



Calhoun: The NPS Institutional Archive
DSpace Repository

Theses and Dissertations

1. Thesis and Dissertation Collection, all items

2004-06

Live from the battlefield: an examination of
embedded war correspondents' reporting
during Operation Iraqi Freedom (21 March-14
April 2003)

Mooney, Michael J.

Monterey, California. Naval Postgraduate School

<http://hdl.handle.net/10945/1541>

This publication is a work of the U.S. Government as defined in Title 17, United States Code, Section 101. Copyright protection is not available for this work in the United States.

Downloaded from NPS Archive: Calhoun



Calhoun is the Naval Postgraduate School's public access digital repository for research materials and institutional publications created by the NPS community. Calhoun is named for Professor of Mathematics Guy K. Calhoun, NPS's first appointed -- and published -- scholarly author.

Dudley Knox Library / Naval Postgraduate School
411 Dyer Road / 1 University Circle
Monterey, California USA 93943

<http://www.nps.edu/library>



**NAVAL
POSTGRADUATE
SCHOOL**

MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

THESIS

**LIVE FROM THE BATTLEFIELD: AN EXAMINATION OF EMBEDDED
WAR CORRESPONDENTS' REPORTING DURING
OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM
(21 MARCH-14 APRIL 2003)**

By

Michael J. Mooney

June 2004

Co-Advisors:

**Alice Crawford
Gail Fann Thomas**

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE June 2004	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Master's Thesis	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE: Title (Mix case letters) Live From The Battlefield: An Examination of Embedded War Correspondents' Reporting During Operation Iraqi Freedom (21 March-14 April 2003)			5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(S) Mooney, Michael J.				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING /MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) N/A			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (maximum 200 words) During Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF), the U.S. Department of Defense instituted a program to attach civilian journalists to coalition military units. Their purpose was to report firsthand on the military campaign to topple Saddam Hussein. These "embedded journalists," as they were called, would travel, eat, sleep, and endure the same hardships and dangers of the soldiers and Marines they were accompanying. While their immediate and highly dramatic accounts offered a perspective not before seen by the news-hungry U.S. public, they also raised questions if the "embedding" process resulted in a more thematically narrow coverage of the war. This study addresses the newspaper coverage of OIF by examining the content of the embedded and non-embedded war reporting of various highly circulating U.S. newspapers. It is posited that being attached or embedded within U.S. military units resulted in the journalists producing a body of stories concerning military operations and personnel markedly different than non-embedded reporters during OIF.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Operation Iraqi Freedom, Embedded Journalists			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 185	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

**LIVE FROM THE BATTLEFIELD: AN EXAMINATION OF EMBEDDED WAR
CORRESPONDENTS' REPORTING DURING OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM
(21 MARCH-14 APRIL 2003)**

Michael J. Mooney
Major, United States Marine Corps
B.S., United States Naval Academy, 1992

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

**MASTER OF SCIENCE IN
LEADERSHIP AND HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT**

from the

**NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
June 2004**

Author:

Michael J. Mooney

Approved by:

Alice Crawford
Co-Advisor

Gail Fann Thomas
Co-Advisor

Douglas A. Brook
Dean
Graduate School of Business and Public
Policy

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ABSTRACT

During Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF), the U.S. Department of Defense instituted a program to attach civilian journalists to coalition military units. Their purpose was to report firsthand on the military campaign to topple Saddam Hussein. These "embedded journalists," as they were called, would travel, eat, sleep, and endure the same hardships and dangers of the soldiers and Marines they were accompanying. While their immediate and highly dramatic accounts offered a perspective not before seen by the news-hungry U.S. public, they also raised questions if the "embedding" process resulted in a more thematically narrow coverage of the war. This study addresses the newspaper coverage of OIF by examining the content of the embedded and non-embedded war reporting of various highly circulating U.S. newspapers. It is posited that being attached or embedded with U.S. military units resulted in the journalists producing a body of stories concerning military operations and personnel markedly different than non-embedded reporters during OIF.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
A.	INTRODUCTION	1
B.	BACKGROUND	1
C.	PURPOSE OF STUDY	6
D.	RESEARCH QUESTIONS	6
E.	SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY	7
F.	LIMITATIONS	7
G.	ORGANIZATION OF STUDY	8
II.	LITERATURE REVIEW	11
A.	INTRODUCTION	11
B.	AN HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF WAR REPORTING	12
1.	The Genesis	12
2.	Russell Sets the Standard	14
3.	The American Civil War	15
4.	The Profession Grows	18
5.	The War to End All Wars	21
6.	The Greatest Generation	24
7.	The Forgotten War	29
8.	The First Television War	31
9.	The 1980s: Total Control	38
10.	The Sidle Commission	40
11.	Operation Just Cause	41
12.	Into the Storm	42
13.	The Aftermath: A New Policy	48
14.	A Paradigm Shift: September 11, 2001	49
15.	Martin Savidge Rocks The Boat	53
16.	Operation Anaconda	54
17.	The Embedded Policy	56
18.	Operation Iraqi Freedom	62
19.	The Current Debate	66
	(a) <i>The Military Reaction: Getting Their Story Out To The Public</i>	67
	(b) <i>The Media Reaction: Access, Content, Censorship, and Objectivity</i>	69
	(c) <i>The Big Picture</i>	71
	(d) <i>Censorship and Objectivity</i>	74
C.	CHAPTER SUMMARY	76
III.	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	79
A.	INTRODUCTION	79
B.	NEWSPAPERS SELECTED FOR ANALYSIS	79
C.	REPORTERS SELECTED FOR ANALYSIS	80

D.	THE CORPUS	82
E.	ETHNOGRAPHIC CONTENT ANALYSIS	86
F.	STUDY FACTORS	88
G.	NEWS SOURCES, LEAD PARAGRAPH, AND INVERTED PYRAMID	88
H.	ANGLE, SCOPE, AND DEPTH	90
I.	EPISODIC AND THEMATIC FRAMING	91
J.	BALANCED REPORTING	93
K.	THEME DEVELOPMENT	93
L.	CHAPTER SUMMARY	94
IV.	FINDINGS	97
A.	INTRODUCTION	97
B.	FACTORS	98
1.	Factor # 1: News Sources	99
2.	Factor # 2: Lead Paragraph	102
3.	Factor # 3: Inverted Pyramid	105
4.	Factor # 4: Scope	107
5.	Factor # 5: Depth	108
6.	Factor # 6: Angle	111
7.	Factor # 7: Framing	113
8.	Factor # 8: Balanced Reporting	116
9.	Factor # 9: Theme Development	120
C.	CHAPTER SUMMARY	125
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	127
A.	INTRODUCTION	127
B.	CONCLUSIONS	128
1.	Research Question # 1	129
2.	Research Question # 2	130
3.	Research Question # 3	133
4.	Impact of Embedded Reporting	135
C.	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	139
	APPENDIX A: U.S DEPARTMENT DEFENSE MEDIA POLICY	141
	APPENDIX B: DAILY NEWS COVERAGE	157
	LIST OF REFERENCES	159
	INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	171

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	U.S. newspapers by circulation	80
Table 2.	Embedded correspondents	81
Table 3.	Non-embedded correspondents	81
Table 4.	Major news events of Operation Iraqi Freedom	83
Table 5.	News articles by source	84
Table 6.	Summary of corpus	84
Table 7.	<i>New York Times</i> Embedded reporters	84
Table 8.	<i>New York Times</i> Non-embedded reporters	84
Table 9.	<i>Los Angeles Times</i> Embedded reporters	85
Table 10.	<i>Los Angeles Times</i> Non-embedded reporters	85
Table 11.	<i>Washington Post</i> Embedded reporters	85
Table 12.	<i>Washington Post</i> Non-embedded reporters	85
Table 13.	Comparison of QCA and ECA	87
Table 14.	Study factors	98
Table 15.	Study results	129

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are many individuals who have brought me to this point in my life, and to them I would like to express my undying gratitude. I would like to thank my family, who has constantly given me the encouragement to pursue all my hopes, dreams, and endeavors. The direction they have provided has been a constant source of inspiration to me. To my fiancée, Bethany - I love you, Rocket, and could not have completed this work without your love, insight and support. Finally, my sincere thanks go to my two advisors from the Naval Postgraduate School, Alice Crawford and Gail Fann Thomas. That this thesis was able to take shape and become a reality is a testimony to their incredible ability as professional scholars to reach even the most obdurate of minds. Their guidance and trust in my path made this past year an enjoyable experience that I will not soon forget.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I. INTRODUCTION

A. INTRODUCTION

War is a force that gives us meaning...the most powerful narcotic invented by humankind is war - Pulitzer Prize winning war correspondent Chris Hedges of the *New York Times*. (Moyers, n.d.)

War has a tremendous impact on society. The accounts journalists transmit or send from the battlefield have immense power to shape our national conscience and direction. In fact, Christiane Amanpour of the Cable News Network (CNN) quips that our modern world is the "age of government-by-news-cycle." (McLaughlin, 2002)

Trained to Pavlovian-like standards, the American public has a voracious appetite for news; so much of our daily lives are driven by the never-ending news cycle. Each day, millions of people pick up a newspaper, surf the internet, and migrate to the television sets like clockwork. Information is power, and in such a serious and deadly endeavor as war, the American public demands to be in the know. There at the frontlines of conflict, where history cannot hide from their trained eye, the individual war correspondent hunts for an illusive quarry-the truth. This study explores the content of reporting of embedded and non-embedded war correspondents during our nation's latest war, Operation Iraqi Freedom.

B. BACKGROUND

September 17, 1862 was the bloodiest day in American history. On that day the Battle of Antietam was fought outside the tiny hamlet of Sharpsburg, Maryland. For twelve hours, Union and Confederate soldiers tore into each other with unparalleled savagery. When the sun finally set on

that early autumn day, over 23,000 Americans were dead, wounded, or missing in action. The armies departed, destined to fight for another two and a half years. (McPherson, 1982)

In the days immediately following the clash of the armies around Sharpsburg, professional photographer Alexander Gardner and his assistant John Gibson snapped numerous photos as they wandered around the battlefield that was still covered with the fallen soldiers. These approximately 70 pictures were the first ever taken of American war dead. A month later, in October 1862, a major exhibition of Gardner's Antietam photographs was held at Mathew Brady's New York City Gallery. (Antietam Image Gallery, n.d.) A reporter for the *New York Times* covered the exhibit for the venerable newspaper, and penned an eloquent commentary on the stunning impact these groundbreaking photographs had on the public:

As it is, the dead of the battlefield come up to us very rarely, even in dreams. We see the list in the morning paper at breakfast, but dismiss its recollection with the coffee... We recognize the battlefield as a reality, but it stands as a remote one. It is like a funeral next door... But it is very different when the hearse stops at your own door, and the corpse is carried out over your own threshold... Those who lose friends in the battle know what battlefields are... Mr. Brady has done something to bring home to us the terrible reality and earnestness of war. If he has not brought bodies and laid them in our door-yards and along streets, he has done something very like it. (Wolfe, 2003)

Long before that October day, war was always good copy for the fledgling news industry. On 17 July 1789, the Swiss journalist Gottfried Ebel provided a fascinating

account of the storming of the Bastille for his newspaper, the *Zurich Zeitung*: "One saw with amazement how on this day an almost naked and unarmed people, inflamed by boldness alone, attacked entrenched positions, armed itself with what it found, and in ten minutes conquered the first fortress of the kingdom." (Morgan, n.d.)

The news industry has matured immensely since Ebel watched the Bastille fall. Similarly, the American public's appetite for news has also grown and matured to monumental proportions. Technological improvements have vastly increased the field reporter's capability to quickly report the news to the eagerly waiting audience. To this end, newspapers dispatched journalists to the scenes of conflict to report and capture the struggle in vivid detail. The list of war correspondents, according to Evans, "trails clouds of glory:" Hemingway, Churchill, Dumas, Kipling, Steinbeck, and Conan-Doyle are but a few who have ventured out to the battlefield to report their observations to the public. (Evans, 2003) The renowned author Stephen Crane reported from Cuba during the Spanish-American War. The "Greatest Generation" of World War II had Ernie Pyle and Robert Capa, who slugged their way through Europe and across the Pacific with U.S. forces. The war in Vietnam became the first "television war," where Americans sat down at the dinner table each night to watch the latest news from the war zone. The constant stream of news reports lamenting America's quagmire in Vietnam has been credited with turning the public's stance against the war effort. This was especially true when Walter Cronkite, the highly-revered anchor for CBS news, openly stated that the war in Vietnam could not be won. (Trulock, 2003)

Perhaps soured by the outcome of that war, many believe that the U.S. Pentagon adopted a very defensive and protective posture regarding the civilian news media. For example, in Desert Shield/Desert Storm, reporters were kept away from the frontlines and placed in large groupings of journalists called "pools." To the chagrin of the reporters, the pools were monitored and escorted by military officials. (Smith, 1992)

In the wake of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, and President George W. Bush's declaration of a "global war on terrorism," the Pentagon revisited its policy concerning media access to the military. (U.S. Department of Defense 10 February 2003 Public Affairs Guidance (ASDPAG), 2003) Recognizing that it was necessary to obtain public and world support for "The War on Terror," as well as the enormous impact pictures and stories directly from the battlefield (like Gardner's 1862 photographs) have in shaping public opinion, the Pentagon knew that they could not repeat the media mistakes of the first Gulf War. Necessity is indeed the mother of invention and out of this need was born the concept of "embedded" media.

