa) cannot be disinterested or free of the suspicion of neo-colonialism; the media, through mechanical ethnicization of conflict in Africa, become the (unwitting) vehicle of a post-Cold war neo-colonial agenda, what has been called the Second Scramble for Africa.

(Ibid: 271)

#### **(b) Islam is synonymous with violence**

Since the "war on terrorism" has been announced by US administration after the attack on World Trade Center 2001, Islam has been constructed as violence and terrorism. The coverage of September 11 event and its aftermath is apparent.

Karim H. Karim writes "Making Sense of the "Islamic Peril" describes the binary term usage by the media to represent the things. He states that following September 11 mass media adopted the Bush administration's "us versus them frame"...their reporting... was shaped by frames that had been in place to cover such issues as violence, terrorism, and Islam (Karim, 2002: 102).

He notes that the space of media was provided for dominant perspective:

“Experts” from government, the military, and academia emerge as the owners of dominant discourses on terrorism. They make themselves readily available through the mass media to the public, to define and describe the problem as well as respond to alternative discourses on the issue.

...On September 11, there was only one story and generally one perspective on the multiple TV networks of North America. Most experts interviewed responded to security matters and did not seem interested in the larger political, social, and economic causes of the attacks. The focus was primarily on the immediate reaction rather than on the larger issues. After some initial fumbling, the Bush administration was soon able to set the frames and the agendas for reporting the unfolding story. Indeed, most media stunned by the events of the day seemed all too willing to accept the government’s lead. As the hunt began for the “Islamic terrorists,” journalists’ narratives failed to provide a nuance and contextual understanding of Islam, Muslims, or the nature of the “Islamic peril.”

(Ibid: 104-105)

He writes that the alternative perspective has not much shown on media. There were some voices attempts to explain the broader context of such conflict. For example, Karen Armstrong, who has written about religious militancy in Islam as well as in Christianity and Judaism, appeared on TV a number of times. However, “they were often brushed aside as interviewers sought confirmation for their perceptions about an endemically violent Islam. The dominant discourse’s sheer ubiquity and maneuverability overshadow the presence of alternative perspectives” (ibid: 105).



(c) Men are heroes, women are victims of war

Feminist investigates the warfare coverage and find that women were shown as weaker and were being used to justify war case.

Jayne Rodgers in the book *Icons and Invisibility: Gender, Myth, 9/11* observes the issue of the gender representations by media in September 11, 2001 event. The article gives the example to emphasize its observation that men are heroes and women are victims of the attacks:

The characters chosen to represent heroes and victims demonstrate the gendering of 9/11 reporting most clearly. Male deaths from the attacks outnumbered female deaths by a ratio of three to one. All of the fire fighters who died in the attacks were male and of the 50 police officers that died, only two were female. Logic would suggest that, while women would not necessarily be the heroes, the victims of 9/11 were largely men. This was not the way the narrative developed. It evolved instead along two trajectories. On one of these, what we could term the iconic, the male hero and the female victim emerged. On the other, on what could be termed an invisible trajectory, men dominated the official responses and women were largely absent.

(Rodgers, 2003: 206)

Rodgers further notes:

The iconic imagery of men from the towers depicts the fire-fighter hero, much to the chagrin of female fire fighters in New York. There were 33 female fire fighters and rescue workers on duty on September 11, working alongside their male colleagues in the towers. Floren, herself a New York fire fighter, suggests that the language used in media reports served to diminish the role of female

officers: 'when you say..."fireman" you imply a necessary connection between gender and occupation. "Firemen" is the perfect word to use when you want to say "all (real) fire-fighters are men"...The portraits of heroism were almost all of men- of Giuliani, of fire-fighters, police officers and the rescue workers who raised the Stars and Stripes at the rescue site.

While men – manliness, masculinity, and maleness – were being constructed as heroes, women were being constructed as victims. There were, media coverage would lead us to believe, few if any female heroes on 9/11. Women were constructed first as victims of the attacks, then defined through narratives centering on the widows and children left behind. Finally, some months later, came the images of the '9/11 babies', born after the deaths of their fathers. In the hours following the attacks, pictures of stunned, weeping women on the streets close to the site were circulated worldwide, one of which was used by the *New York Times* no less than three times over a two-week period. The days and weeks that followed saw the myth of the victim develop further, with coverage of the fiancées, widows and children of men who died in the attacks dominating the 'human interest' angle of media coverage. Little was heard about the men left behind with children and there was no male equivalent to the photographs that appeared some months later of the gathering of 9/11 babies and no group shots of tragic widowers. While the suffering of 9/11 widows warranted attention, the imbalances in reporting are worth commenting upon. While these women were seen to struggle game fully on, their role in the crisis was as wives and mothers, as women essentialized to their femaleness.

(Ibid: 207)

Rodgers observes that women's status in the news reports became more obvious only when the specter of the 'war on terrorism' was raised. At this point, images of women in *burqas*, as victims of the Taliban regime, were widespread. "Ironically perhaps, the media now made the (hidden) victim

visible and gave her iconic status, using her to symbolize not only Taliban repression but also American freedom" (ibid: 208).

Finally, the article concludes that in the case of 9/11, the media helped to depict the courage of America by juxtaposing its female population – feminine, maternal, nurturing – with its male – vigorous, strong and heroic. "The gender myth build up in media reporting of the attacks was of action man and passive woman, restoring, in theory at least, one element of societal imbalance"(ibid: 210).

Transnational Feminists<sup>1</sup> puts forward a statement that offer the response to the events of September 11 and its aftermath. One of the issues of their statement involves a critical analysis of media's role in using the binary oppositions for news presentation:

...Role of the media especially in depictions that include colonial tropes and binary oppositions in which the Islam/Muslim/non-West is represented as "uncivilized" or "barbaric." We note the absence or co-optation of Muslim women as "victims" of violence or of "Islamic barbarism." We note as well the use of those groups of women seen as "white" or "western," both as "rescuers" of non-western women but also as evidence of the so-called

---

<sup>1</sup> The writers are Paolo Bacchetta, Tina Campt Caren Kaplan, Inderpal Grewal, Minoo Moallem, Jenifer Terry.

Transnational Feminists. The authors of this statement are faculty members at various universities around the USA. They share interests in transnational culture, postcolonial and ethnic studies, and contemporary politics of gender and sexuality.

“civilizing” efforts of Europe and North America. We see these discursive formations as a result not only of colonialism’s discursive and knowledge-producing legacies, but also of the technologies and industrial practices that produce contemporary global media, and transnational financing of culture industries. We seek especially to analyze the participation of women in these industries as well as the co-optation of feminist approaches and interests in the attack on a broad range of Islamic cultural and religious institutions, not just “Islamicist/extremist” groups. Thus we point out as a caution that any counter or resistance media would need to have a firm grasp of these histories and repertoires of practice or risk reproducing them anew.

(Joseph and Sharma (eds.), 2003: 270)

## II. 3 The absent story of a skewed coverage

The story that is absent or invisible is the one discussion of the media’s warfare coverage. The critiques go to the point that missing of some information leading to misperception of real event. And leaves the global audience with the view of justification of invasion.

What are absent from the coverage are the larger context—political, economic, cultural, historical background of events, and the hidden agenda of war waging and voices of dissent.

The anti-war voice is usually excluded from war reporting. Their voices are not sufficiently presented in the media. Richard C. Vincent points out that “It was over the coverage of peace marches activities that the news media were criticized for failing to provide substantial time both before and after the war began, and CNN seemed to share in that blame” (Vincent, 1992:186).

This opinion conforms to Herbert I. Schiller who gives the examples of the unheard voice:

...The war has been widely opposed in Japan. "When the Japanese Government tried to send our already unconstitutional Self-Defense Forces to the Gulf," the ad stated, public opposition was massive. "Rallies, meetings, and demonstrations were held all over the country." No recognition of this can be found in the American media. Nor can it be said that these manifestations occurred *only* in an unimportant, Third World country.

Spain was another center of massive popular opposition to its government's contribution, modest as it was, to the coalition fighting in the Gulf. There also huge rallies and governmental resignations might have been expected to receive some American media attention. They didn't.

(Schiller, 1992: 26)

Schiller continually points out the imbalance of war coverage by referring to the situation in Egypt and another part of the world. There, the war supporting aspect was more covered than anti-war movement:

...The closing of Egyptian schools and Universities to prevent student demonstrations against governmental policy, but these were scarcely sufficient to counterbalance the footage of President Mubarak endorsing U.S. actions. Similarly, five-second flashes of huge rallies held in North African cities against the war were completely inadequate in providing a sense of the massive opposition in that part of the world to American policy. What was repeated endlessly for domestic consumption was that the United States was engaged in an allied effort, supported by the United Nations that also embraced the sentiments of a good part of the world.

(Ibid.)

It can be classified that the voice of third world country is one sort of deficit story. Schiller observes that what be heard is the view of the powerful country:

Unreported also were the views of Latin Americans, Asians, and Africans. The admirers, or at least supporters, of the American intervention and war were the leaders of the usual handful of European and English-speaking industrially developed economies and a clutch of other states that were paid or coerced into joining the coalition.

(Ibid: 27)

Besides, the ignorance by the media and US military is the number of the suffered Iraqi from the bombing although the massive killing is a news story as the statement of Schiller:

Most telling of all about the role of the American media has been its utter unconcern with the number of Iraqi casualties suffered from the incessant bombing and, in the waning hours of the war, from the strafing and decimation of thousands of retreating soldiers. Here again, the Pentagon point of view was callous but straightforward. General Colin Powell stated flatly, about the number of Iraqi dead from the air and ground operations, 'it's really not a number I'm terribly interested in.

(Ibid.)

In comparison to US and Iraq story of media's coverage, Schiller finds that American TV networks more covered on US military mission by using the hierarchy of news sources to justify US invasion:

In the one instance when it could not be overlooked because it had been reported live--the bombing of the Baghdad shelter---the networks gave special unlimited opportunities to the Pentagon and other "construction experts" to explain that the shelter was actually a communication center or that Saddam Hussein had deliberately arranged the horror to stage a propaganda coup. But for the most part, references to Iraqi casualties were notable for their absence.

(Ibid.)

He also refers to the observation of article in the *New Yorker* magazine (March 25,1991:26), which conforms, with his opinion. It says that "celebrations that fail to acknowledge the catastrophe those [U.S.] troops are leaving behind are more than unseemly. They trivialize a human tragedy of almost inconceivable proportions" (Ibid.).

Aijaz Ahmad points out that what mainstream media presented about Iraq War 2003 is mostly not the real news about war. The dominant electronic media has shied away from telling audience the other sides of story. He states that only from the alternative media assembled by anti-war groupings on the Net providing that information. He shows the example of absent stories:

Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, the supreme Iranian religious leader, has used the word "satanic" for the US designs; or that not only China but also President Megawati Sukarnoputri of Indonesia as well Malaysia's Acting Prime Minister Abdullah Ahmad Badawi have said that, in Megawati's words, "the use of military action against Iraq is an act of aggression which is against international law...It is not from the big business media that we can learn that every city in Greece has been rocked by demonstrations, or that 200,000

people marched in Athens in the largest rally in a generation; or that over 100,000 marched in Paris or that close to a hundred thousand did so in Berlin while every other city of any consequence in Germany had rallies; or that a notable feature of these rallies is the participation of tens of thousands of schoolchildren holding placards that read: "Not in Our Name." Only from the website of *Counterpunch* magazine did one learn that the number of arrested persons in San Francisco exceeded 1,400, and that helicopters whirred over the city while the police beat up demonstrators across town throughout the day.

(Ahmad, *Frontline*, April 11, 2003: 13)

The author further writing of the unheard voice:

Blix's colleague, (the U.N.'s former Chief Weapons Inspector), Joern Siljeholm, who lives in the U.S. but cannot get a hearing from the U.S. media, told the Norwegian newspaper *Dagbladet* about Colin Powell's claims at the Security Council: "It did not match up at all with our information. The whole speech was misleading. Much of what has been claimed about WMDs [weapons of mass destruction] has proven to be sheer nonsense." One will never hear this on the BBC or CNN, which are as much a part of the "psychological warfare" as is the raining down of the cruise missiles on Baghdad and Mosul.

(Ibid: 14-15)

Kesava Menon describes the ignorance circumstance of the other side in Iraq War 2003:

Stories that could, and should, have been followed up were ignored. Whether it was the use of cluster bombs against Iraqi villagers in Hilla, or the widespread use of depleted uranium munitions, or the number of instances when civilians, including children were killed at roadblocks by trigger-happy



Anglo-American soldiers, no serious effort seems to have been made to elicit a response from senior military officials in Kuwait or Qatar or the capitals of the invading forces.

The overall impression created by the Anglo-American media, especially the embedded variety, was that the entire operation was carried out in humanitarian and sensitive a manner as possible. It was only as the operations were winding down, and the less popular reporters started making the rounds, that a different picture began to emerge. In these reports, the Anglo-American troops emerge as jittery...

None of the networks showed the courage displayed by Al Jazeera to relay gruesome pictures of dead and wounded civilians, including little children. They seemed to be only too eager to put out their military establishments' spin that the damage to civilians could have been caused by Iraqi weaponry.

(Menon, *Frontline*, May 9, 2003: 129)

Menon notes that the brutal scene of human being can be viewed through the media of the opposite side:

The Qatar-based television channel Al Jazeera was one of the very few media organizations that consistently telecast images of dead and wounded civilians. Its coverage of the war irked the U.S. administration and the right wing in that country to such an extent that pressure was put on Qatar's Amir Sheikh Hamad bin Khalifa al Thani to black out the channel. Al Jazeera was delisted from the New York stock exchange, its website was hacked and its telecasts were blacked out in most parts of the U.S.

(Ibid: 128)

He also criticizes the avoidance to tell the truth of journalists:

Report from the electronic media in Baghdad carried routine reminders that journalists operating inside Iraqi lines were restricted in their movements and that their work was being monitored. Until the second week of the war when the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) started doing so, hardly any attempt was made to inform viewers or listeners that the same conditions and restrictions applied to journalists operating behind the lines of the Anglo-American forces.

(Ibid: 129)

This opinion conforms with Roy, who questions the case that only Arab News was criticized as propaganda:

Why should propaganda be the exclusive preserve of the Western media? Just because they do it better? Western journalists "embedded" with troops are given the status of heroes reporting from the frontlines of war. Non-"embedded" journalists are undermined even before they begin their reportage: "We have to tell you that he is being monitored by the Iraqi authorities."

Increasingly, on British and American TV, Iraqi soldiers are being referred to as "militia" (i.e.: rabble). One BBC correspondent portentously referred to them as "quasi-terrorists". Iraqi defense is "resistance" or worse still, "pockets of resistance", Iraqi military strategy is deceit.

(Roy, *Frontline*, April 25, 2003: 20)

Fred Halliday points out that what is disregarded from media coverage of Persian Gulf War is also the significant context which lead to more understand about the event:

Thus a range of issues pertaining to the historical background to the war, or the range of ethical issues involved, which could, and arguably should, have been discussed at the time, were not. For example, throughout the whole period of the crisis there was virtually no discussion of the character of the political regime in Iraq, in particular of the ideology and history of the ruling Arab Ba'th Socialist Party. Analysis of Ba'th thinking could have revealed much about Saddam's thinking on the war, not least with regard to the role of war as a purgative experience for society, or the significance of the military leader.

(Halliday, 1999: 137)

He adds "In fulfilling the responsibility to provide news, and to avoid undermining a country's war effort, other responsibilities, including those to educate the public in the broader issues involved, were neglected" (Halliday, 1999:144).

Besides, the hidden agenda of war waging in contemporary period is one issue that is refrained from media coverage. The international conflict like Persian Gulf War 1991 and Iraq War 2003 was driven by demanding of national interest protecting. Hamid Mowlana raises the event of Persian Gulf War:

One of the major reasons for waging war in the Persian Gulf, which was ignored by the general media and was not mentioned publicly by European and U.S. leaders, was the importance of the Persian Gulf states, especially Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, as major sources of global capital flow. Simply stated, the West not only needs the continuation of free flow of oil at a low price from the Persian Gulf; it also looks to this region as the major source of surplus capital for its military and financially troubled economic sectors. Since the early 1970s, the United States and Europe as well as other smaller nations

have profited substantially from the Arab investment cache abroad as well as from expensive high-tech military orders and the luxurious lifestyle associated with the sheikhs and princes of the Persian Gulf region. For example, Kuwait now earns more from its overseas investment than it does from its oil exports. The flight of capital alone from such countries as Kuwait and Saudi Arabia often exceeds their gross domestic product. Government agencies from Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and the United Arab Emirates have huge investments worth hundreds of billions of dollars...

(Mowlana, 1992: 38-39)

Diversity of viewpoints on war is another absent issue. Richard C. Vincent states that apart from the absence of alternative viewpoints, the frame of reference of some interviewed consultants may have been too narrow. "Rather than providing diversity of viewpoints, these interviews sometimes ran the risk of simply reinforcing the status quo." He provides the example of CNN telecast during the Persian Gulf War:

*Question...* What should be America's war aims? Let me give you an example: Suppose after 10 days we smash this guy's military machines, his tanks, and he's got no surprise coming in and his ballistic missiles and his air forces and the rest of it. Is there any necessity then for us to immediately send a land army in Kuwait? Why not wait him out, rebuild our air ordnance, and come back with more air strikes if he hadn't quit.