Experimented with on a limited basis during the fighting in Afghanistan in 2002, the decision was made by the Pentagon to attach, or "embed," civilian journalists to coalition military units should war with Iraq come to fruition. The policy of embedding news media (Appendix A: Department of Defense Media Policy), as stated in an unclassified 10 February 2003 message from the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, was as follows:

The Department of Defense (DOD) policy on media coverage of future military operations is that media will have long-term, minimally restrictive access to U.S. air, ground and naval forces through embedding. Media coverage of any future operation will, to a large extent, shape public perception of the national security environment now and in the years ahead. This holds true for the U.S. public; the public in Allied countries whose opinion can affect the durability of our coalition; and publics in countries where we conduct operations, whose perceptions of us can affect the cost and duration of our involvement.

Our ultimate strategic success in bringing peace and security to this region [the Middle East] will come in our long-term commitment to supporting our democratic ideals. We need to tell the factual story - good or bad - before others seed the media with disinformation and distortions, as they most certainly will continue to do. Our people in the field need to tell our story - only commanders can ensure the media get to the story alongside the troops. We must organize for and facilitate access of national and international media to our forces, including those forces engaged in ground operations, with the goal of doing so right from the start. To accomplish this, we will embed media with our units. These embedded media will live, work and travel as part of the units with which they are embedded to facilitate maximum, in-depth coverage of U.S. forces in combat and related operations. (ASDPAG, 2003)

In accordance with this policy, U.S. and United Kingdom (U.K.) forces crossed the line of departure into Iraq during the late evening hours of 20 March 2003, commencing Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF), fully outfitted with a full complement of embedded war correspondents. Their mandate was to report firsthand on the military campaign to topple Saddam Hussein, and to "tell the factual story - good or bad..." (ASDPAG, 2003)

Forty days later, when President George W. Bush declared an end to major combat operations on 01 May 2003, the American public and the world community were sharply divided over the concept and performance of the embedded media. While many praised the raw strength, power, and honesty of the frontline reporting, others claimed that the embedded policy was a mere subterfuge to exert control over the media to ensure that only the U.S. government's approved version of the war was reported. (Schechter, 2003)

C. PURPOSE OF STUDY

While the embedded war correspondents' immediate and highly dramatic accounts offered a perspective on war not before seen by the news-hungry U.S. public, they also raised questions if the "embedding" process resulted in a more thematically narrow and perhaps biased coverage of the war than seen previously. This study addresses the newspaper coverage of Operation Iraqi Freedom by examining the content of the war reporting of various highly circulating U.S. newspapers. It is posited that being attached-embedded-to military units resulted in the journalists producing a body of stories concerning military operations and personnel markedly different than non-embedded reporters during Operation Iraqi Freedom.

D. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The following research questions provide the framework for the examination of the embedded and non-embedded journalists' reporting during Operation Iraqi Freedom: (1) How did embedded journalists affect the content of U.S. news reporting of Operation Iraqi Freedom? (2) Was the reporting of the embedded and non-embedded journalists balanced? (3) Were the critics' accusations of "soda straw"

reporting justified? Or in other words, is the embedded corpus narrower in scope and depth than the non-embedded corpus?

E. SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

This study examines the content of embedded and non-embedded reporting during Operation Iraqi Freedom. The scope will include an historical overview of war reporting, a review of DoD media policy past and present, and a comprehensive review of literature concerning the embedded media in Operation Iraqi Freedom. The study contains a systematic examination of selected embedded and non-embedded news reports of major national newspapers. The stories will be selected from eight days of news reporting covering the period of March 21, 2003 to April 14, 2003. Ethnographic content analysis will be used to determine the particular content of the embedded and non-embedded reporting.

F. LIMITATIONS

A limitation of this study is the number of actual embedded war correspondents whose reporting is examined. While the total number of officially accredited embedded journalists fluctuated during the war, a list obtained from the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs (ASD-PA) dated 21 February 2003 claims 671 embeds assigned to U.S. units. While this study concentrates only on journalists affiliated with the three of the five top circulating newspapers in the United States, these were but a fraction of the total number of embedded media. There were great numbers of reporters from other major newspapers, news magazines, and local or regional newspapers also embedded with the U.S. forces. Their stories and reporting were just as riveting and

professional as those working for the larger national newspaper organizations.

Reporters of many nationalities - British, Italian, and Jordanian to name but a few - were also part of the embedded journalistic corps filing for their respective national newspapers. This study focuses solely on American embedded reporters traveling with U.S. forces and filing for American newspapers. To keep the study focused and control for possible bias, only American newspapers and American reporters are examined.

Finally, this study does not take into account the large numbers of television and cable news reporters who were embedded. Their reporting perhaps had a more pronounced influence on the American public's comprehension of the conflict due to the ability to transmit pictures live from the scene. However, this study only examines the print journalism of the embedded reporters to take advantage of the many databases available, allowing unlimited access to the hundreds of stories filed during the study time period.

G. ORGANIZATION OF STUDY

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter II provides an historical overview of war reporting, the 2003 U.S. Department of Defense media policy that established the embedded media program utilized during Operation Iraqi Freedom, and the current debate over embedded media.

Chapter III discusses the newspapers and reporters that were selected for this study and also addresses the methodology used to analyze the content of the embedded and non-embedded reporters' stories. Chapter IV examines the

actual content of the embedded and non-embedded reporters' stories revealed by the analysis, while Chapter V provides conclusions and recommendations for further research into this topic.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. INTRODUCTION

Now to every army and almost every general a newspaper reporter goes along, filling up our transports, swelling our trains, reporting on our progress, guessing at places, inciting jealousy and discontent, and doing infinite mischief - Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman (Knightley, 1975)

At the dawn of the 20th century, a young journalist reporting for the London-based newspaper the *Morning Post* described the impact the war correspondent can have on man and the course of history by simply reporting the truth. "Ah, horrible war," he stated, "amazing medley of the glorious and the squalid, the pitiful and the sublime, if modern men of light and leading saw your face closer, simple folk would see it hardly ever." (Gilbert, 1994) The journalist, reflecting on his observations of the Boer War, was none other than the future prime minister of England, Winston Churchill. Without question, the drama of war demands eyewitnesses such as Churchill. For beyond the actual belligerents' personal histories, war correspondents are "the eyes of history." (Evans, 2003)

As mentioned previously, the war correspondent hunts an illusive quarry—the truth. Many would argue that the truth couldn't survive the slings and blades of war. Almost 2500 years ago, Aeschylus, the father of Greek tragedy penned a rather pessimistic answer to this question. "In war," he wrote, "truth is the first casualty." Unfortunately, from the Crimea to the Spanish-American War to Operation Desert Storm, many would believe this to be an undisputable fact. During the Second World War, an older and more experienced Winston Churchill

bluntly stated, "In wartime, truth is so precious that she should be attended by a bodyguard of lies." (Evans, 2003) Therein lay the paradox that plagues all war correspondents: "The essence of successful warfare is secrecy; the essence of successful journalism is publicity." (Evans, 2003) Into this fray steps the very same war correspondent: the public's advocate, faced by these competing desires. What the war correspondent ultimately attempts to achieve is a balance between the hunt for the truth, the need for operational security, and the public demand for news. Hopefully, the end result is a timely, objective account that keeps the public informed while not compromising the safety of the fighting men in harm's way.

B. AN HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF WAR REPORTING

1. The Genesis

The concept of a trained newspaper journalist, dedicated to reporting on battles and military campaigns, truly came into being during the Crimea War (1853-55). That does not mean that armies were devoid of correspondents reporting on their actions in field prior to this time. Of note is the *London Times*, which employed Henry Crabb Robinson. Robinson reported on fighting along the Elbe River in 1807 and Corunna in 1808 during the Napoleonic Wars. Charles Lewis Guneiso covered the Spanish Civil War (1835-7) for the *Morning Post* of London. (Young and Jesser, 1997)

Not to be outdone by their former masters, the fledgling American press also attempted to bring firsthand accounts from the battlefield to the reading public. James M. Bradford wrote letters to his hometown newspaper during

the War of 1812 describing the American army's operations. What made Bradford unique was that he was in fact the editor of the *Orleans Gazette*, and had actually enlisted in the army to fight for his fledgling country. Bradford's proximity to the action and his professional training as a journalist perhaps makes him America's first war correspondent. (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) George Wilkins Kendall, a reporter from the *Picayune* of New Orleans, rode into battle with Texas Rangers as both a journalist and soldier during the Mexican War in 1846. (McLaughlin, 2002) The intrepid reporter ended up capturing a Mexican flag during fighting on the Rio Grande. (Morgan, 2003) To this day, war correspondents often find themselves unwilling participants in combat. However, men like Bradford and Kendall, the journalist/soldier were the exception rather than the rule during the formative stages of war reporting.

The most common method many newspapers employed was to temporarily hire active duty officers serving within the army to keep them abreast of the latest developments of the campaign. They would do this via letters back to an editor at the home newspaper. An example of this is Lieutenant Charles Naysmith, an artillery officer in the British Army, who wrote detailed letters describing the action in the Crimea for the *London Times*. Unfortunately, Naysmith's duties as a soldier or poor work ethic prevented him writing as frequently to his editors as they desired. "I wish you would impress upon Naysmith with all your eloquence," a clearly perturbed *Times* executive chastised an editor, "the absolute necessity of writing as often as he can and sending letters without delay." (Knightley,

1975) One can imagine the frustration of editors and publishers who were solely dependant on such a haphazard system for their information. Harold Evans, who was awarded a knighthood in 2003 by Queen Elizabeth II for his contributions to the field of journalism, believes that one of the most pressing demands that helped to precipitate the establishment of the full-time, professional war correspondent was timeliness. (Evans, 2003) In light of this, several London newspapers sent dedicated correspondents to the Crimea to ensure that they got timely and accurate reporting. The most renown of these reporters was William Howard Russell.

2. Russell Sets the Standard

"Billy" Russell is widely considered to be the first truly professional war correspondent. In retrospect, Russell stated that he was the "miserable parent of a luckless tribe." (McLaughlin, 2002) His epitaph in St. Paul's Cathedral in London simply declares Russell to be "the first and greatest" war correspondent. (Knightley, 1975) Indeed, Russell's ground breaking reporting set the standard for generations of war correspondents that followed him. His objective, blunt accounts were shocking to a relatively ignorant reading audience and "considerably closer to the truth than anything the public had been previously permitted to learn." (Knightley, 1975) Although his candid reports may have stretched the bounds of operational security, many believe that his exposure of the carnage and horrible conditions experienced by the British Army greatly influenced policy within the government. He was witness to the folly of the Light Brigade's famous charge against the Russian guns at Balaclava, and later reported that the "army has melted

away almost to a drop of miserable, washed-out, worn-out spiritless wretches...[it is] to all intents and purposes, with the exception of a very few regiments, used up, destroyed and ruined..." (Knightley, 1975) His goal was "the truth, and the belief that society can only hope to be just and healthy if it is blessed with an independent and critical and courageous press." (Hankinson, 1982)

3. The American Civil War

The framework that Russell proved for his colleagues was put into practice almost immediately during the next great conflict to arise - the American Civil War. The American Civil War was to be the first large-scale employment of war correspondents by the newspaper industry, both for the North, and the South, as well as several foreign newspapers. Russell himself traveled to America to cover the war, but soon returned to England due to personal and professional problems with his editor. (McLaughlin, 2002)

With the nation undergoing such a trauma in which virtually every family was somehow affected, it was quite natural that the newspapers—both Union and Confederate—would strive to fill the public appetite for news about the battles and campaigns. War was big business for the newspaper industry. A paper could expect to sell thousands more than its normal circulation (in some cases five times more) when major battles filled their headlines. (Knightley, 1975) The *New York Herald* fielded 63 reporters to cover the fighting. (Morgan, 2003) Unfortunately, this enthusiasm for news flooded the industry with "correspondents more fit to drive cattle than to write for newspapers." (Knightley, 1975)

Into Russell's wake flowed a rather unremarkable group of journalists who were "ignorant, dishonest, and unethical." (Knightley, 1975) The average correspondent was "poorly paid, and employed by demanding and unscrupulous editors who wanted news at any price." (Young and Jesser, 1997) Objectivity was not yet a "guiding ethic" of the war correspondent (McLaughlin, 2002), and the overwhelming tendency to favorably slant news made the correspondent "a propagandist for the army he was covering." (Morgan, 2003) Just as ignored was the concept of operational security. Often, orders of battle and other military information were published for all to read. This combination made the war correspondent universally distrusted by the military, according to the photographer Mathew Brady. (Young and Jesser, 1997)

Yet another result of this distrust was increased censorship. The Union War Department actually issued what was known as the "57th War Article," which stated that journalists could be court-martialed if they revealed sensitive military information in their reporting. (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) The thoughts of two Union generals about the war correspondent speak volumes concerning to as how they were viewed as the war progressed. The first is from Irvin McDowell, penned before the First Battle of Bull Run in 1861:

I have made arrangements for the correspondents to take the field...and I have suggested to them that they should wear a white uniform to indicate the purity of their character. (Knightley, 1975)

Compare this to William Tecumseh Sherman, the man who burned Atlanta in 1864 and cut a sixty-mile swath of

destruction across Georgia during his famed "March to the Sea:"

I hate newspapermen. They come into camp and pick up their camp rumors and print them as facts. I regard them as spies, which, in truth they are. If I killed them all there would be news from Hell before breakfast. (Newseum, n.d.)