*Robert Hunter (in San Francisco):* If he hasn't come at us in a way that we have to respond, that is, come at us with his armor or try to extend the war into Jordan, Israel, or try to draw on Iran-sure that's the wise thing to do. Though I must say if we are going to war, I also want to go after his nuclear while I'm at it, his nuclear potential.

(Vincent, 1992: 192)

The significant information has not been acknowledged because of unquestioning Vincent notes that:

...Even though the story may have been largely ignored by the administration, the question was nevertheless asked...journalists could have helped set the news agenda rather than simply follow one already set by the status quo. But many other questions, such as the cost of the war and the consequential "resource drain" effect it had on domestic social programs, went largely unasked.

(Ibid: 195-196)

Kesava Menon criticizes the media in democratic society which did not play their role to question the unfolding information during Iraq War 2003:

This war was supposed to have been fought to achieve the most honorable of objectives to bring freedom and liberty to an oppressed people. As such, the media of the United States should have striven to set high standards of transparency and objectivity which they claim to be their benchmark. Instead, much of the coverage of the war by the U.S. media and by a broad section of the British media was akin to the now-famous photograph showing a crowd of Iraqis cheering as the statue of Saddam Hussein was being pulled down in Baghdad's Firdaus square...The only problem with the published version of the photograph is that it is a complete distortion of the events that actually took place in Firdaus square.

(Menon, *Frontline*, May 9, 2003:127)

Menon refers to the different angles and distances of photographs presented by *Information Clearing House*.*Info* to confirm that what omit from mainstream media's coverage is round information:

The close-up shots showed only Iraqis on and about the fallen statue. But, as the camera angle changes and the lens widens and withdraws to a greater distance, the scene morphs into something wholly different. It becomes obvious that Iraqis are not the only ones present and that there are as many if not more US. Servicemen in the vicinity. As the camera moves further back, it becomes apparent that the Iraqis who had supposedly pulled off this great "Berlin wall" moment were merely a handful and probably a select bunch that had been let through the ring of American tanks that had sealed off and sanitized the road intersection. Finally, there is the last photograph - actually the first in the series - which shows U.S. Marines perched atop a ladder leaning on the statue, throwing a noose around Saddam's bronze countenance, which, by then had been covered by the Stars and Stripes. The rope led to an armored recovery vehicle of the type used to tow away broken-down tanks. It was this vehicle, named after some former U.S. martial figure, and not the people of Iraq that hauled Saddam's effigy down.

Among those shown to be dancing on Saddam's graven image were some who were later identified as close associates of Ahmed Chalabi, the quisling whom the Americans want to install on the throne of the Caliphs. It would be tempting to dismiss this farce if it were not for the real tragedy that underlines it. It is just a representative sample of the manner in which the invasion has been sold to a segment of the international community that could have effectively aborted the Bush administration's military plans—the U.S. electorate.

(Ibid: 127)

The fact that Iraqis resentment against the invasion was also unreported:

The U.S. Military establishment seems to have miscalculated that the Iraqi people, suffering under the repressive regime of Saddam Hussein, would revolt when the "liberating" armies got close, or at least welcome the liberators once they chased the oppressors. But even after Saddam and his henchmen disappeared from the scene and the Iraqis, including the Shias, continued to protest against the Anglo-American presence, the mainstream media in the U.S. and the U.K. appeared reluctant to report the depth of Iraqi resentment against the invasion. Reports about Iraqi protests were either rounded off with quotes from stray characters that spoke of their goodwill towards the U.S., or "balanced" out with the suggestion that the resentment would die out once security and civic services were restored.

(Ibid: 129)

He further notes:

That the invasion was an epochal event in West Asian, indeed in global affairs, is hardly a justification for the media's reluctance to alienate the military establishments of their countries. In a situation where the unfolding events would have incalculable effects on the citizens of their own countries, the media were under an even greater onus to report the facts freely and accurately. A large section of the media did not take the pains to explore the possibilities that were open. They did not ask the critical, or even obvious, questions. Foremost among them were the questions pertaining to the reasons cited to justify the invasion, not one of which could have stood up to serious scrutiny.

(Ibid.)

He continually criticizes the silence of media about the issue that Iraq has been alleged as a source of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) by US administration:

For over a decade, the U.S. administration and its military establishment have said that an intrusion into Iraq will be necessary at some stage because it was the only realistic means by which its weapons of mass destruction (WMD) could be eliminated. With military operations almost over and with the U.S. and British troops supposedly in control of most of Iraq, no traces of these weapons or the facilities to manufacture them have been found. But the media in the US and the UK showed no signs of any serious desire to hold their governments accountable. It continued to give credence to versions offered by the military. For instance, when the Anglo-American forces overran a petroleum facility in the early days of the war, the military spokespersons reported that apparel intended to protect the wearer against chemicals had been found on the site. This was supposed to be critical evidence to prove that Iraq had an undisclosed chemical warfare capability. Not a single reporter seems to have pointed out that gear to protect a person from chemicals is usually found in oil facilities, or bothered to ask whether the quantity of protective gear found at the site was way beyond the normal.

(Ibid.)

Finally, he concludes that there is exception for seeking alternative information:

It was small consolation that the Internet, with a reach nowhere comparable to that of the visual media, provided far superior information. Within its limitations, the web covered all the relevant aspects, including the plight of civilians, the strength of the anti-war movement and the actual progress of the fighting. Interesting sites included [www.anti-war.com](http://www.anti-war.com), Information Clearing House.info, [www.aeronautics.ru](http://www.aeronautics.ru) (a Russian site).

(Ibid.)



## II. 4 The implications of a skewed coverage

Generally, the media's role can be considered from two points, manifest and latent. During wartime, the audience across the world could view the operation of weapons; listen to the statements of the invader, read the viewpoint of 'experts' and so on. These things are apparent. At the same time, the apparent performance conveys some meanings in a sense of exercise of power or ideology. In other words, media does not play their role only informing, entertaining, educating, commenting etc., but also play the other role such as creating of public opinion setting, mobilization, propaganda and so on. The latter is the latent role that is the focus of this section. The Implications of war coverage is categorized as the following:

### (a) Media as propaganda

Media scholars state that the warfare coverage reflects the political role of media. The media acted more as the lapdogs than watchdogs and in effect served as "cheerleading" public relations arms for the government (Morgan, Lewis and Jhally, 1992: 216).

According to Richard C. Vincent, media are "powerful vehicles of persuasion and have long been effectively used to help influence public opinion." Many examples can be cited of governments using the mass media to help promote war causes. Most recently, there has been a grave concern surrounding news restrictions enacted in the Falklands, Grenada, and the Persian Gulf War (Vincent, 1992: 198).

Noam Chomsky views media as worshiper of power in wartime. "Right now it is the cheerleading for the home team. Look at CNN, which is disgusting – and it is the same everywhere" (Chomsky, *Frontline*, April 11, 2003: 12).

It can be said that being the propaganda channel is the political role of media. In other words, information was used as a form of political power. Hamid Mowlana describes the political role of media by raising the case of Persian Gulf War 1991 which he views it marks a new era in "a shift from a partial to a total propaganda":

The mainstream Western media coverage of the Persian Gulf War illustrates a number of outstanding items that have been in the forefront of international relations discourse but that have been put aside by various forces in the interests of political expediency. This type of coverage has resulted in such attributions as "superficial coverage," "failure to cover," or "knowledge gap" regarding the mass media's overall performance in reporting the Persian Gulf War. But in the light of historical trends in international relations during the last several decades, the media did not "fail" in reporting on the Persian Gulf War. In fact, they succeeded in their continual support of the international status quo. The media's reporting of Persian Gulf War in support of the existing regional system was no different from that of other wars. A number of studies conducted over the last four decades, for example, showed how the U.S. and European mainstream media, especially the elite press and the major media outlets, have consistently supported their country's foreign policy decisions—at least in the initial stages when the defeat of a particular foreign policy was not yet on the horizon—without seriously challenging their basic assumptions.

(Mowlana, 1992: 31)

Fred Halliday explains that media also is important for the military to sustain domestic support because in such conflicts public opinion made on the basis of the facts and images presented to them (Halliday, 1992: 145).

There is enough evidence to show that the media builds public support:

Even before the war was launched, the U.S. public was conned into believing that it was necessary to protect its interests. It was systematically made to perceive the campaign as one fought through honorable means and with the noble objective of liberating the Iraqi people. The campaign of deception took place in parallel with the military action and included the near complete blackout of reports and images of civilian casualties...a persistent effort to show that the Iraqis too were celebrating the Anglo-American advance. There were occasions when the effort to show the war in a positive light acquired sinister overtones.

(Bidwai, *Frontline*, April, 11: 105)

In viewpoint of Hamid Mowlana, media play their political role by cooperating with dominant state to maintain their interests:

In the Gulf War that at the center of the conflict were two old and dominant orders: on the international level, a dominant capitalist economic and social system, led by the United States and a number of industrial countries, trying to preserve its own global interests under the pretense of a new world order... These systems of dominance would not have been possible in modern times without dominant global media systems supporting and preserving the global political and economic order.

(Mowlana, 1992: 35)

The idea of war for interests conforms to the writing of Roy. Who says, "...It becomes clear that the war against terror is not really about terror, and the war on Iraq not only about oil. It's about a superpower's self-destructive impulse towards supremacy, stranglehold and global hegemony"(Roy, *Frontline*, April 25, 2003: 21).

Bidwai observes that:

That terrible imperialist project, perhaps the most ambitious in world history, is now unfolding before our eyes through the "shock and awe" strategy so clearly visible in the media coverage of the Iraq war. This has itself become inseparable from crude propaganda on behalf of the belligerent powers, reported almost invariably from the point of view of the attacker (via "embedded" correspondents)- never of the flesh-and-blood people who are among the war's victims. The flow of information is tightly controlled by the US military; and much of it is disseminated by US-based television channels whose reporters all but wave the US flag and who have fully internalized all the partisan jargon that is part of war reporting...and "high-precision munitions"- as if these only kill villains, not ordinary people.

(Bidwai, *Frontline*, April 11, 2003: 105)

In the case of warfare information, Richard C. Vincent pictures how official management can manipulate it. He refers to the commenting on Vietnam War coverage, Roger Grimsby of KGO television, San Francisco:

There are almost no correspondents who speak Vietnamese or who are really up on the political situation. The military are very cooperative and will take you anywhere...So the military angle wins out. In such an environment, newsmaker manipulation can be subtle but extremely effective and can divert public

attention from the real issues of war.

(Vincent, 1992:199)

The Persian Gulf War offered a spectacular opportunity for information and opinion management (Schiller, 1992: 22). This opinion conforms with the writing of American journalist, Tom Wicker who points out that the Bush Administration and the military were so successful in controlling information about the war they were able to tell the public just about what they wanted the public to know. "Perhaps worse, press and public, largely acquiesced in the disclosure of only selected information" (Wicker, 1991 cited in Schiller, 1992: 23). Schiller also points out that "the main theatre of operations for the information war was television. The print press was a secondary front and not quite as carefully guarded."

News controlling by military is one method leading media being a channel of propaganda. The following experience of independent journalist during the Persian Gulf War period is evident below:

Since August 2<sup>nd</sup>, I have talked with Saddam Hussein for six hours, two hours on tape. Longer than any American. I met Tariq Aziz [Iraq's foreign minister] for almost ten hours. I took the first group of journalists into Kuwait, negotiated for the release of hostages. "And when we got back, there was not one serious interview by a network. A categorical rejection. Now why is there no interest in what we saw, observed, and got on tape?"

(Jackson, cited in Schiller, 1992: 25)

Schiller notes that the total control of the news at the war front at least was more straightforward. The Pentagon decide what would be reported, "the

national audience which received its understanding of what was happening in the Gulf from television was locked tightly into the government's version of events" (ibid: 27).

However, Schiller observes, "with few exceptions, the media did their own self-censorship and did it thoroughly" (ibid: 25).

For the official management of Iraq War 2003, warfare information management was conducted in form of "embedded journalist." As the veteran war correspondent Chris Hedges wrote in *The Nation* that the embedding process induces reporters to perpetuate the myth of war as an ennobling exercise. "They depend on the military for everything, from food to a place to sleep. They look to the soldiers around them for protection. When they feel the fear of hostile fire, they identify and seek to protect those who protect them. They become part of the team. It is a natural reaction" (cited in Smith, 2003: 26).

News source selection is one point relating to media cooperation in disseminating content of warfare as the explanation of Schiller:

At home, the faces, and views of only a very select group of individuals appeared on living room screens. Night after night, as well as throughout the day, nearly all commentary about the crisis and the war was restricted to military questions. Not surprisingly, every retired general found a new career as a consultant to one or another of the national networks. When civilians appeared, they were the politically certified think-tank experts or D.C. politicians with impeccable establishment credentials.

(Schiller, 1992: 23)

Media as a propaganda channel becomes the controversial issue when media of Gulf region was criticized its role due to reportage of brutality. Roy questions the case:

When the Arab TV station Al-Jazeera shows civilian casualties it's denounced as "emotive" Arab propaganda aimed at orchestrating hostility towards the "Allies", as though Iraqis are dying only in order to make the "Allies" look bad. Even French television has come in for some stick for similar reasons. But the awed, breathless footage of aircraft carriers, stealth bombers and cruise missiles arcing across the desert sky on American and British TV is described as the "terrible beauty" of war... Why should propaganda be the exclusive preserve of the Western media? Just because they do it better? Western journalists "embedded" with troops are given the status of heroes reporting from the frontlines of war. Non-"embedded" journalists are undermined even before they begin their reportage: "We have to tell you that he is being monitored by the Iraqi authorities."

Increasingly, on British and American TV, Iraqi soldiers are being referred to as "militia" (i.e.: rabble). One BBC correspondent portentously referred to them as "quasi-terrorists". Iraqi defense is "resistance" or worse still, "pockets of resistance", Iraqi military strategy is deceit.

(Roy, *Frontline*, April 25, 2003:20)

Roy further criticizes the contrast of warfare statement convincing through media and its brutal impact on Iraqis:

So here's Iraq-rogue state, grave threat to world peace, paid-up member of the Axis of Evil. Here's Iraq, invaded, bombed, besieged, bullied, its sovereignty shat upon, its children killed by cancers, its people blown up on the streets. And here are all of us watching. CNN-BBC, BBC-CNN late into the

night. Here's all of us, enduring the horror of the war, enduring the horror of the propaganda and enduring the slaughter of language as we know and understand it. Freedom now means mass murder (or, in the U.S., fried potatoes). When someone says "humanitarian aid" we automatically go looking for induced starvation. "Embedded" I have to admit, is a great find. It's what it sounds like. And what about "arsenal of tactics?" Nice!

(Ibid: 22)

### **(b) Media as a supporter of the status quo**

Media has been criticized as the sustainer of the status quo at the level of international relationship and social norms. Hamid Mowlana describes the role of global media as the supporter of dominant state in the global politics. The case of Persian Gulf War is mentioned:

In contemporary global politics...this process has meant international media's continual support of the status quo, including cold war systems, new détente between the superpowers, and "old" and "new" world orders. In this meaning mainstream global communication and media systems, including major news agencies, newspaper networks, and now worldwide television systems, facilitate the flow of information and move more within and among the international elite networks. In terms of domestic constituency, the media's supreme loyalty is to patriotism, the nation-state system, and the national interest. Although the media's sphere of operation and coverage has become global, their worldviews have remained fairly parochial.

(Mowlana, 1992: 31)



The role of media in maintaining the status quo is reflected through news sources using. Richard C. Vincent gives the example from Persian Gulf War reporting:

By featuring news elites, CNN may have helped perpetuate various social norms and official viewpoints and may have functioned as a source of propaganda and disinformation. Hence news accuracy was potentially affected by both the news organization and newsmakers. We saw many examples of both during the Persian Gulf War, and charges of manipulation and bias were at times strongest against CNN.

(Vincent, 1992: 182)

Vincent refers to the examination of the Glasgow Media Group on the use of elite news sources by contemporary media:

...Interviewees are drawn from an extremely narrow section of the social and political spectrum and that a large number of the statements quoted and referenced come from the same individuals in the narrow group that were interviewed most frequently. The group concluded that particular worldviews are reinforced by journalistic practices and that this situation "restructures what the news is to consist of and in a sense what the journalists themselves actually see as exciting, or as being significant in the world."...The authors found that such coverage may lend itself to maintenance of the "status quo."

(Ibid: 182-183)

Vincent concludes in his work that knowingly or unknowingly, CNN often helped sustain the status quo point of view of the Persian Gulf War, as did other news media.

Stuart Hall describes how media operationally and structurally tends to reproduce dominant discourses and the perspectives of authorized knower:

Through the various mechanisms of censorship, licensing, access, and advertising, societal elites also ensure that the mass media primarily disseminate message that promote the social and economic values helping to maintain the status quo.

(Hall, cited in Karim, 2002: 105)

## REFERENCE

- Ahmad, Aijaz (2003) 'The war of Occupation', *Frontline*, April 11.
- Bidwani, Praful (2003) 'An agenda for Global Hegemony', *Frontline*, April 11.
- Chomsky, Noam (2003) 'Iraq As Trial Run', *Frontline*, April 11.
- Ghose, Bhaskar (2003) 'The Image and the Reality', *Frontline*, April 25.
- Halliday, Fred (1999) 'Manipulation and Limits: Media coverage of the Gulf War, 1990-1991', in Allen Tim and Seaton Jean.(eds.) **The Media of Conflict: War Reporting and Representations of Ethnic Violence**. London: Zed Books.
- Karim, Karim H. (2002) 'Making Sense of the 'Islamic Peril': Journalism as Culture Practice', in Zelizer, Barbie and Allan Stuart (eds.) **Journalism After September 11**. London: Routledge.
- McNulty, Mel (1999) 'Media Ethnicization and the International Response', in **The Media of Conflict: War Reporting and Representations of Ethnic Violence**. London: Zed Books.
- Menon, Kesava (2003) 'Embedded Truth', *Frontline*, May 9.
- Miller, David (2003) 'Media Power and Class Power: Overplaying Ideology', in Panitch Leo and Leys Colin. (eds.) **Socialist Register 2002**. India: K P Bagchi&Company
- Morgan, Michael; Lewis, Justin and Jhally, Sut (1992) 'More Viewing, Less Knowledge', in Mowlana, Hamid; Gerbner, George and Schiller, Herbert I. (eds) **Triumph of Image**. Oxford: Westview Press.
- Mowlana, Hamid (1992) 'Roots of War: The Long Road of Intervention', in Mowlana, Hamid; Gerbner, George and Schiller, Herbert I. (eds.) **Triumph of Image**. Oxford: Westview Press.
- Rodgers, Jayne (2003) 'Icons and Invisibility: Gender, Myth, 9/11', in **War and the Media: Reporting Conflict 24/7**. New Delhi: Vistaar Publications.
- Roy, Arundhati (2003) 'Mesopotamia. Babylon. The Tigris and Euphrates', *Frontline*, April 25,

- Schiller, Herbert I. (1992) 'Manipulated Heart and Minds', in Mowlana, Hamid; Gerbner, George and Schiller, Herbert I. (eds.) *Triumph of Image*. Oxford: Westview Press.
- Seaton, John (1999) 'The New 'Ethnic' Wars and the Media', in **The Media of Conflict: War Reporting and Representations of Ethnic Violence**. London: Zed Books.
- Smith, Terence (2003) 'Hard Lessons', *Columbia Journalism Review*, May-June.
- Transnational Feminists (2003) 'Transnational Feminist Practices Against War', in Joseph Ammu and Sharma Kalpana (eds.) **Terror Counter-Terror: Women Speak Out**. New Delhi: Kali for Women.
- Vincent, Richard C. (1992) 'CNN: Elites Talking to Elites', in Mowlana, Hamid; Gerbner, George and Schiller, Herbert I. (eds.) *Triumph of Image*. Oxford: Westview Press.

## CHAPTER III

### WAR AND ITS GLAMORIZATION

In the last chapter (chapter II) I analyzed the skewed nature of media representation of war. And identified the constant themes that was projected, namely that:

- (i) The "other" is bad
- (ii) Islam is synonymous with violence
- (iii) Men are heroes and women are victims of war

In this chapter (chapter III) I seek to show how the dominant media glamourize war. This kind of glamourization suggests the feeling that there is no actual loss and death. It is like a computer game. This also leads to desensitization, thereby helping the agenda of the dominant actors in warfare.

Greg McLaughlin in his book *The War Correspondent* (2002) points out the factors that make journalists unwilling to say something meaningful about the nature of modern warfare:

The rapid changes in both military and media technologies, the development of sophisticated military public relations, the cult of celebrity journalism: these

have all contributed to a crisis in the role and the function of the war reporters in the 1990s.

(McLaughlin, 2002: 4)

In fact, the role of media in war has been seriously criticized since Persian Gulf War 1991. Morgan, Lewis and Jhally point that the media has arguably played a more visible and critical role in the Persian Gulf War than in any other in history.

During the entire "crisis in the gulf," from Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in August 1990, to the rapid surrender of the Iraqi army in late February 1991 and beyond, immense public debate was focused on the role of media. In much of the period building up to the war, news coverage was both lengthy and intense, and during the war itself this escalated into long periods of saturation coverage. Rarely does any event receive such media attention, and rarely is so much attention focused on the media themselves.

(Morgan et al., 1992: 216)

The Persian Gulf War is also considered as the first major global media crisis orchestration that made instant history (Gerbner, 1992: 247). It has been labeled the first "communication war" because the news media, particularly television, were on the scene that very moment:

For the first time in the history of human mankind, a major conflict was followed every minute all over the globe electronically. The war was also a "media war." Journalists saw themselves as involved in the war, even when their participation was indirect. As a result of overt military censorship by allied

forces, a distorted picture of the war's reality was given to the people around the world.

(Nejad et al., 1992: 100)

Communication technology is thus the most important issue relating to new phenomena of news war's coverage. Hamid Mowlana points out that modern communication, especially space-age technology, have changed traditional notions and strategies of international conflict (Mowlana,1992: 40).This statement conforms with the ideas of Harold Innis, Marshall McLuhan, Elizabeth Eisenstein, and others who wrote on the means and the modes of communication that " when the means changes,...access to and control over communications change, and the telling of stories, including history, also change" (Gerbner,1992: 244).

Carruthers (2001) notes that war is not a new phenomenon. It was only in the twentieth century that war became a truly mass phenomenon, covered by the media in a "serial fashion." "The technological progress related to the mass media has transformed twentieth-and twenty-first-century civilians into "witnesses of war" (Carruthers, cited in Zelizer and Allan (eds.), 2002: 249).

Yet another scholar, Howard Tumber confirms the views that the technological sophistication of war is a feature of the modern-day conflict:

Although this has been a feature of war for the last 50 years, it is only recently that the incorporation of new technologies created a different picture of the war, such as "cyber war." The implications of this new type of war are many: battles are three dimensional (including air and space), time is compressed so postmodern battles are a matter of hours instead of days and months, and

machines replace humans in spreading destruction. The war, then, transformed into a spectacle, more bearable, glamorous, and capable of bringing audiences awe, pleasure, and horror. The Gulf War became the landmark of this highly sophisticated spectacle. "Smart" weaponry's ability to kill from a distance, offering the best form of infotainment without morally implicating the soldiers of the allies, created a video-game perception of the war.

(Thumber, 2002: 250)

McLaughlin points that the Persian Gulf War in 1991 is now thought of as the perfect 'television war' and a case study in what Jean Baudrillard calls the 'hyperreal'. It was a war defined by the manufacture of suitable images, not of what actually happened but what the allies wanted us to believe happened. For that reason, Baudrillard and others have argued that "Gulf War did not take place. What we witnessed was a virtual war, a Hollywood spectacle. We were not allowed to see or know about the death of up to 200,000 people or the untold economic and environmental devastation wrought on Iraq and Kuwait" (McLaughlin, 2002: 33).

It seems that CNN is the remarkable operate in contemporary era. As Richard C. Vincent points out that at CNN positioned itself as a key news player soon after the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait:

Two months after the invasion, CNN had already spent some 15 million dollars on coverage of the crisis." At the same time its coverage is unique because of the network's twenty-four-hour newscast format and its commitment in covering the Persian Gulf War almost exclusively for nearly two months in early 1991. Hence, "CNN became the newscast of record for the War and as such



made a significant contribution to contemporary trends in electronic journalism.

(Vincent, 1992: 181)

McLaughlin states that the communication technology of media itself lead to remarkable new phenomena “CNN effect” bringing real time of battlefield to living room:

The advances in satellite and cable television technology in the 1990s have changed the nature of live news. From being a novelty or special feature for the big set-piece event, the live broadcast from ‘our own correspondent’ on the spot became an essential guarantor of the news organisation’s credibility and status in a hi-tech, competitive media market. The reputation of CNN was made in the late 1980s on its apparent knack of being in the right place at the right time with live, uninterrupted coverage of the most important world events of the period. The quality of its coverage at the time was derided by the major American network news programmes but these criticisms belied a certain nervousness, an attempt to distract from a crucial fact: CNN was there and they were not. The organisation was quick to shed its image as ‘Chicken Noodle News’ and build on the plaudits it received for its wallpaper coverage of the Gulf War. It continued to beat its rivals to the big stories of the 1990s.

(McLaughlin, 2002: 24)

Communication technology not only leads to the emergence of real time phenomena of war coverage, but also become the center of media concentration. Hence, what the global audience sees on the screen is the footage and video packaged showing potentiality of US weapons hitting their targets contributed by US military. Vincent writes of the media coverage of Gulf War event that:

The black-and- white grainy footage always showed pinpoint accuracy of this high technology as the target entered the cross hairs of the camera and moments later the screen went blank. The released footage was always of a perfect hit. Rarely could human activity be seen on the ground prior to the explosion. It was all so sterile. Yet people undoubtedly were inside some of the buildings that were obliterated. The destructive power of these bombs and missiles was appalling—people unfortunate enough to be caught at the center were not identified, their arms, legs, and flesh scattered in small pieces. Yet all these realities were easily overlooked in the concentration on the technology alone.

(Vincent, 1992: 188)

The following example of an interview on February 11,1991 run on CNN shows the way media disseminated the warfare information as game:

*Pool Reporter:* What's the best thing you've gotten so far? Can you tell us?

*Pilot of U.S. Air Force, A-10 Squadron Plane:* Got a lot of good secondaries, lotta good explosions. Just kind fun. It's *great!* It's great, ah ya-, it's like an amusement park, almost, but except they're shootin back at ya so you gotta be real careful,- *smart* about what you do. But there's ah, in a strange kind of way, there's a *fun-ness* about it.

(Cited in Ibid: 189)

George Gerbner observes the Persian Gulf War as the operation of the movie which "scripted, cast, directed, and produced by the winners" through video satellite computer system. He notes that the war in the Persian Gulf was an unprecedented motion picture spectacular:

Never before were selected glimpses of actuality strung together with sound bites of photogenic crews, omniscient voice-overs of safari-clad reporters, and parades of military experts with maps and charts at the ready, so mesmerizing, so coherent, and so contrived.

(Gerbner, 1992: 247)

Gerbner gives the example of message of war presented on the TV screen. "Our team has carried out its game beautiful," exulted a military expert on NBC. "We ran our first play, it worked great," said a pilot interviewed on CBS. "We scored a touchdown." Secretary of Defense Cheney told U.S. Air Force personnel that they had conducted "the most successful air campaign in the history of the world" (Ibid: 252).

Gerbner concluded that what was represented as a clean, swift, surgical strike to punish aggression, get rid of Hussein, and secure cheap oil, petrodollars, peace, jobs, and democracy. "The matter of political bombing of civilians is no longer considered an act of barbarism" (Johnson cited in Ibid: 255).

Daya Kishan Thussu in his book *Live TV and Bloodless Deaths: War, Infotainment and 24/7 News* examines developments in international television news and their implications for the coverage of conflict situations at a time when "the political, economic and technological contexts in which news organizations are becoming increasingly global." He gives the picture how war has been presented on television news as:

There are certain key features of the presentation of war on television that have emerged over the last decade of war reporting, which demonstrate the tendency to using entertainment formats: video/computer-game style images of surgical strikes by 'intelligent' weaponry; arresting graphics and satellite pictures, and 'chat-show' use of 'experts'. As a result of this homogenization of coverage of conflicts- bloodless and largely devoid of any real sense of death and destruction- the audience can be desensitized to the tragedy and horror of war.

(Thussu, 2003: 124)

Thussu further argues:

TV news' obsession with high-tech war reporting has grown since the 1991 US attack against Iraq. CNN's coverage of the Gulf War, for the first time in history, brought military conflict into living rooms across the globe. In the high-tech, virtual presentation of war, cockpit videos of 'precision bombings' of Iraqi targets were supplied to television networks by the Pentagon, thus presenting a major conflict, responsible for huge destruction of life and property 'as painless Nintendo exercise, and the image of Americans as virtuous, clean warriors'. In this and subsequent US actions – in Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia, Kosovo and Afghanistan—the humanitarian dimension of the military intervention was constantly promoted by the US media, often in high moral tones. The responsible behaviour of Western forces in combat operations was underlined and the superiority of weaponry emphasized. When cockpit videos were first shown as part of news reports during the Gulf War, the broadcasters always mentioned that they were procured through the US Defense Department. In those ten years, the process has been routinized to such an

extent that this acknowledgement is not considered necessary anymore.

(Ibid.)

This kind of reporting was typical during the 2001 bombing of Afghanistan. Thussu remarks how Jamie McIntyre, CNN's military affairs correspondent, enthused about types of munitions and aircraft being used in the bombing (CNN World News, 7 October 2001). Elaborating further:

In what appeared like a post-modern version of tele shopping, a price tag (\$2.1 billion) appeared on the screen with each aircraft. McIntyre described the bombers, B1 and B52s as 'extremely accurate' and how they were successfully used in Iraq and Kosovo for carpet-bombing. An extraordinarily ironical aspect of the coverage was that he also reported, with similar enthusiasm, the humanitarian relief being dropped by C-17s. This was a new development – delivering bombs and food at the same time. It is interesting to speculate whether the reporting of the raids would have been any different had the Pentagon had its own 24/7 news network.

In addition to video clips providing visuals, news programmes are providing more and more complicated maps, graphics and studio models to illustrate the progress of war. Mimicking war-gaming, miniature tanks and aircraft recreate battlefields in the studio, where, more often than not, male correspondents and experts enthusiastically discuss tactics and strategies, reinforcing the feminist critique of war as 'toys for the boys'.

...One outcome of such type of coverage is that the audience is not exposed to the real and ugly face of war. It is instructive to contrast the 24/7 news network's coverage of the efficiency of high-tech weapons with the death toll that these weapons caused...The bloodless coverage, however, seemed to conform to the 'Pentagon's determination to control the flow of news from the front,' as Neil Hickey, the editor of the *Columbia Journalism Review*, noted. 'Images and descriptions of civilian bomb casualties – people already the

victims of famine, poverty, drought, oppression, and brutality - would erode public support in the US and elsewhere in the world.'

(Ibid:125-126)

The author discusses the implication of war coverage as "infotainment": "the obsession with high-tech reporting, using a video-game format to present combat operations, with complex graphics and satellite imagery, providing a largely virtual, even bloodless, coverage of war. Finally...this type of coverage is in the process of being globalized-given the power and influence of the Western, or more specifically, US model of television news. Such coverage has implications for foreign and security policy and portends ill for the proper understanding of distant wars both within Western societies and across the globe"(Ibid: 117).

In the recently Iraq War 2003, the media, specifically television, became controversial for the role they play. Kesava Menon writes:

Whether embedded with forces or reporting from the briefing centres in Kuwait and Qatar or anchoring news programmes, seemed to have been carried away by the high-tech weaponry and treated the war as an elaborate video game unconnected to the lives of real people.

(Menon, *Frontline*, May 9, 2003: 128)

Anita Pratap criticizing the TV coverage of the Iraq War writes:

This time around, there is something obscene and inhuman about the coverage. Live coverage has trivialised the bombardment of Baghdad into a spectacle of fantastic fireworks. Horrors of war are sanitised and special

effects glamorised to reduce war to entertainment, an extravaganza, a spectacular son et lumiere show. Adults and children watch Baghdad burning, unmindful that beneath the rising mushroom clouds lie charred men, crushed women and children with their heads blown off; an expanding rubble of shattered lives, wrecked homes and destroyed hopes.

(Pratap, *Outlook*, April 7, 2003: 64)

Seema Sirohi comments that... "for the many TV networks bursting with excitement, having invested millions in the project. The rating war is fiercely fought, new way to entertain devised, studio walls covered with photos of marines in battle" (Sirohi, *Outlook*, April 7, 2003:18).

In order to better understand the above glamorization of war on TV screen, it is essential to address the following issues:

- (a) Military and information of warfare
- (b) Media as business
- (c) Psychological aspect of being war correspondent

**(a) Military and information of warfare**

The key player of warfare is the military and the state. They disseminate the information to gain public support to legitimize military action as well as to spread their ideology since the "message is ideological." At the same time psychology is also the essential aspect for war operation. The country, which led war, wants the triumph in the battlefield as well as the triumph of image making.

It is apparent that the information about contemporary warfare disseminated by the military reflecting the certain character of military affair. That is, the increasing of high technology of weapon such as 'smart' bombs, computerized surveillance systems and digital simulations is the center of war operation. In other words, war is increasingly technologized, informatized and mediated (Thussu and Freedman, 2003: 7).

John Downey and Graham Murdock point out that the growth and convergence of digital information and communications technologies lead to the major shift in military thinking and operating of war:

The rapid growth of new, information-processing and communications capacities, built around innovations in the technologies of satellite and computer networks, has stimulated military thinking to follow speculation on change more generally and to see information as the key resource of the future.

(Downey and Murdock, 2003: 70)

Downey and Murdock state about the role of technology in driving change that the military affair has been central to the role of technology or it is called the period of a Revolution in Military Affairs (RMA) in which "communication and information systems will assume a central role as both essential infrastructure supports for new kinds of network-centric military strategies and primary targets for attack" (Ibid.)