In fact, Sherman harbored such a distrust of the press that he believed that during war they should have no rights, and that there was a direct correlation between censorship and victory: the greater the censorship, the higher the probability of victory. (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995)

The American Civil War had a profound effect on the news industry despite the poor performance of the field reporters. However, author Phillip Knightley (1975), in his definitive study of the war correspondent, *The First Casualty*, makes it clear that there were "good correspondents" such as H. Whitelaw Reid of the *Cincinnati Gazette*, Charles Coffin of the *Boston Journal*, and George Smalley of the *New York Tribune*, to name but a few. (Knightley, 1975) On the positive side, the Associated Press (AP), where pooling the resources of multiple reporters to achieve greatest coverage, came into being during the Civil War. (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) One of the biggest impacts was the "formalization of patterns of censorship and indirect political and military control" of the press. (Young and Jesser, 1997)

This initial sour experience of the competing needs between the military and press during wartime have proved to be a bellwether for all the wars to follow. "Soldiers wanted to avoid disclosure of sensitive information and

objected to criticism of their performance," says author Loren B. Thompson (1991). "Journalists wanted unrestricted access to military information and the ability to use it in whatever manner they saw fit." (Thompson, 1991) Regardless of the problems, probably the greatest achievement of the Civil War experience for the news industry was to establish war correspondence as a specialized discipline within journalism. (Knightley, 1975) A new breed of reporter was emerging; aggressive and prepared to go into harm's way to get the story. And all they needed, according to Knightley, was "bigger and better wars." (Knightley, 1975)

4. The Profession Grows

The period between the end of the American Civil War and the beginning of World War I is nostalgically referred to as the "Golden Age" of the war correspondent. (Knightley, 1975) The technologies that came into being during the Civil War (such as the telegraph and crude photography) were now being augmented by the arrival of better cable communications, more advanced photographic techniques, and, eventually, cinematography. This made for faster reporting, but also created more friction between the military and the press concerning operational security.

The individual war correspondent continued to develop and become an established part of the news industry. Newspapers touted their correspondents by name in the byline instead of the innocuous "from our own correspondent." (Knightley, 1975) Society, which was becoming more and more literate, continued the love affair with the press that blossomed in the 1860s. The news industry, realizing that wars made good copy and increased circulation, fully embraced the war correspondent. As a

result, "no conflagration went unreported" during this period. (Morgan, 2003)

The greatest news events for American war correspondents during the "Golden Age" were the Indian Wars on the western frontier of the United States and the Spanish-American War of 1898. While European journalists honed their craft during the many wars fought on the continent and Africa, American journalists awaited action worthy of reporting. Of note is the presence of an AP reporter, Mark Kellogg, riding into fame with Lieutenant Colonel George Armstrong Custer and the 7th U.S. Cavalry at Little Big Horn on 26 June 1876. (Morgan, 2003) Kellogg's last dispatch, written on 25 June 1876, calmly states that, "by the time this reaches you we will have met and fought the red devils with what result remains to be seen. I go with Custer and will be at the death." (Evans, 2003)

The outbreak of the Spanish-American War in 1898 was cause for celebration among the highly competitive news industry. Unfortunately, the jingoistic enthusiasm of the press once again tainted the reporting, giving birth to the "yellow journalism" so often attributed to this period. (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) As a molder of public opinion, the newspaper was extremely effective. Abraham Lincoln was convinced that newspapers were crucial to maintaining popular support during wartime. (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) William Randolph Hearst, publisher of the *New York Journal*, also appreciated the power of the press and the boon it would be for his paper should the United States go to war with Spain. To that end he did his best to "deliberately incite war fever" (Morgan, 2003) and "inflame public opinion" (Knightley, 1975) about Spanish

atrocities to create popular support for a war with Spain. His incredible display of journalistic manipulation is illustrated by the infamous exchange of messages with his artist on scene before the war, Frederic Remington:

Remington: EVERYTHING IS QUIET. THERE IS NO TROUBLE HERE. THERE WILL BE NO WAR. I WISH TO RETURN.

Hearst: PLEASE REMAIN. YOU FURNISH PICTURES. I WILL FURNISH WAR. (Knightley, 1975)

The unexplained explosion and sinking of the USS MAINE in Havana harbor provided Hearst the event he needed to spin the United States into war. Hearst's unsubstantiated accusations of the "enemy's secret infernal machine" created a ground rush of war support, which propelled the nation into war. (Knightley, 1975) Thus, the Spanish-American War was the first media-driven war. (Morgan, 2003)

The most celebrated war correspondent of the conflict was Stephen Crane. The author of *The Red Badge of Courage*, Crane initially reported for Hearst and the *Journal* prior to the war, but left the paper for the *New York World* once war was declared. (Knightley, 1975) In this capacity with the *World*, he covered Theodore Roosevelt and the Rough Riders charge up Kettle Hill in the face of Spanish guns, and later, "saunters off in a khaki suit and slouch hat and captures a town himself." (Evans, 2003) Crane personified the murky line between reporter and soldier, as did the other correspondent best remembered for the Spanish American War, James Creelman. (Knightley, 1975) Creelman, who worked for the *Journal*, actually led a bayonet charge during the fighting in Cuba. (Morgan, 2003)

The influence that the newspaper industry can have on policy and public opinion is perhaps the lasting lesson of the war. Competing newspapers, greed, and a manipulative, disingenuous reporting "marked a moral low point in the coverage of conflicts by the American press." (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995)

5. The War to End All Wars

The experience of the American war correspondent during World War I can be divided into two phases: pre and post April 6, 1917—the date that the United States declared war on the Central Powers. From August 1914 when war erupted on the Continent, until America entered the bloodletting of the Western Front, American war correspondents remained relatively neutral in their reporting of the conflict. This was especially true during the opening months of the war, when tales of German atrocities were rampant in French and British newspapers. Five noted American correspondents actually accompanied the German Army for two weeks during this period and reported that they did not observe the countless atrocities that emblazoned headlines of the Anglo-French press. (Knightley, 1975) On both sides, news reports minimized the carnage and attempted to demonize the enemy. (Young and Jesser, 1997)

With the neutrality of the United States hanging in the balance, both sides targeted the American public through an aggressive propaganda campaign to encourage continued neutrality or intervention. So complete and effective were the British efforts to bring America into the war on their side that they "penetrated every phase of American life, from the pulpit to the classroom, from the

factory to the office. It was one of the major propaganda efforts of history, and it was conducted so well and so secretly that little about it emerged until the eve of the Second World War..." (Knightley, 1975) The German newspapers "were beaten hands down by a media campaign organized by the British Secret Service." (Young and Jesser, 1997)

This is an important fact because of the influence that this had on the prism through which American war correspondents viewed the conflict. It virtually guaranteed that, "in American newspapers the war would be seen as if through British eyes." (Knightley, 1975) With war fever in full pitch, U.S. President Woodrow Wilson, who vowed to make the world safe for democracy, created the Committee on Public Information (CPI) to "inspire the nation to fight" (Knightley, 1975), organize press operations that, "fed information to the news media," (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995), and let loose a "barrage of propaganda on the American public [that] cannot be overemphasized." (Knightley, 1975) Under the guise of patriotism, and forcing correspondents to work under draconian guidelines, the CPI imposed a subtle but effective brand of censorship on the war correspondent. In effect, the CPI, headed by George Creel, "combined the efforts of propagandist and censor." (Knightley, 1975)

To simply say that the rules were strict is an understatement. "To report on the war, each correspondent had to be certified as an accredited or visiting correspondent." (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) This entailed appearing before the Secretary of War (or designated representative) and swearing an oath to "convey

the truth to the people of the United States," (Knightley, 1975) and not print "advance reports about troop strengths, troop and ship movements, anti-aircraft defenses and harbor defenses." (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) The correspondent's newspaper was required to put up a \$10,000 bond to "ensure that he would comport himself 'as a gentleman of the Press.'" (Knightley, 1975) Two major pieces of legislation passed by Congress reinforced the CPI's stranglehold on the press. The Espionage Act of 1917 "prohibited the publication of any information that could even remotely be considered to offer aid to the enemy," (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) while the Sedition Act of 1918, "was used to justify censorship." (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) Taken together, "these Acts were catch-all legislation used to control the press with impunity." (McLaughlin, 2002)

"Flamboyant, energetic news seekers," is how the correspondents were described. (Knightley, 1975) However, their attempts to shed light on the slaughter of the Western Front were largely stymied by censorship. Correspondents such as Floyd Gibbons of the *Chicago Tribune*, who accompanied the Marines in Belleau Wood (and lost an eye and a piece of his shoulder for his pains), was one of the most renown reporters of the war. His reports of the fighting only made it past the censor because it was rumored that his wound was fatal and released as a tribute to his memory. Gibbons survived, and his black eye patch became his trademark. (Gibbons, 1918) American soldiers constantly mobbed Irvin Cobb of the *Saturday Evening Post*, probably the most popular and widely read correspondent, whenever he made an appearance at the frontlines.

(Knightley, 1975) And *Collier's Weekly's* Jimmy Hopper, moving forward with U.S. soldiers near Cantigny, was mistaken by a group of Germans as an American officer, who promptly surrendered to him. (Knightley, 1975) Herbert Bayard Swope's inside coverage of the war from the German side prior to America's entry into the war won a Pulitzer Prize in 1917—the ever first awarded for reporting. (Lande, 1996) Overall, reporting was characterized by constant exaggerations of success, the downplaying of casualties, and little appreciation for the horror of fighting “eye deep in hell.” Censorship was the overriding lesson: “subservience among reporters to the military [censor], and, as a result, public ignorance at the home front.” (McLaughlin, 2002)

6. The Greatest Generation

The lessons learned by correspondents during the First World War had a lasting effect on the reporters who covered the war fought by the men now known as, “The Greatest Generation.” (Brokaw, 1996) Concurrently, the government was also keenly aware of the important role the war correspondent and newspapers played in shaping public opinion. “Public opinion,” said Supreme Allied Commander General Dwight D. Eisenhower “wins war.” (Knightley, 1975) This was the prevailing sentiment within the U.S. government and military leadership as 1940 turned to 1941 and it became increasingly apparent that the United States would be involved in the war before long. With war on the horizon, “news management was a vital part of [the United States'] overall strategy.” (McLaughlin, 2002)

War came to the United States on 07 December 1941. To a degree not seen since the Civil War, and definitely

beyond America's involvement in the First World War, the entire nation was at war. Every facet of society was touched by the war—from the 16.4 million men and women who served in the Armed Forces, to the thousands upon thousands of factory workers who supplied those 16.4 million men and women with the equipment to win the war. (Lande, 1996) With the stark reality of the battleships USS Arizona, Oklahoma, California, Nevada, and West Virginia resting on the bottom of Pearl Harbor, the American war correspondent "became another cog in the massive military machine the Americans constructed," to defeat Germany and Japan. (Knightley, 1975)

It is important to recognize the constraints under which the newspaper industry and war correspondent operated. Just as the CPI controlled the information released to the public in the First World War, the Office of War Information and the Office of Censorship were created in 1942 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt to do the same. (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) The Office of War Information was, "the medium for publicizing the American war effort at home and abroad," whose goal was to ensure that the world was "given the impression that a just and perfect America was well on the way to a swift and total victory." (Knightley, 1975) The Office of Censorship dealt with "censorship of all civilian modes of communication," which included telegrams, radio, films, and newspapers. (Knightley, 1975) Of course, operational security was of utmost importance, with terms such as "loose lips sink ships" becoming the catch phrase for efforts to keep vital military information from carelessly falling into enemy hands. To that end, press codes listed in detail the

matters forbidden to be reported upon. These included, "location, movements and identity of units, ships, and aircraft; war production and supplies; weather forecasts and temperatures in major [U.S.] cities; casualties, and even locations of archives and art treasures." (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995)

In addition to the larger governmental censorship and information programs, the military also employed its own censors who had the authority to "curb the release of news about their combat activities that was deemed to be potentially harmful to their fighting effectiveness." (Voss, 1994) The military censors were "overworked men in a desperate war," that used the following simple criterion for determining if a certain bit of news should be made public: Is it a good thing for the army or navy if this information is made public? (Knightley, 1975) Combined, the goal of the government programs and military censors could be reduced to two simple statements: positively influencing public opinion and maintaining operational security.