As a result of changing in technology substance itself, the operation of warfare becomes virtuous war or bloodless war. And such notion of high tech war was disseminated rather than the casualties by the military in order



to present the good view of war on domestic TV screen. The effort of military to PR the virtuous war to the public is success because the media are likely to privilege and publicize official versions of conflict (Thussu and Freedman, 2003: 7-8).

Herbert I. Schiller notes that the cooperation of media makes Gulf War presentation succeeded. "Control process exercised through an amazing coordination of volunteer efforts by hundreds of media gatekeepers (editors, broadcasters, disc jockeys, sports announcers, talk-show hosts, etc.)" He also refers to Michael Deaver, the chief of staff in charge of image making of Ronald Reagan saying about the success in presenting the Gulf War as "a combination of Lawrence of Arabia and Star Wars"---i.e., heroic Western leadership of the Arab world joined with mouth-gaping demonstrations of advanced weaponry (Schiller, 1992: 23).

The effort of military to present the clean war is essential to devote great attention to perception of the public by exercising of warfare information in various forms. For example, press briefings by political and military leaders, tapes and interviews supplied by military or government sources. At the same time, the other operations to deal with the media such as information control, embedding process were also exercised.

Richard C. Vincent states that the intention of military to provide the "packaged" videotapes of warfare operation is to show military actions in as positive a light as possible and to glorify daily and special missions:

...The video testimonials of "smart bombs" and missiles hitting their targets. So mesmerized was the press over this computer chip arms technology that journalists often seemingly lost sight of the true story they were covering...The black and white grainy footage always showed pinpoint accuracy of this high technology as the target entered the cross hairs of the camera and moments later the screen went blank. The released footage was always of the perfect hit. Rarely could human activity be seen on the ground prior to the explosion. It was all so sterile. Yet people undoubtedly were inside some of the buildings that were obliterated. The destructive power of these bombs and missiles was appalling—people unfortunate enough to be caught at the center were not identified, their arms, legs, and flesh scattered in small pieces. Yet all these realities were easily overlooked in the concentration on the technology alone.

(Vincent, 1992: 188)

#### Aijaz Ahmad writes about information control in the recently Iraq War 2003:

From the battlefield itself, real information is virtually impossible to obtain. Americans never tire of preaching about the freedom of the press but they have not allowed any independent journalists to cover their actions or verify their claims. Instead, as the virtually sexual phrase they have coined suggests, journalists are "embedded" inside their own units, having signed contracts agreeing to say nothing without the prior approval of the axis commanders. So, we have remarkable display of round-the-clock coverage on television, led by CNN and BBC, which is comprised of either the lies of these "embedded" journalists or commentaries by the not-so- embedded journalists far from the scenes of actual fighting, so that the viewers is reduced to culling little pieces of information from the press conferences held by Iraqi officials, intelligence reports emanating from Russia, or bits of news filtering through the Arab channels, notably Al- Jazeera. Faced with vast discrepancies between their claims and what seems to be happening on the ground, American officials

have said publicly that 'disinformation' is a legitimate weapon of war, very much in line with precepts first laid out by Hitlerian propaganda, and they have gone so far as to hack and block the website of Al-Jazeera, the independent news channel which is watched by 45 million people in the Arab world and which has gained four million new subscribers in Europe since the beginning of this war of occupation.

(Ahmad, *Frontline*, April 25, 2003:11)

### **(b) Media as Business**

TV news network is functioning within the fiercely competitive commercial environment. This is partly a result of the privatization of global satellite networks and the technological convergence between media, computer and telecommunication industries. For this has fundamentally changed the international ecology of broadcasting. The shift from public service to rating-led television, dependent on corporate advertising and a heterogeneous global audience (Thussu, 2003). He further explains the feature of TV news operation under commercial circumstance:

Television has to be live and the most important 'live TV' is news, because of its contemporaneity and the ability to transmit it instantaneously to a global audience. This has been facilitated by a market-led broadcasting ecology and the availability of privatized satellite networks.

The demand for live 24/7 news, can lead to sensationalization and trivialization of often-complex stories and a temptation to highlight the entertainment value of news. Audience interest in news is highest at the time of conflict: news is largely about conflict, and conflict is always news, especially its rolling variety, as the global expansion of the Atlanta-based Cable News Network (CNN) demonstrates. CNN created a new paradigm of 24-hour news culture, which

has led to the 'CNNization' of television networks across the globe. One result of these developments is that conflict reporting tends towards infotainment.

(Ibid: 117)

The cost of investment in newsgathering, particularly foreign news is high. Consequently, " television executives are under constant pressure to deliver demographically desirable audiences for news and current affairs programming to contribute to profits or at least avoid losses." (Ibid: 122)

The media ownership is also related to media content:

In the US, one major recent development has been the acquiring of key news networks by conglomerates whose primary interest is in the entertainment business: Viacom-Paramount owns CBS; ABC is part of the Disney empire; CNN is a key component of AOL-Time-Warner (the world's biggest media and entertainment conglomerate), and Fox network is owned by News Corporation. This shift in ownership is reflected in the type of stories that often get prominence on television news – stories about celebrities from the world of entertainment, for example, thus strengthening corporate synergies. Among the characteristics of this new form of television news are dramatic music, special effects, computer graphics, and re-enactments, often presented by a glamorous anchor. The proliferation of all-news channels has also impacted upon European news networks, where there is a tendency to move away from a public-service news agenda – privileging information and education over the entertainment value of news – to a more market led, 'tabloid' version of news.

(Ibid.)

Thussu addresses the reason of mixture of 'information' and 'entertainment' in news and current affair programming:

For television news executives, infotainment appears to be the means to attract a younger generation of viewers, who have been influenced by a post-modern visual aesthetics – including fast-paced, eye-catching visuals, computer-animated logos and rhetorical headlines. Such 'McNuggets of news' seem to resonate with a generation growing up on computer games and MTV-style information. The increasing popularity of on-line news, with its multi-media and interactive approach, is also affecting the presentation of television news.

(Ibid.)

Fred Halliday points in his writing on the aspect of media and commercial that stories of wars in far away places, have to attract audiences to sell to advertisers in competition with soap operas and game shows (Halliday, 1999: 141). Indeed, it is quite beside the point, as many critics of the role of the media in contemporary wars have done, simply to blame the media for inadequate or misleading reporting. The pressures on the media industries also have to be explained:

Within weeks of the victory, Time Warner completed in record time the collection and compression of imagery that would fill five hundred floppy disks into a single CD-Rom history of Desert Storm and its speedy distribution to stores and school libraries. CNN: War in the Gulf, advertised as an "authoritative chronicle of the world's first 'real-time television war,'" was published soon thereafter.

(Gerbner, 1999: 260)

### (c) Psychological Aspect of Being War Correspondent

Apart from the rapid change of military and media technology, the motivation of being war correspondent and motivation behind their action is another factor affecting the content of warfare coverage as well as “the physical and psychological hardships of war correspondents can affect the way in which the coverage is constructed and represented” (Tumbe 2002: 252). One of the psychological explanation behind war correspondent action is that “they do it because they enjoy it” and because they “love that little sprint along the edge of death” (Ibid: 255) some experiences of war correspondent reflect how journalist view the warfare:

Richard Dowden of the *Independent* confesss to fascination as well as fear and revulsion: “Half of me never wants to do anything like that ever again, and another part of me says, “Where’s the next one? That was great!” Tony Clifton, editor of *Newsweek*, compares the Gulf War with sex: it was ‘a hell of a lot of foreplay and one final orgasm that lasted eight and a half seconds.’ Alex Thomson of *Channel Four News* talks of ‘an enormous drive and an enormous excitement and an enormous addiction’ to the job. It was the excitement and glamour that first caught his attention when watching the news as a child:

I watched people do it on TV and I thought, ‘Jesus! That looks quite fun!’ I mean really if I’m honest with you that is part of the motivation...I think that anyone who doesn’t say that being a war correspondent is a glamorous way of making a living is bullshitting you because it is and I’m no different from the person out there. You travel to interesting, different places. You are there at moments of history. You are there when...Cruise missiles come over Baghdad,

the Scuds in Dhahran, when the Marines come up the beach in Somalia, when the peace treaty is signed at the end of the Gulf War, when the Marines come into Port-au-Prince, you know, it is a fantastic opportunity, purely selfishly, leaving the job aside, to be at, to be present where things are happening.

(McLaughlin, 2002:7)

Mike Nicholson reported up to 16 wars in his career as a correspondent for Independent Television News (ITN). He says that 'the motivation is not that you like going to war, though I do; it's the promise of excitement and...the knowledge and the certainty of getting all the big stories'. For him, the excitement and glamour are central:

Obviously, travel is the main attraction or was the main attraction...I used to sit there [as a cub reporter] and see these guys going off to Africa or Australia, going off to all these wars and felt very jealous about it as every young blood did and probably still does. So that was the motivation. I wanted to do all the exciting things I was watching other people do and eventually, and by luck really, it's usually luck, I was given the chance to [report] the Nigerian civil war. And once it's in the blood it's very hard to get rid of...If a company spends a lot of money sending you to foreign places a long way away you can be guaranteed it's going to get pretty prominent place in the running order. So it's also that. You 're going to get high profile. There's that glamour attached to being a foreign correspondent, a roving correspondent, or a fireman war correspondent.

(Ibid: 7-8)

The abiding attraction, however, is a fascination with war:

I like going to war and you have to be very honest about it...which makes you sound rather inhuman; in fact you *do* sound inhuman. And I quite shamelessly remind people of the scene in [the movie] *Patton*,...with George C. Scott, and he goes on top of the hill and after a big tank battle and looks across at the smouldering tanks and he looks up to heaven and says. 'God forgive me but I love it!' And you have to be honest. No use me saying, 'Well, I like to go these places so that people know what's going on in the world, so that they can stop wars happening, so that the suffering of people can be transmitted to those who can do something to ease the suffering.' All that's part and parcel of the job. Of course it is. But in a way it's incidental. The motivation is that I did get quite a thrill from being under fire, being with soldiers, watching the fighting. It's a very exciting, exhilarating existence and I'd be dishonest if I didn't admit it.

(Ibid: 8)

However, this is not to argue that all foreign or war correspondents are thrill seekers, some of them have different idea. Victoria Brittain was interviewed for the book "War Correspondent" of Greg McLaughlin. "Nowadays...there 's a kind of a thing about reporters as stars and I'm not that, I'm not that tradition" Maggie O'Kane confesses some ambivalence about the idea of working within a tradition "because in a way I think a lot of the journalism...was very inhumane. A lot of the war correspondents were very much part of a particular class and a particular sex and were introduced to the war through positions within the army and military rank. So the accessibility to the story and the way that they did it was something I certainly didn't aspire to emulate because it didn't sound very exciting really (Ibid: 22).



McLaughlin argues that there seems to be less certainty about the notion of following in mentioned tradition, especially among younger journalists and certainly among young television journalists:

Correspondents now in their thirties see war reporting like any other type of journalism. It is simply about 'reporting the facts' and 'telling the story' as best and honestly as they can. The modern war zone is a high-octane, high-risk space in which reporters are susceptible not just to a host of physical risks but also to a range of military, political, technological and economic pressures- the pressure to be selective with the facts, to be more circumspect in comment and analysis, to censor themselves, to accept restrictions on their movements, to submit to the tyranny of the satellite uplink and the demands of the 24-hour 'real-time' news agenda.

(Ibid: 23)

## REFERENCE

- Downey, John and Murdock Graham (2003) 'The Counter-Revolution in Military Affairs: The Globalization of Guerrilla Warfare', in Thussu, Daya K. and Freedman Des.(eds.) **War and the Media: Reporting Conflict 24/7**. New Delhi: Vistaar Publication.
- Gerbner, George (1992) 'Persian Gulf War, the Movie', in Mowlana, Hamid; Gerbner George and Schiller, Herbert I.(eds.) **Triumph of Image**. Oxford: Westview Press.
- Halliday, Fred (1999) 'Manipulation and Limits: Media Coverage of the Gulf War, 1990-1991', in Allen Tim and Seaton Jean.(eds.) **The Media of Conflict: War Reporting and Representations of Ethnic Violence**. London: Zed Books.
- Nejad, Kazem M; Badii, Naiim and Rad, Mehdi M. (1992) 'The Iranian Press and the Persian Gulf War: The Impact of Western News Agencies', in in Mowlana, Hamid; Gerbner, George and Schiller, Herbert I.(eds.) **Triumph of Image**. Oxford: Westview Press.
- McLaughlin, Greg (2002) **The War Correspondent**. London: Pluto Press.
- Menon, Kesava (2003) 'Embedded Truth', *Frontline*, May 9.
- Morgan, Michael; Lewis, Justin and Jhally Sut (1992) 'More Viewing, Less Knowledge', in Mowlana, Hamid; Gerbner, George and Schiller, Herbert I. (eds) **Triumph of Image**. Oxford: Westview Press.
- Mowlana, Hamid (1992) 'Roots of War: The Long Road of Intervention', in Mowlana, Hamid; Gerbner, George and Schiller, Herbert I. (eds.) **Triumph of Image**. Oxford: Westview Press.
- Pratap, Amita (2003) 'The CNN Son et Lumiere', *Outlook*, April 7.
- Sirohi, Seema 'Embedded Reality', *Outlook*, April 7.

- Thussu Daya K. (2003) 'Live TV and Bloodless Deaths: War Infotainment and 24/7 News', in Thussu, Daya K. and Freedman Des.(eds.) **War and the Media: Reporting Conflict 24/7**. New Delhi: Vistaar Publication.
- Tumber, Howard (2002) 'Reporting Under Fire: the Physical Safty and Emotional Welfare of Journalists', in Zelizer, Barbie and Allan Stuart (eds.) **Journalism After September 11**. London: Routledge.
- Vincent, Richard C. (1992) 'CNN: Elites Talking to Elites', in owlana, Hamid; Gerbner, George and Schiller, Herbert I. (eds.) **Triumph of Image**. Oxford: Westview Press.

## CHAPTER IV

### REPRESENTATION OF THE IRAQ WAR IN THE THAI PRESS: A STUDY OF SOME THEMES

In this chapter I shall study the manner that the Thai press represents the Iraq War. This chapter is based upon newspapers articles, editorial pages, op-ed articles and perspective columns contributed by columnist and guest columns. The newspaper articles analyzed in this study case drawn from 3 newspapers. The newspapers selected are:

- (i) The Bangkok Post
- (ii) The Manager
- (iii) The Islamic Guidance Post

I chose each of these as representative of different perspectives.

*Bangkok Post* is the oldest English newspaper of Thailand, established in 1946. It is considered as a quality newspaper for the elite group of society, for both Thais and foreigners. It covers a wide range of news and information. It has a local, regional and international section.

*Manager*, established in 1989, is a business and politics newspaper, which rely on Asian perspective. *Manager* is noted for its perspective columns, especially its own columnist.

*Islamic Guidance Post*, established in 1983, is the influential newspaper among Thai Muslim society and also for the Thai government, established in 1983. It has played crucial role on the conflict between the Thai state and Muslim society in the past. It also becomes a news source for non-Islamic media when question of Islam and of Muslims are relevant for a particular issue.

The study covers the period from January 2003 to May 2003. This period covers the timing before US invasion on and after US declared its victory. I have sought to categorize the papers from the theme of the articles.

## **BANGKOK POST**

The articles studied were collected through the Internet searching through [www.bangkokpost.com](http://www.bangkokpost.com) with the keyword "war on Iraq." The search gave with 19 articles, which consist of 9 editorials, and 10 perspective articles written by columnist and guests, who is mostly academician. The themes on Iraq War towards *Bangkok Post* can be categorized as the following:

- (a) The economy and war
- (b) Support to the disposal of President Saddam Hussein's regime
- (c) Support the role of UN as legitimacy international to tackle the situation

- (d) Criticism of US tendency policy towards the world
- (e) Pro US role
- (f) Support Thai government stance on Iraq War
- (g) "Myth" about attack dispelled
- (h) War on Iraq urge Al Qaeda network
- (i) Condemnation of the Iraqi program of suicide bombers

#### **(a) The Economy and War**

The article of January 21, 2003 worries about the impact of war on global economy. It points out that the price of oil will be pushed up and the recovery of the global economy will be hampered. It says, "What worries me most now is how long the war would last: one month, two, three? The longer it does drags on, the greater the impact it will have on the entire world, Thailand included."

In addition, this article states that war on Iraq will help the US economy. It refers to some arguments of analysts to support this statement. It says:

Some analysts say war on Iraq will help the US economy. There are two arguments to support this. The US weapons stockpile, which carry an expire date, will be used on Iraq or sold to allies, and so will be needed to be replaced. The US also should benefit from increase of oil supplies from Iraq, whose reserves are said to be the world 's second largest, after the conflict has ended. Remember that the United States is the world's largest burner of oil.

## (b) Support to the disposal of President Saddam Hussein's regime

This theme can be classified into two issues as follows:

1. *Resign to prevent war.* The editorial of January 27, 2003 suggests that President Saddam Hussein cooperate fully with the UN weapons inspectors to disarm as well as to resign to halt war. It says:

The neighbors of Iraq held a formal and very public meeting last week to urge Baghdad to come clean. President Saddam Hussein, they begged, should not just submit to UN inspectors. Lack of cooperation, they argued correctly, merely fuels the argument for invading Iraq, ending the dictatorship and installing a more sociable regime.

Behind the scenes, another possibility may be gaining speed. The resignation of President Saddam would halt war preparations faster than almost any other action. In recent days, international efforts along this line have increased. Senior policy officials in Thailand say the Iraqi dictator has asked several countries about possible asylum. So far, the inquiries have centered on guarantee of personal safety, with his personal wealth.

Mr. Saddam's unpopular son, Uday, has sent money abroad and the same policy officials believe he also may be seeking asylum. Reports say SAUDI Arabia and Turkey are among the leading nation urging Mr. Saddam and Mr. Uday to volunteer to leave. Both were among the nations meeting last week to warn and plead with Baghdad to cooperate and avoid war. Both are neighbors of Iraq, and likely to help any US-led invasion of Baghdad.

The United States continues to insist the regime in Baghdad will change, an old euphemism for overthrow. But Donald Rumsfeld, the hawkish defense secretary, also has left open several doors. Yes, US troops could lead an attack to overthrow Mr. Saddam and cronies. But the US "would be

delighted" if the Iraqi leader went into exile. Total cooperation by Baghdad with the UN inspectors would make it difficult for the US to justify an attack. So far, the United Nations teams say they are not receiving that cooperation. Troop buildups in the Gulf region have already ringed Iraq and times are clearly of the essence. One of the best ways to prevent war would be for Mr. Saddam to resign and clear out. He cannot win a fight against the American led multinational forces he faces. If he refuses to cooperate fully with the United Nations at least he can spare his nation a full-fledged war. The Iraqi leader should take the offers from friends, leave Baghdad and let another regime take over. Iraq would be welcomed back into the world community and could make a start on democracy.

2. *Need to remove due to dictatorship.* The commentary article (April 02, 2003) points out that Saddam Hussein should be removed, but by UN action. The article explains that opposition to war is correct but one thing we should not forget is that Saddam Hussein regime is one of the most repressive and violent that this modern world has seen. This article refers to several sources to support its opinion. It says:

I recently received a propaganda booklet from the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, International Information Programs, US Department of States entitled Iraq: A Population Silenced. It makes for nightmare reading and I don't doubt for a minute that every word in it is true.

The booklet scatters quotes from various independent sources throughout its 16 pages:

'The political-legal order in Iraq is not compatible with respect for human rights and rather, entails systematic violations throughout the country, affecting virtually the whole population.'



Max van der Stoep, UN special reporter of the commission on Human Rights in Iraq, 1999.

'Iraq under Saddam's regime has become a land of hopelessness, sadness, and fear. A country where people are ethnically cleansed; prisoners are tortured in more than 300 prisons in Iraq. Rape is systematic...congenital malformation, birth defects, infertility, cancer and various disorders are the results of Saddam's gassing of his own people... the killing and torturing of husbands in front of their wives and children...Iraq under Saddam has become a hell and a museum of crimes.'

Safia Al Souhail, Iraqi citizen, advocacy director, International Alliance for Justice.

'In one cell pieces of human flesh ear lobes were nailed to the wall, and blood spattered the ceiling. A large metal fan hung from the ceiling, and my guide told me prisoners were attached to the fan and beaten with clubs as they twirled. There were hooks in the ceiling used to suspend victims. A torture victim told me that prisoners were also crucified, nails driven through their hands into the wall. A favorite technique was to hang men from the hooks and attach a heavy weight to their testicles.'

Gwyne Roberts, reporter, London-based Independent newspaper, March 29, 1991.

'The mere suggestion that someone is not a supporter of the president carries the prospect of the death penalty.'

The article questions that who has the right to remove President Saddam? It says:

My answer to that would be that only actions sanctioned by the United Nations legitimize the invasion of a sovereign nation and the overthrow of its government. This is where I part company with the United States and Britain. Saddam Hussein should be removed but the UN weapons inspectors and

the Security Council should have been given more time and resources to occupy Iraq peacefully.

**(C) Support the role of UN as legitimacy international institution to tackle the situation**

The editorial of January 29, 2003 suggests that the Security Council should give the arms inspectors more time, because of the absence of evidence of weapons of mass destruction, and with the anti-war movement building support worldwide. This editorial states:

Thailand is bound to follow any UN resolution, foreign ministry officials say. Although also committed to honoring bilateral commitments, they add. The Senate Foreign Affairs Committee has made known to the US embassy its opposition to war with Iraq. The committee's chairman, Kraisak Choonhavan, was prominent at a weekend rally promoting an anti-war demonstration planned for Feb 15. That is the day after arms inspectors submit a second report to the Security Council.

The editorial of April 04, 2003 supports that UN play its role for the better future of Iraq and be involved in the post war administration from the beginning. And it also suggests US to accept UN role. It states:

Britain has proposed that the United Nations take the lead role in forging a post-Saddam Hussein administration for Iraq. The United States, ever resentful of the international body, is withholding its opinion, although it is known to prefer just a rubber stamp role for the world body. Though the US-led war on Iraq has yet to be won, the question of what to do with the country

after the shooting dies down will be a first test of the future relations between Washington and the UN, and, by extension, the rest of the world.

The US should take the advice of Britain and allow the UN to sponsors talk between Iraq's diverse political groups to forge a new government once Mr. Saddam is deposed. Afghanistan could serve as a model. Should Washington run the country under a military administration, the world will question if America is using Iraq for its own ends for the good of the Iraqi people, as it claims.

Iraq has the world's second largest oil reserve and her natural resources belong to the Iraqi people alone. The best way to assure everyone of this is for the United Nations is involved in the postwar administration from the beginning. An UN-appointed administrator, preferably a Muslim, should take charge of all non-security matters. Muslim countries should take a leading role in a UN-peace keeping force that would take over from American and British troops.

Though the war may take a lot longer than anyone had anticipated, reconstruction talks, as proposed by Britain, could go ahead nevertheless. These would pave the way for an elected government to run Iraq. Only then could the world rest easy about American intentions. Doing away with the UN or giving it simply a nominal role will only make the world more wary of a superpower or a crusade against enemies no one can readily recognize.

#### (d) Criticism of US tendency policy towards the world

This theme can be classified into three issues as follows:

1. *US functioning as an empire.* The article views US in the process of metamorphosis from a country into an empire. The author refers to Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri to explain that this concept is characterized by a

lack of boundaries, which posits the regime that effectively encompasses the spatial totality. The empire rules over the entire “civilized” world without temporal limit as a result of its sacred understanding as having reached its “end point”. Its rules operate and penetrate all dimensions of the social world through economic and cultural practices so extensively that there are those under its rule who yearn to be its subjects. It says:

During the last century and especially after the Cold War, the US became increasingly expected to assume the central role in the emerging new world order by serving international organizations, including the United Nations and international monetary and humanitarian organizations, in pursuit of the public good. The US was called on to intervene militarily in regional conflicts from Haiti to Persian Gulf, from Somalia to Bosnia. In other words, the American “empire”, as the embodiment of universal values in pursuit of global right, came into existence in a world context that has continuously called it into service.

Under the present circumstances, when the exercise of its almost limitless power has been made possible by technological supremacy, combined with a close-to religious self-understanding that it is in possession of “ideas that conquered world”\_ namely, a particular kind of peace, democracy and freedom \_ especially the free market, the US has developed and committed itself to a sense of mission to advance human liberty which, according to Mr. Bush, “is felt every life and every land.

It therefore went into this war against Iraq believing that the time of containment and deterrence was over and the only option left was to quickly “decapitate the regime” without listening to dissenting voice, neither in the United Nations nor elsewhere in the world.

If this is indeed the case, the continuing perception of the US as the most powerful country on earth, in terms of its military might and economic supremacy pursuing "nation interests", may be conceptually inadequate. Perhaps an alternative would be to conceptualize the US in the process of metamorphosis from a country into an empire.

The article also states the consequence of functioning as empire that believing in its unmatched might and "eternal" value of freedom, and seeking to reinvent the nations of the world in its own image, the US is charting a new course in world affairs by producing the uncivilizing of the international system. It describes:

First, this war has seriously weakened the UN system, to the point that there are people in the street beginning to question the benefit of its continued existence. Second, it has upset the accepted international norm of resorting to the use of force only as a last resort. Third, when Mr. Bush said on March 18 that the US was acting now because "the risks of inaction would be far greater" since "the power of Iraq to inflict harm on all free nations would be multiplied many times over" in one or five years, he was setting a precedent, not only that might is right but also that might used as a pre-emptive measure is right.

In addition, this article seeks to explore the future of peace after this war ends. There are two conditions conducive to the future of peace at this moment in history: avoiding despair and refusing hatred. It says:

Working towards the first condition, the legitimacy of the UN needs to be strengthened while providing space for peaceful protest against the war. The world still needs space for states to engage in dialogue and the setting

of rules that constitute a civilizing process of international order not unlike the historical establishment of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Choosing sides for government cannot take the problem of the UN's legitimacy into serious consideration. Ordinary people, regardless of their religious beliefs, also need to engage in politics by way of voicing their disagreement. Giving space for dissent in their own societies provides an alternative to despair. When facing an emerging empire, religious belief and dissent are crucial to dragging the world out of the despair characterized by a sense of powerlessness, which breed violence in all shapes and forms including terrorism.

Deception and demolition of the other are war's close siblings. Both effectively generate hatred of the other. In refusing hatred, I can't help but think of a little known American woman, Rachel Corrie.

...As a member of the Grassroots International Presence for the Protection of Palestinian, she went to southern Gaza to protect others through non-violence. On March 16, she tried to prevent Israeli army from destroying the homes of Palestinians in Rafah refugee camp by lying down in front of a vehicle to block its path. She was killed when a bulldozer piled sand on her body...

On March 17, the refugee camp in southern Gaza saw an American flag. Often burned as a sign of protest, this time some 1,000 Palestinian marched through the refugee camp, holding the stretch draped with an American flag as a sign of mourning. A Palestinian farmer said: "We fly a US flag today to show our support for all American peace lovers, those like Rachel.

The author sums up that the line-dividing people into piles to be convenient objects of hatred were gone. Rachel Corrie did a great deal to fight hatred with her courage. She paid for it with her life. Her story needs to be told and retold of an American, and there are others, who gave her life for peace without harming or hating others.

"Between the conduct of taking life by an empire and giving life by this young woman, which American action will better bring the world and American society sustainable security and long-lasting peace?" The article questions.

2. *US must pay attention to the war dissent across the world.* The editorial (February 9, 2003) argued that the real reason behind the push for war might be that those surrounding President Bush are convinced that a regime change in Iraq would be the first step towards bringing democracy and stability to the region. "There may be some good arguments supporting that the result would be worth the risks of war, but they should make their case rather than dismiss as irrelevant for all those who are skeptical.

This editorial also points out that ignoring dissent is shortsighted for US. It criticizes:

...US Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld dismissed NATO states whose leaders have refused to back the US stand on Iraq, namely France and Germany, as "old Europe," and implied that they were losing their relevance when compared to England, Spain and the newer NATO countries of eastern Europe. Anger over the defense secretary's comments in France and Germany was not confined to liberals and moderates.

...Richard Perle, chairman of the influential Pentagon Policy Advisory Board, raised the rhetoric another notch when he said:

"Very considerable damage has already been done to the Atlantic community, including NATO by Germany and France." He went on to say that "France is no longer the ally that it once was." But downplayed the

significance of Germany's position as merely an aberration by a "discredited chancellor."

What Rumsfeld and Perle are overlooking is that in almost every case, even in those countries in Europe whose leaders are supportive of a US-led preemptive strike on Iraq, the people are not.

This is so all across Eastern Europe, as well as in Spain and England. The British Newspaper The Daily Mirror recently conducted a poll which showed that 84% of the nation is opposed to a US-British war on Iraq. Another NATO member, Turkey, will bow to US pressures and incentives and allow the use of its territory as a staging ground for battle, but the people are overwhelmingly against war and the government has said that Turkish armed forces will not enter combat.

The situation is the same across Asia. The leadership in Asian countries has been mostly low-key on the issue. About 70% of Japanese, however, are opposed to war and it's unlikely that it has any more support in Thailand.

If the government of all these countries voices the concern of their citizens, will they cease to be allies too? Even in America, opposition is also broad based. According to moderate Pulitzer Prize-winning columnist Thomas L. Friedman, in a recent speaking tour all across America, there was not one audience in which a majority supported war. Not surprisingly though, the government has attempted to marginalize those in the peace camp."

3. *Hatred is the feeling people have towards Americans.* The article (March 26, 2003) states that hatred, abhorrence, resentment or whatever other feeling people have towards American extends much further than the Muslim community. The feeling is also by no means limited to the impoverished. There has been a growing anti-American sentiment ever since the United States became the world's joint pre-eminent power after World



War Two. The sentiment intensified with the end of the Cold War, when the US became the sole superpower.

This article points out that the determining cause of growing worldwide hatred of the US, its president and its unilateral stance is the unwillingness of those in the rest of the global to be "converted" into American. The article tries also to explain the idea and ideal of Americans, which drives American foreign policy. It describes:

Americans are brought up to believe religiously, and hold dear, the values of indiscriminate tolerance, free speech, liberal political and economic values, and, most important, that everything can be changed for the better. The establishment of American nation was based on the idea of anti-authority, a notion that ideals take precedence over institutions, tradition and, at times, even laws.

The US is the first and only state that not only presents itself as believing in certain ideals, it exists because of those ideals.

If Japan, for sake of example, for bids freedom of expression, the country can continue to exist as Japan. If Thailand stops believing in the free market, the "blood" that binds much and us shared history will still allow the kingdom to be what it is.

But if you ever take away freedom of expression, the free market economy and other pillars expressed in the US constitution and bill of rights, American can no longer exist as a people, for the only true sinews of their nation are its ideals. Unlike shared history, heritage, blood, race, ethnicity, language, religion or culture, the survival of soft news composed of ideals and ideas come only with these sinews' export. This, in essence, is the nature of American foreign policy.

Placing the current campaign in this context informs us that George Bush is only trying expanding that which is the American spirit. For America to be able to expand its institutional ideals of Western liberal democracy, anti-traditionalism, free market economics and equality among the sexes, races, age groups and occupation is the equivalent of the Roman Empire being able to crush to death the Malians.

As a protective mechanism, the act of exporting American ideals is the only long-term instrument by which America is able to assure that its national unity survives. Survivability, in this respect, is not measured by how many countries its military can conquer; it is based on how many cultures, economies, societies, people and way of life the American ideals can indoctrinate. One must ask oneself whether mission "Iraqi Freedom" would be named what it is if this were only a military campaign.

American foreign policy is entirely endogenous with the elemental contributing factor being American ideas and ideals themselves. It is only the engines used to channel these ideas and ideals, which differ; the impetus behind both "diplomatic" and "forceful" measures is essentially unilateral.

Americans are divided into two camps. The first comprises those who believe they can make the world a better place and export American ideals by peaceful means. The second comprises those who believe they can change the world into a better place by forceful means.

The former are post-materialists and post-modernist who joined American based NGOs or international organizations, including the United Nations and institutions under the World Bank Group, to peacefully yet imploringly coax the world into modifying along American lines. The latter are conservative, hawkish right-wingers such as Mr. Bush and his ilk who understand the militaristic capability of their nation and opt to forcefully, yet with the same intentions, coax the world into modifying along the ironically identical line of American standards.

Haters being able to reconcile their feelings when they see members of the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank or NGOs on rescue missions have not solved anti-Americanism. In fact, America's attempts at benign hegemony only add fuel to the fire. Anti-Americanism originates from the resentment that people have towards the dogmatic, ceaseless and stubborn desire attempt by Americans, whether through force or peaceful measures, to export their ideals.

The clashing between this superpower, which purports to hold the ultimate truth, against nations and peoples who manifestly believe in the endogenous formation of their own ideals, laws, cultural ways and institutions. results in such outcomes as the war in Iraq.

However, anti-American roots lie deeper. As long as the rest of the world continues to view US foreign policy as a crusade for America ideas and ideals, it will not matter if that crusade is pursued through soft or hard power, the phenomenon will continue to exist."

#### **(e) Pro US role**

The article of April 08, 2003 states that the antagonism towards the Americans is inappropriate, unwarranted and unnecessary. What US has been doing is trying to promote a better world. The article gives the reasons to support US policy on Iraq. It says:

First, there is a double standard in the international system whereby the United States\_ the world's hegemony\_ is held to different standards than all other nations.

The French government only a few months ago sent troops to the Ivory Coast without any official international mandate. This act of "unilateralism" had no more fundamental justification than the deployment of US troops in

Iraq but, not surprisingly, France's action effectively escaped the media's attention and, more importantly, international condemnation.

The term unilateralism is used very liberally in the context of American foreign policy but is seldom used elsewhere.

Second, it must be said that prior to its invasion of Iraq, the United States had exhausted all the diplomatic means to achieve its ends. Furthermore, the dire state of the Iraqi political, economic and social systems is explicit confirmation that deterrence, containment and inspections have been ineffective in dealing with the present Iraqi regime.