Hundreds of reporters followed the Allied armies around the globe as they battled against the Axis powers. Like the First World War, the military used accreditation to maintain positive control of which reporters were granted access to the fighting. For example, there were 558 accredited correspondents covering the Allied invasion of Normandy on 06 June 1944. (Evans, 2003) Each correspondent was required to have a U.S. passport as well as an official press pass from the War Department. So armed, the reporters were grouped together in official "press camps" near the front lines that catered to their

administrative needs as well as gathering point for briefings and meetings. (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) Each camp was assigned 50 accredited correspondents. (Wagner, 1989) Reporters wore military uniforms without rank insignia, (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) and were administered the equivalent privileges of a major or lieutenant commander. (Harris, n.d.) In fact, Eisenhower considered war correspondents to be "quasi staff officers," and reminded them that as such, "your first duty is a military duty, and the one fact which you must bear in mind is to disclose nothing which would help the enemy." (Young and Jesser, 1997)

As in previous wars, the news industry was not altogether happy with complying with the restriction imposed by the military and the government. However, "war correspondents went along with the general scheme for reporting the war because they were convinced that it was in the national interest to do so." (Knightley, 1975) The reporters' willingness to see themselves as part of the overall war effort was widespread. (Young and Jesser, 1997) The more well-known correspondents have become thoroughly integrated with the history of the conflict: Edward R. Murrow, reporting on the Britain's "finest hour" as German bombs rained down on London in 1940; Ernie Pyle, the first soldier's advocate, who told the story of the common infantryman's everyday travails with mud, cold, poor rations, and death; and Ernest Hemingway, riding back into his beloved Paris at the head of a band of Resistance Fighters - a day ahead of the American Army. (Knightley, 1975, Morgan, 2003)

Confronted as they were with censorship and the patriotic urge to support their country's cause during the greatest conflict the world had ever seen, the performance of the correspondents during World War II is a matter of opinion, perhaps best explained when taken in context of the period. Many reporters believed they were tied to something bigger than just their newspaper. The comments of Canadian war correspondent Ross Munro speak for many of his generation:

I was committed to the war completely and utterly, right from the start. I don't think young people today could ever feel the commitment that we had. Maybe it was jingoism, chauvinism, and stupidity, but we felt the Germans were going to wreck this world of ours and that we would have to stop them. The troops were committed to it and I think the correspondents were—I certainly was. But it won't happen again. The war we were in was very clear-cut. It really was a crusade. (Knightley, 1975)

The author John Steinbeck, himself a correspondent for the *New York Herald Tribune*, wrote:

We were all part of the war effort. We went along with it, and not only that, we abetted it. Gradually it became a part of us that the truth about anything was automatically secret and that to trifle with it was to interfere with the war effort. By this I don't mean that the correspondents were liars. They were not...It is in the things not mentioned that the truth lies... Yes, we wrote only a part of the war but at the time we believed, fervently believed, that it was the best thing to do. And perhaps that is why, when the war was over, novels and stories by ex-soldiers, like "The Naked and the Dead" proved so shocking to a public which had been carefully protected from contact with the crazy, hysterical mess. (Steinbeck, 1959)

Others became disillusioned with the paradox between the charge to seek the truth, emotionlessly reporting on the suffering, remaining patriotic, and supporting the war effort. Robert St. John of the AP wrote that, "[W]e were all just leeches, reporters trying to suck headlines out of all this death and suffering." (Knightley, 1975) More critical was war correspondent Charles Lynch who plainly stated that it was:

...humiliating to look back at what we wrote during the war. It was crap-and I don't exclude the Ernie Pyles [or other celebrated correspondents]...We were a propaganda arm of our governments. At the start the censors enforced that, but by the end, we were our own censors. We were cheerleaders. I suppose there wasn't an alternative at the time. It was total war. But, for God's sake, let's not glorify our role. It wasn't journalism. It wasn't journalism at all. (Young and Jesser, 1997)

7. The Forgotten War

The war in Korea—or more appropriately, the police action in Korea—was “the worst reported war of modern times.” (Royle, 1989) Only five years after the United States' victory in World War II, the American military (and American press) found themselves on foreign shores engaged in combat operations. Following the North Korean invasion of 25 June 1950, American forces, as part of a larger United Nations force, rushed to the Korean peninsula to stem the communist juggernaut as it drove deep into South Korea. The scene witnessed by the first war correspondents arriving was one of utter confusion: fleeing civilians, routed South Korean and American forces, all retreating south before the North Korean forces.

At the beginning of the war, there was no press censorship as experienced by the correspondents following the bombing of Pearl Harbor by the Japanese, only a "voluntary code of war reporting aimed at preserving military secrecy..." (Knightley, 1975) The stories coming from the correspondents echoed this hands-off approach. They wrote of beaten and under-equipped soldiers fleeing before the enemy, poor leadership, and lost opportunities. Marguerite Higgins of the New York Herald Tribune quoted a demoralized U.S. Army lieutenant who asked her, "Are you correspondents telling the people back home the truth? Are you telling them out of one platoon of twenty men, we have three left? Are you telling them that we have nothing to fight with, and that it is an utterly useless war?" (Higgins, 1951) Such candid reporting of the war effort as witnessed during the opening months of the Korean War was unheard of during World War II. The stories of disorganized retreats, poor morale, and lack of equipment quickly were branded by the military as unpatriotic, which labeled the reporters as traitors, and of "giving aid and comfort to the enemy." (Knightley, 1975)

In an effort to stem the public criticism that they believed had its roots in the blunt reporting of the war, the military quickly imposed bans on the press. General Douglas MacArthur, Commander of United Nations forces in Korea took steps personally to remind the correspondents of their "important responsibility in the matter of psychological warfare." (Knightley, 1975) The voluntary code of war reporting caused confusion among the reporters because they did not have a firm grasp of what they should or should not report. Eventually, the Department of

Defense imposed a system of censorship similar to that practiced during World War II. Censors checked reporters' stories to ensure that things such as "food shortages, panics, inferior U.S. equipment or the rampant corruption of the South Korean government" were not put into print. (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) The restrictions on the press "went well beyond military or operational security." (Young and Jesser, 1997) Derogatory comments concerning troops or commanders were also forbidden. All of this was "backed up by an informal 'get on the team' attitude which appeared to find a ready response among proprietors and editors." (Young and Jesser, 1997)

In examining the correspondents' work during this conflict, despite showing physical courage on the battlefield, they "failed to show equal moral courage in questioning what the war was all about." (Knightley, 1975) For the war correspondent, "Korea was the link, the indeterminate end of one era and the beginning of another." (Young and Jesser, 1997) The nature of the war—and the peace—set the stage for the next test of the war correspondent: Vietnam.

8. The First Television War

The Vietnam War marked "both a high point and a low point in the relationship between the military and the media," (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) and has had an immense impact on how the military viewed war correspondents and the media in general for many years. Apart from the bloodshed on the battlefield, the one enduring legacy born of the Vietnam War (in regards to the media) was an almost visceral distrust between the U.S. military for the news media. Known as the "Vietnam Syndrome," this belief

basically revolves around the contention that the press was openly opposed to the war and that their negative reporting turned public opinion in the United States, ultimately costing America the war. (McLaughlin, 2002) "A popular argument is that the media were directly responsible for the loss of political and military will to continue the war in Vietnam." (Young and Jesser, 1997) "Television brought death into people's living rooms every day," and "was a major factor in fuelling the anti-war movement ...making Vietnam America's least popular war." (Swain, 2004) President Richard M. Nixon quipped that the war in Vietnam "was the first in our history during which our media were more friendly to our enemies than our allies." (Evans, 2003)

This legacy of distrust was the low point of the media/military relationship. The high point was that although the military was fully aware of the negative reporting, they did not impose censorship to restrict the press as they had in previous conflicts. (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) Censorship as it existed was voluntary based on "guidelines covering some 15 areas concerning troop movements, equipment, and locations." (Young and Jesser, 1997) General William C. Westmoreland, Commanding General of U.S. forces in Vietnam, opted for this policy because "he trusted the goodwill of the American correspondents reporting the war." (Matthews, 1991) However, in place of censorship, the military "mounted a public relations campaign, under highly professional direction, to get over its version of the war." (Knightley, 1975)

The strategy was two-fold: appeal to the natural patriotism of the press corps to support the war effort against Communism and saturate the media with "official" daily reports, briefings, and updates on the progress of the war. Hopefully, the war correspondents would be kept somewhat in check and be less prone to report more negative stories and events. "Anyone who questioned any aspect of official policy was at best a "liberal," and at worst a "communist." (McLaughlin, 2002) An example of this mindset is demonstrated by a question leveled at AP reporter Malcolm Browne during a press conference in Saigon by Admiral Harry P. Felt: "Why don't you get on the team?" (Knightley, 1975) Vice President Hubert Humphrey, addressing correspondents in November 1967 told them that, "[W]hen you speak to the American people give the benefit of the doubt to our side...We're in this together." (Aronson, 1970)

"Westmoreland supplemented his voluntary [censorship] guidelines with a program that attempted to keep the press informed by providing regular background briefings for selected correspondents, 24-hour consultation services by knowledgeable public affairs officers, [and] daily press conferences..." (Matthews, 1991) This mechanism that the military used to keep the journalists up to date on the military operations within Vietnam was called the Joint United States Public Affairs Office (JUSPAO), which was "manned by 'professional' briefers backed up with a formidable array of slides, backdrops and other visual aids." (Young and Jesser, 1997) Unfortunately, "[T]he only thing missing was the truth. (Young and Jesser, 1997) Located in Saigon, the JUSPAO conducted daily briefs of the

day's operations, which quickly became known among the journalists as the "Five O'Clock Follies" because of "the abundance of propaganda and lack of any real information." (Zangrilli, 2003) "If he was prepared to believe JUSPAO, a correspondent could cover the war simply by attending the briefings each day." (Knightley, 1975)

"The most troubling aspect was that, with few exceptions, the Follies became the principal source of information about the war." (McLaughlin, 2002) Before long, the "nonsensical claims made by the military led to outright contempt" for the JUSPAO briefings. (Young and Jesser, 1997) Many felt that they were "designed to feed the news media with a daily hard news story but were not taken seriously by most journalists because they were based on hasty, fragmentary, inevitably inaccurate field reports of action in a theatre of war where there was no actual front line, moving or stationary." (McLaughlin, 2002) As the war increased in intensity, and American casualties began to mount, this not-so-subtle attempt to control which news the journalists received was discounted more and more by the media. "When there were eventually nearly 700 war correspondents in South Vietnam, it became inevitable that some of them would refuse to accept the official line at face value and would get out into the field to see things for themselves." (Knightley, 1975) The truth, as it always does, managed to find a willing audience. "The sanitized, fantastically optimistic picture of the war's progress" failed to convince reporters who had spent time in the front line units, rather than remaining in Saigon. (Reporters at War, n.d.) "Reporters who had only that day come in from the field were able to deride the 'body count'

tally that JUSPAO used as the measure of success and could debunk the official version of events on the basis of having seen and recorded the true situation for themselves." (Young and Jesser, 1997)

The correspondents who covered the war in Vietnam were a varied lot. There were old hands from World War II and Korea, renowned authors, freelance writers, college students, photojournalists, and reporters from major newspapers and network television stations. (Knightley, 1975) To get accreditation, a reporter simply needed a letter from their editor that accepted responsibility for the journalist. (Young and Jesser, 1997), while freelance reporters needed letters from two recognized media sources that were willing to purchase the writings of the reporter. (Knightley, 1975) The number of correspondents in country varied as well. In 1964 there were only 40 accredited journalists in Saigon; by the summer of 1965 there were more than 400. (McLaughlin, 2002) Young and Jesser (1997) state that, "[A]t any one time [when the war was at it height] there were upwards of 1000 accredited journalists in the country." (Young and Jesser, 1997) McLaughlin (2002) puts the number at 2000. (McLaughlin, 2002)

The Vietnam War "was a new kind of war that required a new kind of correspondent." (Knightley, 1975) While some correspondents readily accepted the official version from JUSPAO and became part of the military propaganda machine, it was those who did not who ensured that the whole story of the Vietnam War was revealed to the American public. (Knightley, 1975) Reporters such as Peter Arnett, Larry Burrows, Dickey Chapelle, David Halberstam, and Michael Herr are some of the more renown. Free to move from unit

to unit, the reporters "became very adept at hitching rides and, in many cases, were adopted by units with whom they shared the same dangers." (Young and Jesser, 1997) While it is generally acknowledged that the hierarchy of the military machine was not too fond of the media, differing views exist on how well liked the correspondents were by the men in the field. Some were accepted by the rank and file and developed good relationships with their military sources. (McLaughlin, 2002) Others were not so readily accepted. When reporter Michael Herr was being dropped off by a jeep at a front line unit, a soldier remarked, "Those bastards, I hope they die." (Knightley, 1975) Soldiers and Marines who suffered the daily dangers and deprivations of the common infantryman "resented the media's intrusion into their grief or the filming of their dead and wounded," (Young and Jesser, 1997) or the fact that the soldiers would be called to put their lives on the line if the reporters were caught in an ambush and wounded. (Kennedy, 1993)