Third, the United States has no reason to apologize for its dominant military power and its willingness to use that power forcefully and decisively, as long as its intent is benign.

The article further supports US role. It says:

Liberal democracies may have their weaknesses, but theirs is the only system that can attain equality, freedom and a semblance of democracy in a region where despotism and oppression are the norm.

It is tragic to think that many believe it a noble cause to malign and obstruct a nation, which is trying to promote a better world, especially when it sacrifices its men and its resources to achieve that end.

As American troops approach a final confrontation in Baghdad, they are reminded of the fact that a least seven of their own are being held as prisoners of war, 15 are listed as missing in action, and 40 have lost their lives.

As are the lives of the American troops, the future of the international system is at grave risk. If the war should take a turn for the worse, at the very least we risk the creation of an America, which is indifferent and apathetic in regard to external concerns. Even worse, we risk reverting to a multi polar

world where no power exists to keep the international system in check and anarchy is set free to reign.

Given the stakes, we should certainly hope that victory for the US-led coalition is a matter of when, not of it." The article sums up.

The term unilateralism is used very liberally in the context of American foreign policy but is seldom used elsewhere, for example, when French government sent troops to the Ivory Coast without any official international mandate. This act of "unilateralism" had no more fundamental justification than the deployment of US troops in Iraq but escaped the media's attention and international condemnation. Secondly, prior to its invasion of Iraq, the UN had exhausted all diplomatic means to achieve its ends. Furthermore, the state of the Iraqi political, economic and social systems is an explicit confirmation that deterrence, containment and inspections have been ineffective in dealing with the present Iraqi regime. Thirdly, the US has no reason to apologize for its dominant military power and its willingness to use that power forcefully and decisively, as long as its intent is benign. "Given the stakes, we should certainly hope that victory for the US-led coalition is a matter of when, not of it." The article sum up.

#### **(F) Support Thai government stance on Iraq war**

Thai government policy on Iraq war is beneficial for the country in term of national interests and security establishment, as the opinion of article of March 24, 2003 and article of April 02, 2003 respectively. The first article agreed with Thailand clarifying that it supported the UN resolution. It says:

The Foreign Ministry issued a statement last week clarifying that it supported the United Nations resolution to disarm Iraq of weapons of mass destruction through peaceful means, while at the same time committing Thailand to cooperate with the United States on security matters and in its anti-terrorism

efforts. In essence, the statement gives notice that Thailand opposes the war on Iraq, but is willing to take part in any post-war rehabilitation and reconstruction activities.

The stand taken by the government would appear the most appropriate given the circumstances. There is the clear impression it was taken with the nation's best interests very much at heart. Although a long-time ally of the United States, Thailand, at this time, can not support the war on Iraq: The war is morally and legally wrong and the military action was taken in defiance of a United Nations resolution.

However, this article criticizes government's decision to expel three junior Iraqi diplomats from the country on the grounds that they represented a security threat. "No substantial evidence was given to back the charges against the diplomats, and so it is widely suspected that expulsion was influenced by Washington.

Finally, this article proposes that Thailand should brace for active participation in the post war rehabilitation of Iraq, especially on humanitarian aspects. It says:

Thai medical staff was dispatched to provide health service in East Timor in the after math of the bloody riots that accompanied that newest Southeast Asian nation's birth. An engineering corps was recently sent to Afghanistan to help with reconstruction work there. Thailand can\_ and should\_ also play an active and constructive role in the rehabilitation and reconstruction of Iraq.

Humanitarian work is one area in which Thailand is well equipped financially and in terms of manpower to be very useful. After all, we now have extensive experience. What will need to be done after this conflict represents an opportunity that should not be missed, especially if Prime Minister Thaksin Shinawatra wants to assert himself as a regional leader.

The second article supported the Prime Minister's stance which made clear that Thailand remained committed to the UN framework, at the same time Thaksin Shinawatra government expelled 11 Iraqis, who might have mounted a terrorist attack in Thailand or have used Thailand to hatch terrorist operations to take place in nearby countries. In other words, the author agrees with the middle path which Thai government took. It says:

The commencement of hostilities in Iraq less than two weeks ago posed a challenge to Mr. Thaksin and Thailand's foreign policy and security establishment. With the US administration and the UN Security Council at odds over the disarmament of the Iraqi regime, the formulation of Thailand's position naturally became a conundrum.

On the one hand was an established ally who had provided crucial assistance for this country's security needs over the past four decades; on the other was the predominant international institution supervising relations among states in the international system.

Unlike his hasty and eventually reversed response to the Afghan conflict, Mr. Thaksin kept his cool this time. Flanked by Foreign Minister Surakiart Sathirathai, the prime minister made clear from the opening day of hostilities that Thailand remained committed to the UN framework.

But the Thaksin government also took the concurrent measure of expelling 11 Iraqis. Three were diplomats and the other purportedly businessmen. The 11 were deemed a liability to Thailand's security interests. With only one Iraqi diplomat left in the country, the Iraqi embassy was forced to close its doors temporarily but has since resume operations.

No doubt the Iraqis' expulsion did not displease US officials, who warned of possible terrorist reprisals in thirds countries. The Iraqis' expulsion also sent

a signal that Thailand was implicit behind the US-led war against the rouge regime of the Bush administration's choosing.

The Thai position effectively became two-sided, standing by the UN and sticking to the US.

A growing column of local anti-war protesters has roundly criticized such "fence-sitting". However, as with any country intent on being respected internationally and forced to choose between the United States and the UN, Thailand could have done worse. The UN imparts international legitimacy; the US is the world's preponderant power.

...The spat between the United States and the UN over what to do with Saddam Hussein's Iraq is not Thailand's problem, and should not be allowed to undermine Thai national interests in the longer term.

If the UN can regain its credibility in the weeks ahead in view of its recent inability to rein in American power, then Thailand will be on the winning side. If the UN crisis of the credibility continues to degenerate in view of the US's aggressive unilateral, Thailand will still be on the winning side by having implicit supported American policy objectives.

Yet there is an additional gain from Thailand's fence sitting on the war in Iraq. The expulsion of the Iraqis was prudent. The threat of terrorist reprisals, especially in light of the finding that the Bali bomb plotters had brainstormed on Thai soil, is real.

...Thus the Thaksin government was right to dismiss the 11 Iraqis, who might have mounted a terrorist attack in Thailand or use Thailand to hatch terrorist operation to take place in nearby countries. While this move may be seen as supportive of US policy objectives, it certainly protected Thai national interests by pre-emptive potential terrorism.

...Thailand's concerted response this time harks back to its tradition foreign policy of balancing between the heavyweights of the world arena. Having to



choose between the United States and the UN is dually problematic. The best option is two pick both.

**(g) "Myth" about attack dispelled**

The article (March 22, 2003) analyses that American led invasion which will result in a "rebranding" rather than "regime change". The article points that the Bush administration is more interested in "leadership change" than "regime change." It says:

In Bush's parlance, regime change simply means the stepping down of Saddam Hussein, his immediate family members, and inner circle hence the proposed exile option. This would leave intact the political and military structures. Another dream solution would be a military coup d'etat by an Iraqi junta. It is hoped that faced with imminent defeat, the Iraqi generals will simply abandon Saddam Hussein. In any case, post war Iraq will not experience real or radical political change. How could the remnants of the Reagan administration be really interested in democratization?

Weren't they the very same people who enthusiastically supported murderous authoritarian regimes in Central America and apartheid in South Africa during the 1980s?

Weren't they the very people who were involved in the Iran-Contra scandal, and part of the very administration that supported state terrorism against Nicaragua in the 1980s according to the World Court? Democratization in Iraq will also alarm undemocratic Saudi Arabia and other petty kingdoms in the region. An iron fist of an Iraqi junta is needed to hold the country together, lest it breaks into smaller states.

This article refers to Rai sum up: "Exile or coup, Iraq's weapons will remain the same; Iraq's army will remain the same. This is not a war of liberation. "For the people of Iraq, this is just a re-branding.

**(h) War on Iraq urge Al Qaeda network**

The editorial of January 29, 2003 views that the saber ratting of US president has galvanized Muslims to close ranks behind their own. And war against the regime of Saddam Hussein is expected to be a prime-recruiting agent for Osama bin Laden, whose Al Qaeda network lost some support with moderates after the suicidal attacks on the US in September 2001. "Young Muslim in southern Thailand, already active in a boycott of US goods as part of the war against war, could be drawn to the cause. And the network could seize on the waging of war to respond with a new terrorist strike." The article states.

**(i) Condemnation of the Iraqi program of suicide bombers**

The editorial of March 31, 2003 focuses on condemning of the Iraqi program of suicide bombers. It writes that the very notion is both dangerous to society and honor. It believes that the Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein is the first government in history to approve, raise and glorify suicide bombing and worries that one of the most dangerous possibilities of our day is that the Iraq war may make suicide bombers appear legitimate to many unthinking people. This article says:

It was long known that President Saddam Hussein rewarded the murderous suicides of Palestinian in Israel. It was long rumor that Iraq was running a school to train young men and women to become suicide bombers.

There should be nothing but condemnation of the Iraqi program of suicide bombers. The idea that the young patriot is willing to sacrifice his life for his

nation or cause is acceptable if tragic. Indeed, the very notion of service in the armed forces carries such a responsibility. The life of every soldier, sailor, and airman is on the line in many ways. But it is a serious, dangerous and ultimately unacceptable step from putting one's life on the line for country and duty to be deliberately taking one's life for those same ideals.

How fitting it was to see the dependably craven Iraqi Vice-President Taha Yassin Ramadan as the leading spokesman for the idea of Iraqi suicide bombers after the weekend attack on four American soldiers at an Iraqi checkpoint. He bragged the attack was just the beginning and: "You'll hear more pleasant news later." Well, it is not pleasant. It is probably more unpleasant than any of the other news from the unnecessary, violate and most unhappy war now under way in Iraq.

Until now, only marginal and widely detested group\_ Hamas, Hizbollah, the most extreme Palestinian zealots, the Tamil Tigers\_ have tried to extol suicide as an honorable tactic. Iraq has sat in decent society in the United Nations, lived among civilized regimes and claimed to speak for civil citizens. Now it applauds the act of self-destruction by young men it brainwashes. Yet, it is fitting that members of a government which has gassed its citizens, tortured its patriots and forced a million refuge to flee in fear during peacetime would be first to encourage their young people to die for them. But it is barbarously frightening.

It is impossible to respect the vicious old men who raise and recruit suicide bombers. The Iraqi government seems to be determined to go out with the huge display of depravity. One could even understand if it attempts to use terrible weapons. But one must never accept the chilling idea that a government should train its citizens to kill themselves to he mere hope that they can kill a few of the enemy.

If suicide bombing is acceptable, no society can ever live peacefully. If one accepts a government even the Iraqi government has the right o train and order suicide bombers, then any group has the same moral right.

Unthinking supporters of Saddam's Iraq may argue that suicide bombers are only being used on the battlefield. The dangerous is that by making suicide bombers legitimate, Iraq is helping to ensure they will be used everywhere.

## MANAGER

The articles studied were collected from a hard copy of newspaper from January to May 2003. The theme on Iraq War towards *Manager* was found as the following:

- (a) Criticism of US role
- (b) Distortion of the western mass media
- (c) War and ethics
- (d) War and world dominant strategy
- (e) US and the attempt to "hoodwink" war
- (f) Iraq War will become protracted war
- (g) The cost of war in Iraq
- (h) Explanation of the meaning of the word "jihad"
- (i) The prolonged war and Bush administration stability
- (j) The second crusade

### (a) Criticism of US role

This theme can be classified into four issues as follows:

1. *US as a hooligan*. The article of January 15,2003 gives two examples to support the idea of America as a global hooligan. Firstly,

instead of limiting its warfare target only on Iraq, US proclaimed to broaden its target to North Korea, if it does not stop nuclear development project, "otherwise, US will declare war on North Korea simultaneously." Secondly, apart from accusing Iraq as the country, which supports the Al Qaeda network, US also accused Iran, North Korea, some Arab countries and some Asian countries of supporting terrorism and accepted this accusation as the justification for US to exercise military to defend it. In this context, the article states that:

This phenomenon reflects that nowadays, US plays the role of a hooligan, who can invade and capture any weak country announcing a link of terrorism to it. This attitude of US means that US reject the role of UN and US views UN as an effigy organization in which US can incite to do what it wishes.

*2. The conquest of Iraq is the US plan to plunder Middle East region.*

The article of January 17, 2003 criticizes US role for controlling the energy resources as its main driving motive behind the onslaught of the war. "US led war on Iraq which is the huge oil reservoir country in order to occupy a whole Middle East region."

The article explains that US's invasion on Iraq is not surprising but rather intelligent and well planned to expand their economy. It is imperialistic policy of US to colonize and make targets the states where it has an easy access to raw material and free market. Some of the important documents on US policy are listed below to make argument more valid.

The author refers to “the New Bush Doctrine on September” and “the project for the new American Century” (PNAC) to support the claim. “The new Bush Doctrine on September 20, a 23- page document that openly proclaims Washington’s intention to capture the world and “pre-emptively” eliminate all present and future rivals.”

The document cites the article in the Sunday Herald, September 15, 2002, uncovering a secret operation of US to capture the world, called “the Project for the New American Century (PNAC)” written by Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz and Lewis Leiby on September 2003, as the guiding policy of US.

Referring to the Sunday Herald, the document (PNAC) demands Bush administration use of the US military power to control and rule the whole land of Persian Gulf, no matter whether Saddam regime exists. Moreover, it plans to preclude the rise of the great power rival and shaping the international security order in line with American principles and interests. It also advocates “regime change” in China, saying it is time to increase the presence of US forces in Southeast Asia leading to providing the spur to process of democratization in China. PNAC document also call for America using key allies such as Britain as the most affective and efficient means of exercising American global leadership. Bush administration proposed this policy to US parliament, which called “Bush Doctrine.” The principle idea is pre-emptive strike and open uncontested world domination.

The article concludes that in fact, Bush doctrine is not different from the US’s former strategy, that is to refrain from internal matters of state and times of

crisis and obstruction. "Affirmably, whoever hates America because of its actions thereof, is supposed to attack it certainly and surely."

3. *US violate universal pillar.* The article of March 26, 2003 asks the readers to stand against the occupation of Iraq. The reason given due to US abuse of 4 principle universal pillars.

Firstly, Justice, the article writes Bush is merciless man, making war without rationale by commanding to attack Iraq with various kind of destruction weapons without considering the impact on innocent civilians.

Secondly, Democracy, the article writes Bush does not respect the majority that is the principle of democracy and his ancestors accumulate for a long time by leading war against Iraq. "His declaration of war is violating resolution of majority voice in UN.

Thirdly, Human Rights, the article blames Bush abuse of human right. "Making war leading Iraqi soldiers and civil to be separated from the ones they love as well as destroy their properties and treasures. Creating the hardship, and difficult things to innocent people.

Fourthly, International law and UN regulation. The article views Bush as the leader of society, which adopts principle of law, he contradictory abuses those principles. "As US and its allies invade Iraq without UN consent, therefore they started an unjust, criminal war and they commit a sin to Iraqis like dictators Adolf Hitler, Musolini, and General Tojo during World War II.

The article also argues against Bush's justification of war declaration to establish democracy for Iraqi after disposing of Saddam, predominantly a dictator.

I want to question how is it possible? Whereas the US conduct the same way of dictatorship by abusing above main principles. It is not different from the way of Saddam whom US charged as dictator.

In addition, the article argues the accusation given by Bush saying that Iraq is peril state to US and the world. "It is nonsense accusation because Iraq was boycotted for more than 12 years until its army is in ineffective condition to fight with any country for its defense and sovereignty purpose.

4. *America practices is double standard.* The article of April 11, 2003 criticizes the role of super power military country with its implicative writing, since name of country has not been mentioned. What article criticizes is the illogical policy conducting, which seems double standard and against entire law, to gain its interests.

The superpower military country led war to occupy one country without approval from world organization, which that country established, and being the important membership. The accusation was possession of mass destruction weapons and involvement with terrorist activities. However, in fact, that accusation could not be proved obviously. At the same time, the weapon-inspection team found no evidences in support of their allegations.

Quite contrarily, that sort of mass destruction weapons has been existed in the power country. In addition, it is the only and first country, which used heavy weapon in World War II, and the causality rose up to 100,000 civilians. It accused the other country for going against Geneva charter, whereas complainant itself acted against the charter of UN, which is bigger than Geneva charter.

It accused that the opposite country started and operated unjust fighting in warfare by dressing civil cloth or forcibly turning oneself into warrior. This accusation does not base on the fact that the injustice and unrighteous



happened since the stronger country invade to the weaker country having less population, military power, economics power.

The article further states that from the viewpoint of the international relationship, paying respect to the sovereignty of the other countries is important, in case of powerful country issuing an ultimatum to dispose the other country's leader, otherwise he would be forced by military power and war waging. This is the clear mark of political coercion and threat. "The question is where is justice? Where is international law? Is UN charter still effective?"

The article further questions the claim of powerful dominant country to liberate people from oppressions to facilitate democratic system in other country that in several countries which has been supported by powerful country whether still being democratic countries. "Some in Latin America or Middle East are not democratic countries. These claims are unreasonable."

The article continues criticizing the double standard action of super power country. It said that the intimidate to sue the leader of the other country to criminal war court is the stupid threat because the thing is that the country which invaded the other was committing international crime as well obviously. "The resolution of world organization has never given the right to lead war for occupation. Invasion is the act against international law and world charter. This is the act of international crime obviously."

The article concludes that being the superpower country does not mean merely the maintenance of military and economic power, but it is also essential to have principle of dignity, righteousness, moral and justice.

The honor and dignity of power is not about the winning in warfare and occupying the land belonging to the others, but it depends on being a role model for the world as well as playing the role of trustable, acceptable, just and dignified global stage. It is pity that all of these qualifications have not been seen from the world eye.

#### **(b) Distortion of the western mass media**

This theme can be classified into three issues as follows:

1. *CNN becomes an unreliable media.* The article of April 9, 2003 regards CNN as no longer reliable media and points out that this is the first time that US and UK, who own global media like CNN and BBC, no longer use the influence of media to dominate global viewers. The reason is that, *firstly*, viewers have to pay for cable TV membership. *Secondly*, there are other international media, which have emerged to compete with western media, such as Al Jazeera, the independent popular TV station of Qatar or World Wide Watch of China, which broadcasts 24 hours in English via satellite. *Thirdly*, there were not only CNN or BBC in Iraq war battlefield, the other news agencies also embedded in the field and presented quite different aspects of the available information.

CNN presented news as war game showing the destructive potential of weapons such as cruise missile, or smart bomb destroying building, tank or

airplane as well as presenting the scene of heavy shooting of artillery and tank of US and UK ground troops in Iraq's city, including the scene of US militants seizing Iraqi prisoners of war.

At the beginning of war, CNN reported that one division of Iraqi soldiers around 8,000 persons surrendered and President Saddam was injured or killed by the attacking. Some shots reflected good gesture depicted by Iraqi civilians towards US military. Or in the case of US military press conference or Bush speech, CNN live broadcasted until it was finished, adversely, CNN presented partly information from Iraq side. What CNN reported is opposite to the report of NHK of Japan, DW of Germany, Al Jazeera of Qatar or World Wide Watch of China which presented the hardship of innocent people who were suffering from bombing as well as the demonstration of world wide anti-war protesters.

The article criticizes CNN covering on Iraq war. And finally, it concludes that no matter when the war of occupation, which was regarded as against moral, international law and justice, will come to the end. The important thing is that UK and US have lost their reliability and prestige as civilized country, which governs with democratic system. Likewise CNN and BBC have also lost their worthiness. It is the time Thai TV should reduce news buying from those media and turn to the others.

2. *Criticize western and Thai media role.* The article of March 26, 2003 criticizes that western media insists upon world audiences to feel and understand that the event happened in Iraq is war and it is the war between alliance and evil to do away with Satan from the world and free Iraqi people from the sin. The article also criticizes some Thai media, which played the role of western media's mouthpiece. It states:

Some Thai media organizations behave as if they were the mouthpiece of western media by influx broadcasting and press upon one side information for a whole day, as if they were supported with the budget from western media to shape idea for Thai people that what is happening is justified, excellent and desirable.

Imagine, if anybody declared to liberate Thailand by the same way, bombing country and saying that I will give you rice and restore your country. Do Thai people accept? Actually, the Iraqis did the same what Thai people would have done in the situation. Worldwide people who are not only exposed to one side information would do the same.

The article argues that nowadays news and information cannot be completely suppressed like last 12 years of former Gulf War or lately Afghanistan war. Because the opposition has been disseminated broadly by the other side of information. The truth becomes discovered gradually.

Al Jazeera of Qatar, CCTV of China, Russia TV, and France TV have presented the fact that the information presented by western media is not truth. At the beginning day of invasion, the information was presented that Iraq was occupied, Iraq leader if not injured otherwise died, and the war will be over within a few days. After five days passed, it was proved that that information is fake.

Chinese militant criticized the situation via CCTV that the resistance of Iraqis strike back just started, US and allies must be confronted with heavily long drawn guerrilla, which this critic conform with the opinion of the militant in many countries.

When the global audiences, especially American realized that it was lie, the number of 1,000 people protested their American news agency and it seems that this news agency will become hoodwink news agency for the worldwide

audiences perception. In Thailand, do we continually accept the news from this agency as heaven?" The article criticizes.

The article write that today the information has been clearly expressed that the purpose of occupation war is to occupy oil resources in Iraq. "Thai people should be clearly made understand that this case is not war, but it is the snatch away of oil benefit in Iraq. Nothing difficult and complicated."

3. *Distortion of the western media.* The article of January 29, 2003 points out that the freedom of expression completely exists only in the theory. It is impossible to exist in practice. The author believes that media works mainly respond according to their national interests.

BBC, CNN, Reuters, Times, Newsweek, Wall Street Journal, Washington Post, New York Time and so on entirely respond to their national interests. It might be true that 60-70 % of their presentation or their critic is straightforward, objective and non-alignment policy. However, the rest of 30-40 % is distortions, lose objectivity and cherish their country interests during the occurrence of international conflict situation.

The article gives the example of the US and China conflict to support the idea of media distortions.

In the case of Chinese aeroplane (F7) crash US espionage aeroplane in China Sea near territorial water of China. What CNN reported on Internet is trying to state the fault of Chinese pilot. The message was disseminated in sense that Chinese pilot flew the aircraft closely to US aircraft until the crash happened. The evidence shown in CNN covering was the close-up shot of

Chinese aircraft with the caption said: "Chinese pilot fly so closely to US plane that crew can take photo clearly.

The article argues that this is the obvious distortion of reporting because US crew can use high quality zoom lens to close up the picture although Chinese aero lanes fly far away. "There are many high quality zoom lenses used on espionage aero plane. Absolutely, US crew will not use simple one in espionage works." The article states and continues adds one more example about the case of Chinese Embassy building damaged by US missile in Belgrade, Yugoslavia. CNN reported that it was the mistake, which took place because US used the old map in its operation.

This is the unacceptable reason at all; even the primary school students cannot believe that the most progressed country still used the old map in its affair. And the worst thing is that the local media also repeated what CNN broadcasted.

The article tries to persuade the readers to mobilize their opinion by consumption of western media on the basis of authentic judgments and make balance by increasingly getting exposed to Asian media, not incline to western media as usual.

Don't just admire the capacity of media's live coverage; any news agency can do the same thing if they have a huge amount of budget. The awareness point is that western media still subtly distort the substantial of news or critic issue.

### (c) War and ethics

The article of January 30, 2003 focuses on a treatise on the art of war. It views the situation before US attack against Iraq with the frame of a treatise on the art of war.

Regarding to a treatise on the art of war, Mao Tse Tung explained precisely and concisely that all invasion of wars are unjust wars. All of resistance wars are just wars. The history of war proved that unjust wars would be defeated eventually.

Vietnam war lesson obviously confirms that although US possessed more and modern troops and weapons than Vietnam, unjust war always leads to defeat. It might be seen that the invader is the winner, but it is temporarily winning which defeat is waiting for.

In January 27, 2003, if weapons of mass destruction were not found in Iraq, UN will not agree to operate war in the name of UN. And if US goes against and leads war on Iraq, it can be said that what US does is 'invasion'. And it will be the first explicit invasion of this century. And it will become the justification for Iraq and international community to go against war.

This article concludes that justice is the first priority for deciding to lead war regarding to a treatise on the art of war. Without justice, it loses. This is the splendid of justice.

#### (d) War and world dominant strategy

The article of February 21, 2003 interprets the US invasion as the action of new colonialism conducted by Imperialists and Capitalists. The strategy used to achieve their goal is that of slaughter as well as mobilizing all sorts of media, as being a tool of their propaganda. "What is happening is one form of colonialism, just only place and scene of drama has been changed."

This article states that two kinds of this strategy were completely used in Yugoslavia civil war and has still been conducting in Iraq.

A Serbian declaration of unconditional surrender to US and NATO troops after ethnic cleansing war is the end of the conventional war of the 21st century and from the military viewpoint, bombing Yugoslavia as completely collapse, ruin and fast is the showing for selling of US weapons capacity for massacre in which US weapons business gain benefit.

The article points out that US uses the superior weapons technology as its strategy to coerce and terrorize the defenseless countries who will not be able to fight in order to secure and defend its own international interests. "US has become military technology power because at the end of twentieth century, US can control economy resource (oil). Consequently, this influence leads to merging as principal oppressor imperialist nation." The article impresses upon.



### **(e) US and hoodwink war**

The article of March 28, 2003 points out that Iraq war is the recurrence of the wicked war happening in Yugoslavia by US, Germany and NATO. Both of war has the common ground of occupation to gain the invader's interests.

The article calls Iraq war and Yugoslavia war as hoodwink, the strategy used to justify their occupation is propaganda and telling lie to manipulate the world's opinion. The author regards this thing as a new strategy of present time war.

In Yugoslavia war, every sort of mass media was mobilized to be the mean to disseminate the lie, to blacken, to frame up, to exaggerate. Adolf Hitler called "Techniques of Persuasion." This strategy started by stating the essential reasons to occupy, and follow up by mobilizing all sort of western media to participate in the battlefield and disseminate the one sided information.

People in the world were manipulated and misinformed to believe that there were massacres like ethnic cleansing, ganged rapes in Yugoslavia until people felt sympathy about the victim's fate and accepted that the march progressive of NATO troops was solely justified to maintain state of peaceful living, and this strategy has been used in Iraq as well. The article states.

### **(f) Iraq war will become protracted war**

The article of April 9, 2003 predicts that the situation of Iraq war is transforming to protracted war, which would be certainly happening under prevailing circumstances.

The article explains that *firstly*, could be called protracted war, as it has to be conducted with the implication of justice on the nation or from the group of people who were invaded on their land against an unjust war of invaders. This idea conforms to the principle of war stating, "justice war will overcome unjust war"

In this case, Iraqi people, Muslim people making war to protect Islamic land of Iraq and national interests of Iraq and exile the troop of invader out of Iraq. In this sort of war, the people who were invaded will seriously fight with entire force and for infinite period for their independence and sovereignty.

*Secondly*, the protracted war is the circumstance that the one who protects their land from invasion has less strength of military and troops than the invader's and will not be able to overcome soon and the stronger invader who is confronting with all kind of resolutely attacking, will not be able to win decisively and not to defeat soon.

The protectors have chance to win, but definitely will not be able to overcome soon, the invader have trend to defeat, and much stronger, but will not defeat soon yet. This kind of circumstance creates protracted war.

*Thirdly*, conducting protracted war depending on internal condition, that is majority of people participate in warfare leading by progressive political party to protect their land decisively. In other words, protracted war is war by people. "According to civilian's militia of the oppressed can damage even Apache plane is just the small example of power of warfare by civilian."

*Fourthly*, just warfare has been supported by global community whereas unjust war has been against, with this condition, the one who makes just war will be supported to do protracted war and supposed to gain advantage over the invader gradually. Adversely, the invader will be opposed and confronted with obstacles in waging war, eventually, leading to be more disadvantageous.

Now it is obvious to the world's eyes that the war for occupation to gain benefit for oil and to make profit for weapons business group is a clear violation of the charter of the United Nations and international law. In addition, it seems to harm Arab world as well. So Iraq was reveal and disguise supported by global community. Whereas US and UK were widely opposed even in their own country and faced a great number of internal conflict abundantly.

*Fifthly*, the just warfare fighters need to have capacity in war strategy and military tactics to deal with the power arm forces and war potentiality of invader.

This time of warfare, Iraq avoided face to face attacking, heavy weaponry attack. Merely making an ambush by light weaponry. A great number of Iraqi airplanes never appeared and a number of tanks less appeared. Only one way to protect citizen and country is allowing US and UK soldiers to enter its city earlier in order to exploit them as a shield for protecting Iraq from air force bombard attack.

The article predicts that whenever US and UK troops settle in capital city or big city, the situation in Iraq will be changed. UK and US will become

defensive instead of Iraq. Air force operating will be limited as well. Whereas Iraq will alter as an actor." Guerrilla warfare is the only chief way to attack, and suicide attack is the supporting way. With this reason, the real protracted war will start in Iraq." The article concludes.

### **(g) The cost of war in Iraq**

The article of March 20, 2003 focuses on the cost of military action against Iraq, states that the cost of war is not only budgetary costs, but also total costs.

Every country which is involved in Iraq war obligate to undertake the costs of war, both war actor countries and war victim countries as well as the battlefield countries in middle east region. In addition, the cost of war is not merely limited to budgetary costs, but it also covers the costs of economic society and political consequence, which cannot account as amount of money.

The article divides the cost of Iraq war into 3 parts. That is military costs, costs for maintaining peace and restoration in Iraq, and costs of impact on oil price and macro economic.

The huge number of military action cost does not only depend on the number of US troops operating in Iraq, but also depends on how long the war drags on. Even if Iraq is defeated in the war like Afghanistan, US still will have to pay the costs for military occupation and maintain peace in Iraq. The longer occupation, the higher costs of maintain peace in Iraq.

Moreover, during the occupation, US have to confront with the global community presence asking to restore Iraq and treat Iraqis war victims with the necessary humanistic support.

*Finally*, waging war against Iraq has affected macro economic, significant impacts on oil prices, because Middle East is the important source of oil supply in the world. The stability of price oil depends on the length of wartime. Worryingly, there is an additional fear that Saddam might explode Iraqi oilfields and neighbors' oilfields if he is at bay.

Moreover, waging war against Iraq also had negative influences on financial market and money transformation consequences. The more or less of seriousness of impact depends on the strength and prolongation of war. In the case of US, this sort of impact is expected to be fewer adversaries than as Iraq. But the overestimated fact is about psychological impact of war. Undoubtedly, the event of war created the big number of public finance expenditures leading to the recession of public finance status of country. This is the sign that the coming of post war economic recession will cause Bush loss in second term of US presidential election.

However, the costs of these estimates has not yet included the lives of solders and civil life of Iraqis, Americans, and the others on earth which cannot be estimated at all. The important thing is that President Bush selected the military action to be the way of peace establishment. It has never happened that the state of peace will be established by violence. Violence cultivates only endless violence. The basic question is that if Saddam is evil, is George Bush Junior, the same race of Saddam Hussein?

### **(h) Explanation of Jihad meaning**

The article of April 2, 2003 explains jihad as sacrifice fighting for God, it ranges from fighting to lift up one's mind, fighting against injustice, unkindness to sacrifice one's life for God.

Only senior religious leaders called "Imam" can declare Jihad and it needs to be conformed to religious principle. The person who sacrifices her/his life to protect religion and prophet are called Mujahid and it is the sacred meaning commitment.

The article argues that the presentation of western media, which named Jihad warriors as suicide attacker, does not give any understanding and knowledge at all. "Its meaning has been reduced to irrational doctrines."

### **(i) The prolonged war and Bush Administration stability**

The article of April 3, 2003 discusses the consequence of prolonged war on Bush government's stability and on the status of US public finance.

The author refers to the Asian Wall street journal, April 1, 2003, which reported that the longer the war is, the more decrease of Bush popularity.

The survey result of Pew Research Centers found that at the beginning, American government succeeded in brainwashing American people to believe that the US military power will subdue Saddam very soon. After US waging war against Iraq for not more than one week, the poll revealed that

within a few days American people reduced their trust on US government from 70 % on March 21, 2003 to 40 % March 24, 2003.

The US administration propaganda along with the media cooperation make Americans believe that the number of US soldiers dead and injured is small. Gradually, this belief was shaken when warfare still continued.”

The article presents the view that the prolonged war is not merely an impact on government stability alone, but also an impact on the public finance status of country.

Bush rejected the question of paying for a cost of war in Iraq because he has known well that the exposure of war costs will affect public opinion. His government has tried to make American understand that cost of war is lower than the real payment.

Eventually, Bush asked congress to approve a budget for war 74,700 US dollars. This budget was set for 30 days of war operation. If war still continues, the budget will increase in number. Although US can occupy Iraq, it still has to bear the expenses for maintaining peace restoration in Iraq. These expenses have not yet asked for and approved by the Congress. US administration inclines to push it into UN undertaking.”

The article sums up that if war in Iraq is long – drawn, the increase of budget for war will affect American economic system, which is still recessive.

#### **(j) The second crusade**

The article of April 4, 2003 views Iraq war as the starting point of second crusade. No matter this war will end soon or late, it is going to develop into the religious war.

It is gradually clear that the conflict between Islam and capitalism will develop into a new religion war, in other words, crusade II. The situation, which is happening, now clearly shows that Iraq war is going to develop into the war of Islam.

The article refers to Islamic media, which states that the person who initiated declaration of religion war is Bush, not Islamic World. Bush gave statement after 9/11 event saying that "we will do the long crusade" which is the sentence that has been later criticized that Bush want to subdue a Muslim countries as a whole, after Iraq then Iran.

Media in Muslim world effectively succeeded in remarking Bush wording, at least more than half of the Islamic world believes that this war is war on Islam, not war on Iraq.