Compared to previous conflicts, the war in Vietnam was better reported than any previous war America fought. (Knightley, 1975) Vietnam has been called the first real "television" war (Young and Jesser, 1997) due to the advances in technology that permitted reports from the war zone to be viewed by the American public each evening on the broadcast news. While there were only 10 million television sets in America during the Korean War, there were 100 million during the height of the Vietnam War. (Knightley, 1975) For the first time, "the full weight of the modern media was deployed without restriction." (Young and Jesser, 1997) The war was also unique in another

aspect: the military had to deal with a news media that was not fully behind the country's conduct of the war. (Young and Jesser, 1997):

It became a war like no other, a war with no front line, no easily identifiable enemy, no simply explained cause, no clearly designated villain on whom to focus the nation's hate, no menace to the homeland, no need for general sacrifice, and, therefore, no nation-wide fervor of patriotism. It was a vicious war, in a tiny, distant, devastated, and backward nation, against what Bernard Kalb of CBS described as "the most faceless foe in our history. (Knightley, 1975)

Against this confused backdrop, the correspondents did the best they could to report the real story of the fighting in Vietnam back to the American public. Peter Arnett, who spent 13 years in Vietnam as a correspondent mused that, "[C]aught between the truth of what we saw and the nation's sense of patriotism, the Vietnam reporters became something like outcasts, destined to defend their professionalism for the rest of their lives." (Arnett, 1996) The most lasting effect of the war concerning the war correspondent was the complete erosion of trust of the military for the media. The failure to control the media through censorship as in previous wars was not forgotten by the Pentagon. The open media policy proved "self defeating," as the appeal to patriotism fell on deaf ears. (Knightley, 1975) "The U.S. Army," stung by their defeat, "made up its mind that in the future its attitude toward media reporting would be different, certainly more restrictive..." (McLaughlin, 2002) The distrust and contempt born of the "first television war" (Young and

Jesser, 1997) would greatly influence its "judgment in future handling of war reporting." (Young and Jesser, 1997)

9. The 1980s: Total Control

Following the debacle in Vietnam (which produced the prevailing thought among the military that the reporting by the war correspondents and the media industry cost America the war) the military was "quick to appreciate the importance and impact of public opinion on operations." (Young and Jesser, 1997) The bitter taste left in the mouths of the officers who fought in Vietnam created a generation of future leaders that "felt they had more to lose than to gain by dealing with the press." (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) The press and correspondents were of no use to the commanders; dealing with the media was the realm of the public affairs officers within the military ranks. When the first major military operation of the post-Vietnam era (the invasion of Grenada) became imminent, the military hierarchy decided to keep the "news media in the dark as much as possible." (McLaughlin, 2002)

In October 1983 the U.S. military launched Operation Urgent Fury, the U.S. invasion of the Caribbean island nation of Grenada. Urgent Fury was aimed at securing the safety of over 1000 American citizens on the island that were caught in the middle of a violent coup and restoring order. The campaign was "marked by secrecy of planning, the absence of any public information annex in the operational plan, deliberate exclusion of the media, and the manipulation and management of news." (Young and Jesser, 1997) Even the spokesman for the Secretary of Defense, whose job it was to deal with the Washington press corps, did not learn of the invasion until it had begun.

(McLaughlin, 2002) The rationale behind the secrecy and initial exclusion of the media was stated by Admiral Wesley McDonald as being a result of "the absolute need to maintain the greatest element of surprise in executing the mission to ensure minimum danger to U.S. hostages...and to the servicemen involved in the initial assault dictated that the press be restricted until the initial objectives had been secured." (Braestrup, 1985) Admiral Joseph Metcalf, USN, who commanded the U.S. forces, admitted that, "I had a great deal to do with keeping [the press] out. I think I did the right thing." (Braestrup, 1985) Said General Norman Schwarzkopf, USA, about the decision to exclude the media: "As the meeting closed, somebody raised the question of the press. We agreed that we would open Grenada to reporters at 5 o'clock the next afternoon, because by then Grenada would be ours." (Schwarzkopf, 1992)

Three hundred reporters were kept bottled up on Barbados, and when the military finally allowed correspondents in Grenada, they only allowed 15 reporters and photographers. (McLaughlin, 2002) The fighting was over, and "there was nothing to report except the fact that they had not been able to report." (Young and Jesser, 1997) The resulting news blackout infuriated the U.S. news industry. "I've never seen such a mad dog and pony show before," commented a news executive. "I just think that the goddamn thing is such a flagrant manipulation of the press." (Young and Jesser, 1997) In a reversal of the free flow of information experienced by the press in Vietnam, during Operation Urgent Fury there were "no press briefings, no press releases, no nothing." (McLaughlin, 2002) In a legal suit filed against the Department of

Defense's media restrictions during the invasion, the Washington Federal District Court dismissed the complaint, but ruled that the military could dictate restrictions on the press during operations. (McLaughlin, 2002) Although Operation Urgent Fury was a comparatively small military operation, it proved to be a turning point in the evolution of media-military relations and for the future manner in which correspondents reported war.

10. The Sidle Commission

Relations between the media and military at the time of Operation Urgent Fury had atrophied to an "appalling state." (Young and Jesser, 1997) As a result of the media outcry over their exclusion during the operations in Grenada, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General John Vessey, USA, named retired Major General Winant Sidle to head an internal commission to review relations between the media and the military and reconcile press access with operational security. (Porch, 2004) Named "The Sidle Commission," the group consisted of seven military members and six media representatives and convened in February 1984. (Ben-Zedeff, 2004) Sidle stated in the final report that, "[T]he American people must be informed about United States military operations and this information can be best provided through both news media and the government. Therefore the panel believes it is essential that the U.S. news media cover U.S. military operations to the maximum degree consistent with the mission security and the safety of the U.S. forces." (Young and Jesser, 1997) The major achievement of the commission was the establishment of the Department of Defense National Media Pool (DNMP). (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) The concept of the DNMP was that "a group of journalists pre-selected from the major news

organizations would agree to abide by security regulations and share reports and be ready to move to the "seat of war" at a moment's notice. This group would be maintained in existence only until the main body of reporters appeared on the scene." (Porch, 2003`) Along with other recommendations for the inclusion of public affairs in operational planning, field support of reporters, and educating the force on media matters, it was hoped that these changes would "smooth future relations with the press, obviating any need for military commanders to become more involved in the public affairs process than they had been before." (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995)

It was not long before the DNMP was first used. During Operation Earnest Will, the U.S. Navy operation to escort re-flagged Kuwaiti tankers during the Iran-Iraq War, the DNMP was "dispatched to the Persian Gulf, where the correspondents boarded U.S. Naval vessels on a rotation basis and reported back on the escort operations." (Benzedeff, 2004) This first deployment of the DNMP, consisting of 28 separate pool rotations and 47 transits of the Straits of Hormuz from July 1987 to April 1988, was a "markedly successful evolution." (Matthews, 1991) One correspondent commented, "First and foremost, [the DNMP] had been a success inasmuch as our audiences were better served for our having been there, rather than at our Washington desk's, and for having covered the escort operations, albeit under unusual conditions." (Matthews, 1991)

11. Operation Just Cause

The next opportunity for American war correspondents to report on conflict was the U.S. invasion of Panama,

Operation Just Cause, in December 1989. Despite the small-scale success enjoyed by the journalists reporting during Operation Earnest Will, the pattern of secrecy that marked the Grenada operation re-emerged, and the DNMP did not deploy until it was too late to cover the action. However, this time it was not the military that made the decision to deny the media. "Military leaders played NO part in shaping that decision." (Matthews, 1991) The Secretary of Defense, Richard Cheney, "who held the media responsible for undermining public morale in Vietnam and "did not look on the press as an asset" (Porch, n.d.) admitted that it was his decision alone that prevented war correspondents from reporting the opening actions of that short war. (Matthews, 1991) Denied access, non-pool reporters traveled to Panama on their own to get whatever information they could. (Porch, n.d.) Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Colin Powell, USA, later wrote, "We were slow in getting the press pool to Panama and to the action... Consequently, the press ate us alive, with some justification. In the future, I knew, we had to do a far better job." (Powell, 1995)

12. Into the Storm

In August 1990, Iraq launched an invasion into neighboring Kuwait. In response, U.S. President George H.W. Bush ordered the immediate deployment of U.S. forces to Saudi Arabia to protect the oil rich nation from the Iraqi Army. This six-month build-up of forces was coined Operation Desert Shield by the Pentagon, while the campaign to expel the Iraqis from Kuwait became known as Operation Desert Storm. When the brief war was over, the Pentagon and the media had differing opinions of the effectiveness of the war correspondents' coverage of the fighting.

Assistant Secretary of Defense Pete Williams bragged that America experienced "the best war coverage we ever had." (Boot, 1991) The press felt that they were "spoon-fed." (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) Fifteen Washington bureau chiefs, representing major news organizations throughout America, stated that the war was "the most uncovered major conflict in modern American history." (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) Furthermore, they wrote:

Our sense is that virtually all major news organizations agree that the flow of information to the public was blocked, impeded or diminished by the policies and practices of the Department of Defense. Pools did not work. Stories and pictures were late or lost. Access to the men and women in the field was interfered with by a needless system of military escorts and copy review. These conditions meant we could not tell the public the full story of those who fought the nation's battle. (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995)

However, General Powell did not agree with the complaints:

The image of World War II's legendary Ernie Pyle, filing stories from European foxholes and Pacific beachheads, was thrown in our faces by our critics. Yet, press coverage of Desert Storm was unprecedented. Of the 2,500 scheduled journalists overall, 1,400 crowded the theater of operations at the peak. Compare this figure with 27 reporters going ashore with the first wave at Normandy on D-Day...Of the 1,350 print stories submitted by the press pool reporters, one was changed to protect intelligence procedures. (Evans, 2003)

The two major complaints for war correspondents during Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm were the ad hoc pool system that was developed by the military, and the daily press briefings to the assembled reporters in Saudi Arabia. (McLaughlin, 2002) The problem of the ad hoc pool system

was simply one of numbers. The first members of the established DNMP arrived in Saudi Arabia on 13 August 1990. (Ben-Zedeff, 2004) Saudi Arabia's initial reluctance to allow any journalists at all in the kingdom assisted the Pentagon in maintaining a grip on the initial information flow, but not for long. "Early in the build-up the Saudis made a simple announcement," recalled General Powell, "They were not going to allow any reporters into their country." (Powell, 1995)

The Pentagon immediately knew that, although they may secretly desire to maintain positive control of the war correspondents (in light of their experience in Vietnam), they could not allow a repeat performance of the press debacle that occurred in Panama. "That we knew, could not stand," continued Powell about the Saudi policy, "You do not send nearly a half million Americans, plus thousands of other nationals, halfway around the world to prepare for a major war and then impose a news blackout." (Powell, 1995) The Saudi government eventually began to grant visas to the hordes of war correspondents that wanted to cover the deployment. (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) Much to the chagrin of the Pentagon, it quickly became evident that the enormity of the brewing conflict—the first large-scale deployment of U.S. forces since Vietnam—drove the appetite for news beyond the capacity of the 17 war correspondents of the DNMP. Although it remained in existence for three weeks, "media pressure for increased accreditation [on the DNMP] overloaded and finally collapsed the system." (McLaughlin, 2002) It was precisely due to such large numbers of reporters streaming into Saudi Arabia—800 flooded into Saudi Arabia during the initial build-up of

forces—that the Pentagon devised the ad hoc “combat pool” system. (Porch, n.d., Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995, Young and Jesser, 1997)

As stated by Pentagon spokesman Pete Williams, the combat pool system had three purposes: “It gets reporters out to see the action, it guarantees that Americans at home get reports from the scene of action, and it allows the military to accommodate a reasonable number of journalists without overwhelming the units that are fighting the enemy.” (McLaughlin, 2002) It also meant, “the only way any journalist could cover the war and remain officially sanctioned by the U.S. military and the Saudi government was to be a member of a pool.” (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) In a manner, the pool system was a subtle method of controlling the war correspondents. This was largely due to the specter of Vietnam that still haunted the U.S. military as it prepared for its first serious challenge since their less-than-graceful withdrawal from that country in 1975. The last thing the military wanted was a prolonged, bloody war reported every night on the television and newspapers. (Young and Jesser, 1997)

The main complaint expressed by war correspondents assigned to the combat pool system was one of de facto censorship and manipulation, (Porch, 2004, Young & Jesser, 1997) as well as a denial of access of reporters to best position themselves to cover the breaking stories. (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) The tight restrictions of media travel infuriated the war correspondents, who thought they would be able to move freely around the battlefield as they had in Vietnam, jump on a helicopter, hitch a ride on a truck, get their story, and quickly return to Dhahran to file

their reports. (Porch, 2003) Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney rebuffed the reporter's complaints, saying that the correspondents "didn't have any concept of how the nature of warfare had changed, or that we were going to do our operations at night or that we were going to move very fast or that if we didn't provide the transportation for them, there wasn't any way that they were going to be able to keep up." (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995)

Critics state that for the "first time in American history reporters were essentially barred from accompanying the nation's troops into combat." (Blanchard, 1992) The combat pools "offered journalists very little in the way of first-hand action...they saw little or nothing of the brief and much vaunted 'land war'" (McLaughlin, 2002) There were exceptions. Molly Moore, a Washington Post war correspondent, accompanied the U.S. Marines during their breach of the Iraqi defenses along the Saudi-Kuwaiti border and the subsequent attack to liberate Kuwait City. (Moore, 1993) However, those non-pool accredited correspondents (only 186 participated in the pools) were even more restricted in their movements (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995):

Those not assigned to pools would have access to several military briefings held in Riyadh, one by CENTCOM [U.S. Central Command] and two others by British and Saudi commands. In addition unaired background briefings were provided to the media. Otherwise, travel within the theater of operations by media reps was prohibited. (Young and Jesser, 1997)

These official briefings conducted by American, British, and Saudi military officials have received much criticism. "While the pooling system kept journalists well away from the real action, the briefings kept real

information away from journalists." (McLaughlin, 2002) The high-tech Pentagon videos of "smart bombs" were akin to "video war games that played to the whoops, cheers and laughter of the assembled journalists..." (McLaughlin, 2002) "The briefings proved immensely popular with home audiences, giving the impression that the public was getting the news straight from the horse's mouth." (Young and Jesser, 1997) By showing only "selected highlights from the most successful missions" of combat aircraft, the military again became de facto assignment editors for the war correspondents, sanitizing the information released to the public. (Young & Jesser, 1997)

Many reporters worked outside the pool system, risking have their credentials revoked and immediate deportation from the region. They quickly were given the moniker of being a "unilateral." (McLaughlin, 2002) Chris Hedges of The New York Times was one such war correspondent. Michael Kelly, of the Boston Globe, accompanied Egyptian forces into action, bypassing the pool system. (Reporters at War, n.d.) Another unilateral was decorated combat veteran, retired U.S. Army Colonel David Hackworth, who said that unescorted media [unilaterals] often found themselves staring down the gun barrels of American troops who were instructed to treat such unilaterals as hostile. (Young and Jesser, 1997) "Although I managed to get out on my own, we didn't have the freedom of movement to make an independent assessment," said Hackworth, "Everything was spoon fed. We were animals in a zoo and the press officers were the zookeepers who threw us a piece of meat occasionally." (Young and Jesser, 1997)

13. The Aftermath: A New Policy

In the opinion of the media cognoscenti, "the Gulf War [Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm] pool system produced a mediocre product." (Porch, n.d.) The evidence suggests a "familiar pattern of deliberately denying media access to the earliest phases of operations, followed by a policy of media containment and limitation." (Young and Jesser, 1997) In a letter sent to Secretary of Defense Cheney after the war, news executives clearly stated their displeasure in the manner in which they were permitted to report to the American public. "We believe that the Pentagon Pool arrangements during Operation Desert Storm made it impossible for reporters and photographers to tell the public the full story of the war in a timely fashion," they wrote, "*We believe it is imperative that the Gulf War not serve as a model for future coverage.*" (Italics added) (Young and Jesser, 1997)

In the spirit of cooperation, the Pentagon and the news industry worked together to try to solve the access and censorship problems that caused such heartache during the war. The result was a set of guidelines titled the DoD Principles for News Media Coverage of DoD Operations, published in April 1992. (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) The document contained ten principles that reaffirmed "open and independent reporting," by accredited journalists provided access to all major units (with restrictions on access to Special Operations units). (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) It also stated that journalists should be permitted to ride aboard military vehicles and aircraft when feasible, and, echoing the letter sent to Secretary Cheney, that "pools are not to serve as the standard of covering U.S. military

operations." (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) The events of September 11, 2001 would quickly put to test the military's dedication to ensuring that the mistakes of the past concerning the employment of media during wartime were to be not repeated.

14. A Paradigm Shift: September 11, 2001

While it is important to understand the evolution of the war correspondent, it is perhaps more important to examine more recent events that shaped the media's role during Operation Iraqi Freedom. On September 11, 2001, the world was forever changed in the blink of an eye by the terrorist attacks on the United States. Suddenly, after a decade of humanitarian and peacekeeping missions around the globe, the U.S. military was suddenly confronted with fighting a global war on terrorism. The first American military action of the 21st century was called Operation Enduring Freedom, a long-term campaign targeting the Usama Bin Ladin, the Taliban, and the Al Qaeda terrorist network. And just as they had done since the birth of the Republic, American war correspondents covered the action to ensure that the public kept informed. Initially, however, the media was not welcomed with open arms by the military—a disturbing flashback to the strict control of the post-Vietnam era.

The first offensive action of Operation Enduring Freedom was a raid on a Taliban airbase and complex by U.S. Army Rangers and Delta Force operators in the vicinity of Kandahar, Afghanistan during the early morning hours of October 20, 2001. Because of the secretive nature of such special operations, reporters were literally "kept in the dark." (Isaacson and Jordan, 2003) However, military

cameramen of the Joint Combat Camera Center did record the action with a specially equipped night vision camera (Isaacson and Jordan, 2003), and the "grainy, green-tinted footage of determined commandos and billowing parachutes dominated the television news that night." (Hersh, 2001) When queried if such operations against the Taliban would continue in future, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Richard B. Myers, replied, "Some things are going to be visible, some invisible." (Hersh, 2001) Unfortunately for the Pentagon, Seymour Hersh of The New Yorker wrote "a scathing account of the mission, alleging it was bungled." (Isaacson and Jordan, 2003) With no war correspondents along, "there was little independent reporting to inform the debate." (Isaacson and Jordan, 2003)

With the American public hungry for positive news after the tragedy of September 11, 2001, this was not welcome news for the war correspondents waiting in the wings. As had occurred in the past, the need for operational security in wartime was at conflict with the journalist's quest to keep the public informed. The claim that "[M]ission considerations including sensitive special operations tactics and the volatile security environment in Afghanistan inherently limited media opportunities in that theater..." was of no comfort to the journalists. (Leedy, 2003)

In November 2001 conventional forces—U.S. Marines and soldiers—went on the offensive in Afghanistan. Similar to Operation Desert Storm, war correspondents were confined to "centralized briefings and carefully corralled pool[s]." (Isaacson and Jordan, 2003) As a result the Pentagon "paid

the price for not facilitating coverage." (Leedy, 2003) "There was nobody there to tell the story of the youth of America going out and doing this great mission with such success in real tough terrain," said a U.S. Army officer in retrospect. "It was a missed opportunity [to tell their story]..." (Miracle, 2003) The lack of correspondents in the field again denied the Pentagon the opportunity to counter false reports and propaganda. An example of this is an incident in which it was reported through the grapevine that soldiers from the 10th Mountain Division ran over a child and beat a man to death during a raid. "[W]e should have had reporters on that raid because the villagers lied...we didn't have any evidence to rebut their allegations." (Leedy, 2003)

With such restrictions emerging (again), it is little wonder that antagonism began to build between the media and the military (again). (Berkowitz, 2003) "There is a war being fought by Americans and we're not there to chronicle it. We have access to the Northern Alliance, we have access to the Taliban, we have practically zero access to American forces in theater." (Hickey, 2002) The tension came to a head when reporters were "locked in a warehouse on December 6, [2001] so that they could not cover troops injured by a stray [friendly] bomb." (Lee, 2004) Of course, the media did not sit still for such outrageous censorship. "A gross abuse of the ground rules for the press pool," reported the New York Times. (Hickey, 2002)

The resulting uproar prompted a quick apology from Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, Victoria Clarke: "We owe you an apology," she said in a memo to news bureau chiefs dated December 6, 2001. "The last several

days have revealed shortcomings in our preparedness to support news organizations in their efforts to cover U.S. military operations in Afghanistan." (ASD-PA, 2001a) Furthermore, she recognized that:

We [the Pentagon] have a significant responsibility to provide your correspondents the opportunity to cover the war. It is a responsibility that we take seriously. Our policy remains the same as it always has been: Keeping in mind our desire to protect operational security and the safety of men and women in uniform, we intend to provide maximum media coverage with minimal delay and hassle. That has not always been the case over the last few days, particularly with regard to the coverage of the dead and wounded returning to the Forward Operating Base known as Rhino. (ASD-PA, 2001a)

Clarke stated that guidance had been reissued to all military commands, reemphasizing the Secretary of Defense's and Chairman of the Joint Chief's intent that for "maximum coverage [and] minimum hassle," (ASD-PA, 2001a) and that the Pentagon's goal was for "longer duration, larger numbers, and unilateral filing status for news organizations covering the military action in Afghanistan." (ASD-PA, 2001a) At a December 13, 2001 press briefing, Clarke also said that the Pentagon did not like the pool system any more than the press did, but the limited transportation assets available in theater to move journalists to the scene of the action was a factor in the media's access being less than acceptable. (ASD-PA, 2001b) However, by the end of December 2001, the Pentagon terminated the requirement that all reporters in Afghanistan remain part of an official press pool, and reporters began to "roam about the country freely." (Synovitz, 2002) Although the requirement was removed, the

press pools still remained in effect to facilitate easier access to war correspondents who still desired to use the military for transport to remote areas. (Synovitz, 2002) Access was indeed slowly getting better for the war correspondents. And in March 2002, a major step toward making access even better was taken by the Pentagon when they experimented with a concept called "embedding."

15. Martin Savidge Rocks The Boat

"When the public affairs posture changed from passive to active, it was difficult to catch up and get the media out in front with the troops," commented U.S. Army Colonel Melanie R. Reeder, a public affairs officer deployed in Afghanistan. (Miracle, 2003) Out in front with the troops was exactly what the war correspondents wanted—at least the most adventurous ones. "Some reporters weren't even living at the base [Kandahar airport]; they had a house in town, with cooks, a staff and showers," said CNN war correspondent Martin Savidge. (Wall, 2003) Savidge was an aggressive, seasoned correspondent who desired greater access. "We had been camping out, literally, at the Kandahar airport, living on the base for about six weeks. You could see military coming and going, and it was frustrating that this sort of activity was going on and we couldn't go on it," reflected Savidge. (Wall, 2003)

After Savidge blasted the Pentagon's mismanagement of the media during a live interview on CNN's "American Morning," he was approached by a public affairs officer who simply said, "Let's go to the mountains." (Wall, 2003) Perhaps after all the miscues during the early months of the campaign in Afghanistan, all the publicity concerning lack of access, the censorship gaff over friendly fire,

dealing with a public and media hungry for substantive news on the war on terror, and the scorching condemnation by Savidge, military commanders and public affairs officers decided to try something new. (Pool, 2002) Savidge, along with a few other select correspondents, were about to become the Pentagon's first experiment with the current method of "embedding" media within U.S. military units.

16. Operation Anaconda

Nestled into the mountains of Eastern Afghanistan is the Shi-e-Kot valley. In March 2002 the Shi-e-Kot was a haven for Taliban and Al Qaeda fighters, and the U.S. military was determined to go into the series of bunkers and cave complexes in the valley and clean them out for good. (Pool, 2002) U.S. Marine Captain Jeff Pool was in charge of the group of correspondents. "My responsibility," said Pool, "was to safeguard the media crews' lives and ensure complete, open access to personnel and combat operations." (Pool, 2002)

The group consisted of Savidge and his cameraman, an Agence France-Press (AFP) print reporter, a journalist from the Discovery Channel, and a U.S. Army photojournalist. (Pool, 2002) The correspondents were instructed on the ground rules concerning operational security and obeying without pause the commands of the soldiers they were accompanying. (Pool, 2002) During the 17-day offensive against the Taliban, Savidge and his fellow correspondents provided unique insight into the United States' new global war on terrorism. Savidge, upon returning from the operation on March 19 said during an interview:

We were embedded. This idea of embedding journalists is almost a throwback to World War II. There was some done in Vietnam. The

journalist goes along into the fight and has access to everything that the soldier has intelligence reports, the briefings before the event occurs-and then going in. (Martin Savidge, 2002)

Indeed, the correspondents rode into battle with the soldiers on Chinook helicopters, trudged up treacherous mountain ravines, and suffered in the freezing temperatures of fighting at 8000 feet. (Pool, 2002) Not surprisingly, the correspondents were well received by the soldiers. "The soldiers appeared happy to have the media along and treated them just like any other soldier, in part because they were sharing the experience, not just reporting on it. (Pool, 2002)

Despite initial criticisms that "journalists have been denied access to American troops in the field in Afghanistan to a greater degree than in any previous war involving U.S. military forces," (Hickey, 2002) the media was pleased with the more open policy the Pentagon instituted during the latter parts of the campaign in Afghanistan. Of special note was the experiment with embedding correspondents during Operation Anaconda. As far as both the media and military were concerned, both sides won. "Operational security was not compromised, and both the public and military benefited from a full and independent chronicle of the largest U.S. ground operation [Operation Anaconda] in a decade." (Isaacson and Jordan, 2003) CNN military affairs correspondent Jamie McIntyre gave the military "good marks for access" during Operation Anaconda, while Associated Press reporter Susanne Schafer stated that "the situation for journalists improved during Anaconda." (Cortes, 2002) The "embed" genie was out of the

bottle, and there would be no denying the war correspondents access the next time the military went to war.