Although, white house tried to reduce the level of misunderstanding among Islamic world, it seems not much effectively.

The article insists that it is believable that crusade II has to be continued, it is the war without the battlefield. It is the war with the degree of violence ranging from scolding to suicide bomb. The idea, which shape jihad movement against invaders who attack Islam and God.

It is unpredictable that the resistance in the name of jihad will continue after the end of Iraq war or not. However, the feeling of hatred has been emerged and spread wider, ready to explode anytime. Post -Iraq war will become longer burning. The article sums up.



## ISLAMIC GUIDANCE POST

*Islamic Guidance Post* is Thai language monthly newspaper. The articles studied were collected from hard copy of newspaper, which published two issues during Iraq war event, that is January-February 2003 and February-March 2003. The theme on Iraq War towards *Islamic Guidance Post* was found as the following:

- (a) American is dangerously imperialist
- (b) The Iraq War is part of Zionist plan
- (c) A background of Bush's Saddam Hatred
- (d) US as an autocrat ruler
- (e) Unmasked US: real terrorism
- (f) Anti war and condemnation of war waging

### **(a) American is dangerously imperialist**

The editorial of January – February, 2003 points out that US is the most wicked imperialist state conducting policy as the representative of some monopoly business groups in America, attempting to oppress other countries for their business interests. Their success has been well cooperated with dictator rulers in those countries. The article states:

America, the country, which has been regarded as saint 'or' world police, is now completely unmasked and being replaced with the label of terrorist, war monger or world hooligan. Its policy has run by the back up of some US business groups, cooperated with the rulers of the target countries through the mechanism of local politics, diplomatic and military.

From west to east, north to south, entire world is full of bloodstains and corpses of people who fight for their country's sovereignty. This is the evidence showing the barbarianism of warmongers and bandits who have looted the third world countries without humanity. Therefore, it could be said that American Imperialism is dangerous enemy for people in country it involves.

### **(b) The Iraq war is part of Zionist plan**

The article of January – February 2003 states that Iraq war is the operation following the plan of Jewish in America, who has supported the Israeli government and has close relationship to Bush's people such as Donald Rumsfeld and Dick Cheney.

The acting of US leader and US government as well as its allies is nothing, but just following Zionist ideology and its belief about Jewish's dream land which is mentioned in the book named 'Der Judenstat.

In fact, Bush does not have any capacity and world leader personality at all, contrarily, he is following the planning of two Jewish American groups, that is 'foundation for the defense of democracies and 'center for security policy which support and have close relationship with Likude Party of President Sharon of Israel as well as being the company of Bush and his men."

This article also points out the reasons for US's waging war against Iraq that apart from the benefit of oil resources and the extension of political and military power under the Neo-Imperialism doctrine. US has also the concealed reasons which is not mentioned in the public, that is the

dissatisfaction of using Euro currency instead of US dollar currency in Iraq in November 2001. The article notes:

Since Saddam Hussein funded the amount of 2,000 million US dollars into Euro currency, which affected the 17% decrease of US dollars value. Thus, to nip rice in the bud, US and UK put every effort to remove Saddam, otherwise, US dollars and Pound currency will confront with the depreciation problem.

At the same time, the countries in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Middle East are turning to use the currency of Euro instead of US dollars and UK's pound. This movement has shaken the position of global monetary and economic controller run by UK and US. Consequently, allies and US needed to attack Iraq to maintain their status and benefit.

The article further states that the country, which will gain benefit from Iraq war operation not less than UK and US, is Israel.

The first benefit is obtaining military and military weapons assistance from US in the amount of 4,000 million US dollars if US lead war on Iraq, in addition US plan to give loan to Israel in amount of 10,000 million US dollars to guarantee the economic stability of Israel during wartime. Clearly, what US hand over to Israel is useful to eliminate Palestinians.

The second benefit, if US invade Iraq, is that Israel will take the chance while Global community paying attention on Iraq, to more increasingly demolishes Palestinians.

The third benefit is that the attacking on Iraq will weaken the political, economic, and military stability of Arab and Muslim world, especially in Middle East region. Therefore, the instability of Muslim world will have an effect on their supporting for Palestinian's fighting against Israel.

Lastly, If US can occupy Iraq as it wishes, and establishes Iraqi government under US control, it will strengthen Zionist government as well as guarantee the security and interests protection of Israel more than present times.”

### **(c) A background of Bush's Saddam Hatred**

The article of February – March 2003 says that the idea of Washington to continuously destroy Saddam does not just occur in the period of George W. Bush, two years in position. In fact, it has excited and has been aroused to change regime in Iraq for more than 10 years by two key persons in Bush administration, that is Dick Cheney, US Vice President and Paul Wolfowitz, Deputy minister of defense.

This article gives some details about the background of both persons:

Before being appointed as minister of defense, Dick Cheney had more experiences in politics working; he was also the former head of a staff of President General Ford as well as being a friend of Bush junior for 20 years. Thus he is a person who has known how the mechanism of Washington works.

For Wolfowitz, he is tricky, was born in Jewish family, a son of mathematician. He quit academician working and enter politics work in department of control and disarm weapons. He met Cheney in the period of Reagan government.

This article states that what both of them were thinking and writing becomes the foundation policy of US in present times and their expectation was issued in the document called “Defense Plan of Pentagon for 1994-1999.” Its

purpose is to prevent emerging of rival country and to reserve US's right for pre-emptive operation through military attack to defense itself from any threats such as chemical weapons or bio weapon.

In spring of 1997, key persons in new conservative wing of Republican Party started seriously pushing forward this policy upon Iraq and these people such as Wolfowitz, Donald Rumsfeld, Dick Cheney and others have played important role in Bush government. Thus they plan " the project for the new American century" to run US to be the master of the world.

#### **(d) US as an autocrat ruler**

The article of February-March 2003 written by Vittaya Visaidrat points out that US leader is a person who conducts double standard, and the standard he holds respond to US interests only. The article says:

While Bush has been saying that Saddam is dictator and he wants to establish democrat in Iraq, he has been supporting General Musharaf of Pakistan, just because Pakistan is US base against Taliban.

US claim it as being moral but accused the others as terrorist. The fact is that US itself has behaved as world bandit by violating regulations of UN of which US itself is member.

After this, dignity of US will obviously fall down. It was eliminated by US itself. When autocrat against the rule and play the role of bandit, imagine what will happen ahead.

It seems that Bush's acting has become a rising of Saddam's appreciation in the eye view of Iraqis. Today Bush might be the hero of Americans, unpredictable; tomorrow he might become bandit for Americans and be upset in the next presidential election.

### (e) Unmasked US: real terrorism

The article of February-March, 2003, page 26 views that US is the real terrorist preferring to conduct violence to the others. It says:

If we look back through history, we will find that US committed several crimes, Red Indians, who were the origin owners of US land, were killed as if they were animals. US also waged war on the Korean peninsula, Indochina, especially in Vietnam War a million of civilian died. Recently, US also led war against Afghanistan and created a cruel situation for Afghan people. US were against these countries because it wanted to eliminate any leader who disagrees with US policy and replace the one who follows US.

So far, hooligan blood has been endless exist in body and mind of US. With this reason, Noam Chomsky, US linguistic criticizes US policy in a book "a culture of terrorism" saying that US is the source of completely terrorism breeding in the world.

In the brain of US administration team, the thought, which prevail, is waging war and being expert in violence, especially with the defenseless weaker. Moreover, this event reflects the greedy nature of US to occupy world's second huge reservoir of oil resources in Iraq. This is the tricky character of US.

#### (f) Anti war and condemnation of war waging

The column page 9 of January-February, 2003 copies the declaration of Thai Muslim group for Peace announcing anti war and condemn US's waging war to Iraq. It says:

US policy leading by George W. Bush having intention to making war against Iraq and it seems that US tries to use every mechanism of politics, economics, and military to intervene and push the pressure on international scenario to follow their demand.

Definitely, making war against Iraq causes brutal impact on a huge number of Iraqi people. If we look back at the boycott on Iraq last ten years, it has been found that Iraqis have been faced with several hardships, lack of essential items for their living. A million of innocent Iraqis children suffered and died as a result of the boycott. However, this kind of misery has not enlightened US leader at all. Contrarily, US are still warlike by accusing Iraq of having possession of chemical weapons and raise this issue to justify their attack against Iraq.

Recognizably, US was the first country which used nuclear weapons in World War II 1945 and we should not forget that in the past time, US leader was the monger who handed over those weapons to Iraq.

Seriously considering, US is the only country, which twice used nuclear weapons to massacre mankind in warfare.

US forbid Iraq to possess or produces such weapons while adversely, US commit this thing. Obviously, this is the act of hoodwink.

We, on behalf of Muslim group for peace announce to stand against war on Iraq by US and we denounce the US policy including the countries like England and Australia, which are US allies. And whenever US wages a war

in future, we suddenly will do whatever we can with all our potentials within our scope to stop war.



## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION

The study of “media and war” is based on the fact that media plays a central role from everyday life to larger social contexts. The recent events have shown that the role of media in contemporary warfare’s coverage is as seriously debated as the actual war itself.

The coverage of international conflicts tends to show the power of western media in constructing the reality of war from western viewpoint. Additionally, media often presents the warfare as a game and entertainment rather than from a brutality aspect. The media also constructs many stereotypes.

With the significance of relationship between media and war, the study examines the following issues:

- (i) The skewed nature of representation of war in the dominant media, present in chapter II.
- (ii) War and its glamorization, present in chapter III.
- (iii) Representation of the Iraq War in the Thai press, present in chapter IV.

## The skewed nature of representation of war in the dominant media

This chapter analyzes the skewed nature of media representation of war. *First*, it looks at the role of media in major international conflicts including the Rwanda crisis of 1994. The idea is to indicate the common aspects of war representation and identify the themes that emerge. The themes that appear to be constant are:

- (i) The “other” is bad
- (ii) Islam is synonymous with violence
- (iii) Men are heroes, women are victims of war

*Second*, it looks at the media representation of war in order to bring out the following:

- (i) The “absent” story and the
- (ii) Implication of this coverage

The study reports that the “absent” story contains 1) the larger context of events 2) the hidden agenda of war waging and 3) the voices of dissent. The consequence of some missing information lead to misperception of real event.

For the part of implication of war coverage, the finding involves 1) media as propaganda and 2) media as a supporter of the status quo.

## **War and its glamorization**

In this chapter, the study seeks to show how the dominant media glamorizes war and to specify some factors involved. The study finds that the coverage of warfare is the version of bloodless war. What the audience witnessed was the footage and video packaged showing the potentiality of US weapons hitting their target. War coverage was seen as a game with the help of communication technology, which brings the real time phenomena to the living room.

The study reports that the factors involved war and its glamorization are 1) military and information warfare management 2) media as business and 3) psychological aspect of being war correspondent.

The certain themes which was found out in chapter II and chapter III, I was able to formulate and put forward after a careful examination of literature in the area of media studies. In that sense these chapters can be read as a review of literature in the field. This literature includes books and journals as well as popular magazines.

## **Representation of the Iraq War in the Thai press**

In this chapter, the study looks into the Thai press that represents the Iraq War 2003. For this, I use the method of content analysis to determine the theme on Iraq War. This chapter is based on newspapers articles, editorial pages, op-ed articles and perspective columns. The newspaper articles

analyzed in this study case drawn from three newspapers. The newspaper selected are:

- (i) The Bangkok Post
- (ii) The Manager
- (iii) The Islamic Guidance Post

I chose each of these as representative of different perspectives. *Bangkok post*, the English newspaper for the elite group of society. Its articles provide both local and international perspectives on certain issues. *Manager*, most of the perspective articles decisively echo Asian voice. *Islamic Guidance Post*, the perspective articles reflect Islamic ideology.

The themes on Iraq War towards *Bangkok Post* can be categorized as the following:

- (a) The economy and war
- (b) Support to the disposal of President Saddam Hussein's regime
- (c) Support the role of UN as legitimacy international to tackle the situation
- (d) Criticism of US tendency policy towards the world
- (e) Pro US role
- (f) Support Thai government stance on Iraq War
- (g) "Myth" about attack dispelled
- (h) War on Iraq urge Al Qaeda network
- (i) Condemnation of the Iraqi program of suicide bombers

The themes on Iraq War towards *Manager* was found as the following:

- (a) Criticism of US role
- (b) Distortion of the western mass media
- (c) War and ethics
- (d) War and world dominant strategy
- (e) US and the attempt to “hoodwink” war
- (f) Iraq War will become protracted war
- (g) The cost of war in Iraq
- (h) Explanation of the meaning of the word “jihad”
- (i) The prolonged war and Bush administration stability
- (j) The second crusade

The themes on Iraq War towards “Islamic guidance Post” was found as the following:

- (a) American is dangerously imperialist
- (b) The Iraq War is part of Zionist plan
- (c) A background of Bush’s Saddam hatred
- (d) US as an autocrat ruler
- (e) Unmasked US: real terrorism
- (f) Anti war and condemnation of war waging

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### BOOKS

- Allen, Tim and Seaton, Jean (eds.) (1999) **The Media of Conflict: War Reporting and Representations of Ethnic Violence**. London: Zed Books.
- Barrat, David (1992) **Media Sociology**. London: Routledge.
- Borgatta, Edgar F. and Borgatta, Marie L. (1992) **Encyclopedia of Sociology Vol.1**. New York: Macmillan.
- Cohen, Robin and Kennedy, Paul (2000) **Global Sociology**. London: Macmillan.
- Corner, John; Schlesinger, Philip and Silverstone Roger (eds.) (1997) **International Media Research: A Critical Survey**. London: Routledge.
- Giddens, Anthony (2001) **Sociology**. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Delhi: Polity.
- Gorman, Lyn and McLean David (2003) **Media and Society in Twentieth Century: A Historical Introduction**. Malden,USA: Blackwell.
- Grossberg, Lawrence; Wartella, Ellen and Whitney, Charles D. (1998) **Media Making: Mass Media in Popular Culture**. London: Sage.
- Herman, Edward S. and McChesney, Robert W. (1998) **The Global Media: The New Missionaries of Corporate Capitalism**. India: Madhyam Books.
- Joseph, Ammu and Sharma, Kalpana (eds.) (2003) **Terror Counter-Terror: Women Speak Out**. New Delhi: Kali for women.

- Keeble, Richard (1997) **Secret State, Silent Press: New Militarism, the Gulf and the Modern Image of Warfare**. Luton: University of Luton.
- Lull, James (1995) **Media, Communication, Culture: A Global Approach**. Great Britain: Polity.
- McLaughlin, Greg (2002) **The War Correspondent**. London: Pluto Press.
- Mcquail, Dennis (1987) **Mass Communication Theory: An Introduction**. London: Sage Publication.
- Mowlana, Hamid; Gerbner, George and Schiller, Herbert I. (eds.) (1992) **Triumph of Image**. Oxford: Westview Press.
- Panitch, Leo and Leys, Colin (eds.) (2003) **Socialist Register 2002**. India: K P Bagchi&Company.
- Raboy, Marc and Dagenais Bernard (eds.) (1992) **Media, Crisis and Democracy: Mass Communication and the Disruption of Social Order**. London: Sage.
- Robertson, Roland and White, Kathleen E. (eds.) (2003) **Globalization: Critical Concepts in Sociology Vol. VI**. New York: Routledge.
- Robinson, Piers (2002) **The CNN Effect: The Myth of News, Foreign Policy and Intervention**. London: Routledge.
- Ryan, John and Wentworth, William M. (1999) **Media and Society: The Production of Culture in the Mass Media**. Boston: Allyn&Bacon.
- Sharma, R.N. and Sharma, Y.K. (2003) **The Gulf War-II 2003**. New Delhi: Shubhi Publications.
- Sorlin, Pierre (1994) **Mass Media**. London: Routledge.
- Taylor, Steve (ed.) (1999) **Sociology: Issues and Debates**. London: Macmillan Press.
- Thussu, Daya K. and Freedman Des (eds.) (2003) **War and the Media: Reporting Conflict 24/7**. New Delhi: Vistaar Publication.

Trumbull, Charles P. (ed.) (2001) *Britannica Book of The Year Events of 2001*. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica Inc.

Webb, Jen; Schirato, Tony and Danaher, Geoff (2002) *Understanding Bourdieu*. London: Sage.

Zelizer, Barbie and Allan, Stuart (eds.) (2002) *Journalism After September 11*. London: Routledge.

## JOURNALS

Columbia Journalism Review, May/June, 2003

Frontline, April 11, 2003

Frontline, April 25, 2003

Frontline, May 9, 2003

Frontline, November 21, 2003

Outlook, April 7, 2003



## INTERNET

North, David (2002) *The War against Iraq and America's Drive for World Domination*, [www.serendipity.li/wot/north01.htm](http://www.serendipity.li/wot/north01.htm), October 4

North, David (2003) *The Crisis of American Capitalism and the War against Iraq*, [www.wsws.org](http://www.wsws.org), March 21

Richard, Anne C (2003) *The Cost of War in Iraq: A Checklist*, [www.theglobalist.com](http://www.theglobalist.com), March 24

[www.fair.org](http://www.fair.org)

[www.media.guardian.co.uk](http://www.media.guardian.co.uk)