17. The Embedded Policy

The concept of embedding reporters had occurred to a certain degree before Savidge and his fellow journalists accompanied soldiers into the Shi-e-Kot. Recall Robert Capa going ashore in the first wave at Omaha Beach on June 6, 1944, or Joe Galloway flying into the Ia Drang valley with the 7th Cavalry in 1965. "In many respects, embedding is hardly a novel concept, but revives World War II and Vietnam practices." (Porch, 2001)

As previously discussed, the access and censorship problems experienced by war correspondents during Operation Desert Storm in 1991 resulted in a set of guidelines titled *DoD Principles for News Media Coverage of DoD Operations*. (Aukofer and Lawrence, 1995) However, the lack of any major conflict and the advent of multiple humanitarian and peacekeeping operations during the post-Desert Storm era largely left the policy untested. Briefly tested in during military operations in Haiti in September 1994, and expanded during the peacekeeping intervention in Bosnia in December 1995 (Porch, 2001, Porch, n.d.) the concept of embedding journalists never truly had the fertile environment that the post September 11, 2001 era provided for the media. A fertile environment meant support for the program at the highest levels of the civilian and military establishment. Unfortunately, the first true test for the Pentagon's open policy—Afghanistan—proved to be a failure until Operation Anaconda.

The embed experiment during Operation Anaconda proved to be a harbinger for how war correspondents would ply their trade during the next conflict the United States found itself engaged—the liberation of Iraq from Saddam Hussein. The select group of correspondents who covered Operation Anaconda, “helped blaze the path for a large-scale, Secretary of Defense-dictated, embedded-media program in Operation Iraqi Freedom.” (Miracle, 2003) Looking back at the campaign in Afghanistan, the U.S. Army quickly came to the conclusion that “[W]hen journalists were provided access, the accurate story was told. When they were not provided with information [read access], the result was speculation, misinformation, and inaccuracy.” (Miracle, 2003) It seemed only natural that the next time the military and media had to interact, the Pentagon was determined that access would no longer be a question.

It was against this background—the ongoing Global War on Terrorism and the enthusiastic response to the revived embed program—which the Pentagon began to craft, shape, and greatly enhance the embedded policy in anticipation for a war against Iraq. During a forum entitled “Assessing Media Coverage of the War in Iraq: Press Reports, Pentagon Rules, and Lessons for the Future” conducted at The Brookings Institution in June 2003, Victoria Clarke discussed the genesis of the embedded program that would be instituted for Operation Iraqi Freedom:

It was actually an extraordinary evolution of a concept that already existed...It had to do with the fact that we knew if we went to war, we'd have a lot more people out there, a lot more soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines. It had to do with the fact that we knew the more people saw the U.S. military, the more they would

understand the mission and how they were going about their jobs, and the more the people saw of the Iraqi regime...I knew with great certainty if we went to war, the Iraqi regime would be doing some terrible things and would be incredibly masterful with the lies and the deception. And I could stand up there at that podium and Secretary Rumsfeld could stand up there and say very truthfully the Iraqi regime is putting its soldiers in civilian clothing so they can ambush our soldiers. Some people would believe us and some people wouldn't. But we had hundreds and hundreds of credible, independent journalists saying the Iraqi regime is putting their soldiers in civilian clothing. (Brookings, 2003)

From the first indications that another major ground campaign would be conducted, the Pentagon was fully in support of including the media in its war plans. "We've been doing embeds on a smaller scale for years and have all known that the program works extremely well," said U.S. Army Major General Larry Gottardi, the Army chief of public affairs during Operation Iraqi Freedom. In fact, U.S. Army Field Manual 46-1 (FM 46-1) Public Affairs Operations (July 1997) defines embedding as:

...the act of assigning a reporter to a unit as a member of the unit. The reporter eats, sleeps, and moves with the unit. The reporter is authorized open access to all sections of the unit and is not escorted by public affairs personnel. Rather, the unit is the reporter's escort. Reporters file their stories from unit locations and security is accomplished at the source, by establishing with the reporter what can be covered and reported on and what cannot be reported on, or when material can be reported. (FM 46-1, 1997)

Appropriately, the U.S. Army "assembled a tentative list of media interested in embedding in September 2002, long before OIF [Operation Iraqi Freedom] became a viable

contingency." (Leedy, 2003) "It was helpful this time [that] you had the backing of the DoD. When the Secretary of Defense is telling commanders that it's important—of course it helped," Gottardi commented. (Ayers, 2004) Brigadier General Ronald Rand, USAF, director of public affairs for the U.S. Air Force, echoed Gottardi's sentiments. "The big difference was that it was organized, systematic, and directed top-down," he said in February 2004. "Because of the White House, [General Tommy] Franks [who commanded U.S. forces in Iraq], and all the components, we worked harder and more effectively and efficiently, even with the unilaterals [non-embedded journalists]." (Ayers, 2004)

In February 2003, as the northern Kuwaiti desert began to swell with the arrival of thousands of U.S. and British soldiers and Marines in preparation for the eventual invasion of Iraq, the Pentagon issued a 13-page message to all the U.S. services instituting the embedded media program for what would soon be called Operation Iraqi Freedom. The document, dated February 10, 2003, carried a cumbersome title: Public Affairs Guidance (PAG) On Embedding Media During Possible Future Operations/Deployments In The U.S. Central Command's (CENTCOM) Area Of Responsibility (AOR). (ASDPAG, 2003) However, the policy was clear. War correspondents would have access that would be unmatched in the history of war reporting. As Clarke stated above, the embedded reporters would serve a two-fold purpose: be an honest, objective broker on the scene, countering any enemy propaganda, and keep the U.S. public informed on the daily progress in the race to Baghdad. The endstate was to manage perceptions and positively influence

public opinion to help bring a speedy conclusion to the war:

The DoD policy on media coverage of future military operations is that media will have long-term, minimally restrictive access to U.S. air, ground, and naval forces through embedding. Media coverage of any future operation will, to a large extent, shape public perception of the national security environment now and in the years ahead. This holds true for the U.S. public; the public in Allied countries whose opinion can affect the durability of our coalition; and publics in countries where we conduct operations, whose perceptions of us can affect the cost and duration of our involvement. Our ultimate strategic success in bringing peace and security to this region will come in our long-term commitment to supporting our democratic ideals. We need to tell the factual story—good or bad—before others seed the media with disinformation and distortions, as they most certainly continue to do. Our people in the field need to tell our story—only commanders can ensure that media get to the story alongside the troops. We must organize for and facilitate access of national and international media to our forces, including those forces engaged in ground operations, with the goal of doing so right from the start. To accomplish this, we will embed media with our units. These embedded media will live, work and travel as part of the units with which they are embedded to facilitate maximum, in-depth coverage of U.S. forces in combat and related operations. Commanders and public affairs officers must work together to balance the need for media access with the need for operational security. (ASDPAG, 2003)

Reading the Secretary of Defense directed PAG, war correspondents must have been greatly encouraged, guardedly optimistic, and openly pessimistic—all at once. This was a return to the access enjoyed by their predecessors during the heady days of World War II—perhaps even better

considering the immense leaps in media technology that promised real time reporting from the front lines of which Ernie Pyle or Joe Galloway could only dream. Examining the PAG, one finds that it is replete with phrases such as, "ensure a full understanding of all operations," "access to operational combat missions," "seats aboard vehicles...will be made available to allow maximum coverage of U.S. troops in the field," "media are provided with every opportunity to observe actual combat operations," and "gender [of the war correspondent] will not be an excluding factor under any circumstance." (ASDPAG, 2003) Said Walker Lundy, editor of the Philadelphia Enquirer: "I'd rather cover a war this way than the way we did during the Persian Gulf War. Unless it's a diabolical trick by the military, I'm pretty impressed that they're doing this." (Kurtz, 2003) Others had their reservations. Before the war commenced, longtime CBS news anchorman and Vietnam War correspondent Dan Rather opined that, "I have trepidations. There is a pretty fine line between being embedded and entombed. The best story in the world is not worth a damn unless you can get it out." (Madore, 2003)

Lest there be any misunderstanding, there were restrictions on the embedded war correspondents. Paragraph 4 of the PAG lists "ground rules" by which each embedded correspondent was obligated to abide. The ground rules listed what information was releasable and what was not releasable by the media "since their publication or broadcast could jeopardize operations and endanger lives." (ASDPAG, 2003) Furthermore, the PAG states that violation of the ground rules could result in immediate removal of the embed, and to ease the worries of censorship, "[T]hese

ground rules recognize the right of the media to cover military operations and are in no way intended to prevent release of derogatory, embarrassing, negative or uncomplimentary information." (ASDPAG, 2003)

18. Operation Iraqi Freedom

Prior to the war commencing, Victoria Clarke reiterated that "very, very senior people in this building [the Pentagon] and Central command truly understand how important it is... [they all] recognize the importance of what we're trying to do" in regards to the embedded media program. (Zwirko, 2003) As February 2003 turned into March, the rhetoric in Washington and Baghdad increased as it became more likely that the U.S. led coalition would indeed cross the border and move to remove Saddam Hussein from power. In early March, those journalists who had not accompanied units from the United States as they made the journey into the Persian Gulf began to arrive in Kuwait. Among their number were correspondents from major newspapers, network and cable television stations, smaller market newspapers as well as magazines such *National Geographic*, *People*, and the *National Journal*. (Kurtz, 2003, ASD-PA, 2003b) After being briefed by public affairs officers and issued chemical protective equipment, the war correspondents were transported to the numerous military camps in the Northern Kuwaiti desert where they were formally embedded into their respective units.

All told, the total number of embedded war correspondents officially sanctioned by the Pentagon varies according to the source. The numbers quoted in various sources prior to and after the war include "approximately 500," (Miracle, 2003) "more than 500," (Zwirko, 2003) "some

600," (Shafer, 2003) "more than 600," (Ayers, 2004), "approximately 700," (Ranade, 2003) to "700-plus," (Smith, 2003). Even during the previously mentioned media forum held at The Brookings Institution in June 2003, the moderator, journalist in residence Ron Nessen, was unsure of the exact number: "The most memorable media development of the war coverage, it seems to me, was the concept of the embedded reporters. And I don't know, I've heard different numbers, 500, 600, 700 reporters, who were assigned to one unit throughout the war." (Brookings, 2003) An official list of embedded media obtained from the Office of the Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs dated February 21, 2003 gives the number as 671. (ASD-PA, 2003b) *Knight Ridder Newspapers* had more war correspondents embedded with coalition forces than any other media organization: 31 reporters and photographers and one artist. (Brookings, 2003)

Being an embedded journalist was not solely limited to American reporters. Journalists from the UK, Germany, Japan, Norway, Saudi Arabia, France, Czechoslovakia, Canada, Israel, Russia, Australia, Canada, China, Korea, and even Al Jazeera—the controversial anti-American network based out of Qatar. (ASDnames, 2003, Kurtz, 2003) Foreign news agencies were granted around 150 slots, with Al-Jazeera getting four - one each with the U.S. Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. (Carlson, 2003) The commitment the media made to the embed program also went beyond the human capital of sending reporters into harm's way. Prior to the war CNN devoted \$25 million for war coverage, with the broadcast networks estimating that their

coverage would cost approximately \$1 million a day. (Kurtz, 2003)

The embedded media were not to be the only reporters on the battlefield. Being embedded was not the only option for war correspondents that desired to report on the campaign in Iraq. Journalists could journey forth into Iraq independently, depending on their own good luck to move safely about the battlefield and report on what on whatever they desired. This freedom of movement was extremely attractive for many war correspondents, who feared that being embedded with the military would mean de facto censorship and restriction of movement—thereby stifling their eternal quest to report the true story to the American public. (Shafer, 2003) These journalists were called “unilaterals” in the vernacular of the Pentagon, and one account has approximately 2,000 unilaterals in Kuwait prior to the war commencing. (Miracle, 2003) Of course, the unilateral reporter, while having more freedom to move to the cover the story they desire, were also sacrificing the security and safety of being protected by the coalition forces.

Some news organizations planned to “send their most hardened correspondents to report independently from the region.” (Campagna, 2003) Many were already in Baghdad and planned to stay there for the duration of the war. (Campagna, 2003) NBC correspondent Richard Engel was one American reporter to secretly remain in Baghdad for the entire war. His experiences as a unilateral journalist in the enemy’s capital during wartime are documented in a recently published book, *Fist In The Hornet’s Nest*. (Engel, 2004) The Pentagon, concerned over the safety of

unilateral reporters moving unsupervised about the battlefield, warned them to leave Iraq when the war actually commenced. (Campagna, 2003)

It can be argued that the embedded media during Operation Iraqi Freedom were better prepared to cover the fighting from the front lines than any previous generation of war correspondents. Barbara Starr, CNN Pentagon correspondent, stated in February 2003 that the embed program would be an "unprecedented test for the American and world news media as it is for the military. You know, the Pentagon press corps has complained and whined for years that we've had no access to the battlefield, that we don't get access to troops. Well, now they're taking us right to the front lines with them. So reporters are going to have to live like soldiers. It's going to be very, very challenging." (PBS, 2003) With that in mind, the Pentagon, in an effort to better "prepare media for the threats of modern warfare, and enhance understanding between the Pentagon and the fourth estate," (PBS, 2002) conducted abbreviated "media boot camps" for the war correspondents selected to be embedded. Included in the training syllabus were evolutions such as endurance hikes, first aid, and chemical warfare defense drills. (Miracle, 2003) Conducted at military bases around the United States, the "short courses in war" was the first time the military trained journalists prior to the commencement of hostilities. (PBS, 2002) In late 2002, some 350 reporters underwent such a training period at the Marine Corps base located in Quantico, Virginia. (PBS, 2002) Sixty more correspondents were hosted at Fort Benning, Georgia. (Leedy, 2003) CBS News correspondent Byron Pitts, who has covered conflicts

in Afghanistan, Kosovo, and the Persian Gulf commented that, "I think that the journalists who are here today walk away with a clear understanding of the physical, emotional, and psychological demands that war will have on the military. I think the military walks away with some appreciation that there are some of us who take our jobs seriously, who are respectful of the job that they do, and that we make an effort to be as professional in our job as they are." (PBS, 2003)

19. The Current Debate

On April 9, 2003, only 22 days after U.S. and UK forces crossed the border into Iraq launching Operation Iraqi Freedom, U.S. Marines pulled down the enormous statue of Saddam Hussein in Baghdad's Firdos Square, symbolically marking the capture of the capitol city. Within a week, the Marines had moved north to Hussein's hometown of Tikrit, which they captured with minimal resistance. The war in Iraq was officially declared over on May 1, 2003 when President George W. Bush stated that major combat operations were ceased. In true American fashion, almost immediately the debate began on how effective the Pentagon's experiment with embedding media actually turned out.

A cursory examination of the multitude of editorials, stories, and even books that have been written during and since the official declaration of the end of major combat operations on May 1, 2003 reveals that the criticisms fall into two obvious camps: pro-embedded and con-embedded. Even within these camps are two smaller groupings that deserve examination. For simplicity they can be generically labeled "the military," and "the media." The

first examined in this study is the U.S. military's opinion of the embedded media program.

(a) The Military Reaction: Getting Their Story Out To The Public

By the end of May 2003 the U.S. military began to publish what is called in the military vernacular "after action reports" (AAR) and "lessons learned" regarding their experiences during Operation Iraqi Freedom. Included within these AARs are sections discussing their impressions of the embedded media program. The two major ground units that conducted the drive to Baghdad, the U.S. Army 3rd Infantry Division (Mechanized) (3ID (M)), and the U.S. Marine 1st Marine Division (1st Mardiv)—and had the most embedded reporters attached to their maneuver brigades and battalions—offered interesting commentary to the debate.

The 3ID received their embedded media on March 11, 2003. (3IDAAR, 2003) The AAR stated that "two days before the ground war, the 3ID (M) provided the media a broad overview of the [war] plan, including tentative timelines...as the operation progressed, media were allowed unprecedented access to plans. We know of no media that violated the trust during the entire operation." (3IDAAR, 2003) Other comments included that as the war progressed, and the division saw the quality work produced by the embedded reporters, "[I]t was evident that the program was working according to our expectations." (3IDAAR, 2003) In summation, the division concluded that:

Overall, the ambitious media embed program executed by the 3ID (M) was an unqualified success. Media that became part of the team told first-hand accounts of 3ID (M) fairly and accurately. Neither mission accomplishment nor the integrity of the media was compromised.

The media we surveyed spoke highly of their experience and stated the embed far exceeded their expectations. Soldiers, media, and the American public were the true beneficiaries. (3IDAAR, 2003)

The 1st Mardiv received 80 embedded journalists on March 10, 2003. (1stMardivAAR, 2003) The Marine Corps has always been media friendly, and this was reflected by the Division Commanding General's sentiment that, "Left unsung, the noblest deed will die." (Plenzer, 2004) The Marines felt that "[T]he presence of embedded media significantly reduced the Iraqi ability to conduct a propaganda campaign," while it "promoted bonding between the military and the media." (1stMardivAAR, 2003) In a separate article penned by the 1stMardiv Public Affairs Officer in February 2004, Capt Joseph M. Plenzer recalls a question a reporter asked concerning how much real access the embeds were going to be allowed.

Embed: Really, how close are you going to allow me to get to the frontlines?

Plenzer: I can put you in the back of an LVTP-7 amphibious assault vehicle with 18 angry grunts, drive you within 300 meters of the objective, and send you in the assault as the Marines storm the enemy's trench lines and drive bayonets into their hearts. (Plenzer, 2004)

Plenzer said the room went silent, and that you could hear a pin drop. (Plenzer, 2004) Finally, one "skittish" reporter asked, "Is he *serious*?" (Plenzer, 2004)

The 1stMardiv stated that the embed program, "served as a lens to focus the world's attention on the Division's combat story, favorable or not." (1stMardivAAR, 2003) In conclusion, the Marine Corps stated:

The media program in this campaign worked well for both the military and the media. The media received unprecedented access, and the Marine Corps was able to get its story to the American and international publics as never before. In this instance [Operation Iraqi Freedom], the embedding media was a limited success for the Division. This paradigm should not be blindly followed and a thorough risk-benefit analysis must be conducted before embedding media in the same fashion for future combat operations. (1stMardivAAR, 2003)

(b) The Media Reaction: Access, Content, Censorship, and Objectivity

The commentary by the media industry concerning the embedded program centers around four main issues: access, context, censorship, and objectivity. There are many accolades written about the unparalleled access that war correspondents had to the troops and front line action during the pre-invasion build-up in Kuwait and the subsequent drive to Baghdad. A war correspondent embedded with the 101st Airborne Division stated that, "[G]iven past experience, where access was spotty, this time it was universally excellent...Particularly once the war started and the 101st moved into Iraq-I had access to the operations center and was at [101st commander Maj. Gen. David H.] Petraeus' elbow constantly." (Ayers, 2004) CBS war correspondent John Roberts, embedded with the U.S. Marines' 2d Light Armored Reconnaissance Battalion said, "The level of access was really terrific...We had access to officers whenever we needed them, and they were happy to speak with us on the caveat that security was observed." (Ayers, 2004) Mark Mazetti of *U.S. News and World Report*, also embedded with the Marines, agreed: "Before the war started, they briefed us on the whole battle plan for the Marines. We

got to see where they scrapped the plan [and adapted to the changing situation on the battlefield]." (Ayers, 2004) CBS' Dan Rather commented that, "...it wasn't perfect...in some cases [they] embedded people, but they didn't let them up with the far-forward units. But there's [little] to complain about, and there's a lot to applaud." (Miracle, 2003)

There were, however, those who were not as pleased as Roberts and his colleagues. A reporter embedded aboard the U.S. aircraft carrier USS Abraham Lincoln said that the embeds were forced to abide by ground rules much more restrictive than the Pentagon's. Reporters were banned from the mess decks so they could not interact with the sailors, and had a military "minder" noting their every question and answer levied of the ship's crew. (Shafer, 2003) On the ground in Iraq, Jerry Zrewmski of the *USA Today* said, "I felt like a hostage...I was thinking I would be going to Iraq for two days, but a general's change in plans changed this to at least a five-day adventure—and far more danger than I'd expected." (Shafer, 2003) And Bob Franken of CNN offered an interesting perspective on access:

If there was combat, I wasn't usually able to move out and go shoot the other side. In fact, one could argue that one of the inherent problems with the embeds is that we didn't have anybody embedded with the Iraqi side. But the fact is that we did not. Physically we couldn't cover that. So chances are there is a lot that we missed simply because we physically were unable to get to it. (Brookings, 2003)

Another criticism concerning lack of access centered around covering special operations forces—echoing

complaints from operations in Afghanistan two years earlier. "One area where it didn't work at all was with the special operation forces--no one knows what they were doing to this day," said Rick Atkinson of the *Washington Post*. "For conventional forces and for all the services they were very accommodating, but not with the special op forces." (Ayers, 2004)

The question of access was in fact a major consideration that persuaded many war correspondents to report the conflict as unilaterals. "The risk of embedding is that you won't be able to see anything...the real danger is not being killed but being seriously out of position," said one unilateral journalist. (Shafer, 2003) Many unilateral reporters speak of being treated as "second-class citizens" in the eyes of the military simply because they were not official embeds. (Shafer, 2003) *The New Yorker's* Jeffrey Goldberg, who was a unilateral during the war, believed that the embed system was a de facto credentialing system that endorsed some reporters and rejected others who were not part of it. (Shafer, 2003) "As far as the 'coalition military press machine' was concerned...the unilaterals were one level lower than Republican Guardsmen." (Shafer, 2003)

(c) *The Big Picture*

A universal criticism of the embed program was that with so many embedded reporters filing countless stories from their individual units, it was difficult to get a clear picture of the war as a whole. (Brookings, 2003, Ranade, 2003, Smith 2003, Zwirko, 2003, Ayers, 2004, Harper, 2004,) Pentagon media spokesman U.S. Army Major Tim Blair admitted in a briefing the day before Hussein's

statue came tumbling down in Firdos Square that, "[T]here's so much [news] that it's hard to keep track of every report coming out of the region." (Zwirko, 2003) Blair, who was the Pentagon's point man on the embedded program, also warned that the many separate reports streaming in from the battlefield should be considered just that—separate reports. "It's a small snapshot of that particular piece of the battlefield, so you have to keep every one of those reports in perspective." (Zwirko, 2003)

Some critics thought that the focus at the individual soldier and Marine-level came at the expense of the overall story of the war. (Ayers, 2004) Reporting by the embeds, although wonderful in its detail and real-time nature, was negatively described as looking through a "soda-straw," (Pasquarett, 2003, Smith, 2003) or "into a microscope." (Harper, 2004) One embedded war correspondent compared being embedded as being the same as the number-two dog in a sled dog team. "You saw an awful lot of the dog in front of you, and a little to the left and right." (Smith, 2003) Phil Bronstein, editor of the *San Francisco Chronicle*, said, "we're only able to see little slices of the pie," while an ABC News executive commented that "we were looking at the battlefield through 600 straws," and that, "it was difficult to conceptualize it [the war]." (Kurtz, 2003)

Not surprisingly, other journalists thought differently. They recognized their place in the hierarchy of the news chain, and that it was up to other journalists and editors in the United States to piece together the many disparate pieces of any certain breaking story. "I certainly did not get a clear picture of the war because we

were so isolated," said an embedded reporter with the 101st Airborne Division. However, he conceded that it indeed was his job "to look at things through a microscope, not binoculars." (Kurtz, 2003) "I'd like to call it a bright, intense look at a small slice of the war," opined John Roberts of CBS. "The reason you have so many embedded reporters is that every day they each bring a slice, and then when you put all the slices together—with [CBS News National Correspondent] David Martin at the Pentagon, etcetera—then you have the whole pie." (Ayers, 2004) Rick Atkinson added, "If you buy into the proposition you're going to be with a unit, then that's what you are going to see. The obligation of the reporter is to make the best of [his or her situation]." (Ayers, 2004)

Coverage, overall, tended to be more comprehensive in the major newspapers than that shown in live and recorded television reports. (Smith, 2003) Writers at the newspapers could take all their embedded reporters' daily stories and notes that were electronically sent from the battlefield and combine them with other's notes to produce a clearer picture than television images of firefights and burning vehicles, which tended to be "run and run endlessly...[they were] not informative. There's an entertainment factor that's huge on television in creating this drama." (Kurtz, 2003) Although "irresistibly fascinating," the television reports were "not crammed with information." (Friedman, 2003) A CNN anchor warned his audience that the reports were "snapshots" and that "its our job here to put it all together." (Friedman, 2003) The always articulate George Will of ABC News stated that "today's problem—live television from journalists with

units engaged in Iraq—is the problem of context. Up-close combat engagements almost always look confusing and awful because they are.” (Friedman, 2003) The “News Hour with Jim Lehrer” stated that, “the greater significance of much of what was shown was lost amid the ‘almost addictive’ and highly dramatic reports.” (Ranade, 2003)

The summary stories in the newspapers were “aided immeasurably by the full-page maps that charted troop movements, most of which were simpler and easier to comprehend than the high-tech studio sand tables favored by the corps of television generals.” (Smith, 2003) Newspapers had the benefit of being able to partially digest what was being reported before having to produce a product for public consumption. Said one newspaper editor: “I thought it was newspapering at its very best. We were able to take a breath and sort out what happened, compared to the overwhelming immediacy of television, where there was no ability to step back and provide context.” (Kurtz, 2003) “The fog of war makes foggy news,” said Robert Lichter of the Center for Media and Public Affairs. “War is too messy to package into sound bites and two-minute stories.”

(d) Censorship and Objectivity

As seen by the history of war reporting, censorship has always been an issue for the war correspondent. It was no different for the journalists who covered Operation Iraqi Freedom. Obviously, those unilateral correspondents had no serious threats to their ability to report whatever they desired, regardless of content. They effectively traded the relative safety and up-close access to the military of the embedded program for

freedom of movement and freedom from censorship. Of similar nature has been the concern for objectivity in reporting. In examining the current debate on embedding, both these issues were very much a concern for the news industry and those journalists being embedded.

Prior to the war, there were many fears among the media about the embedded program. A common comment was that "embed" really meant "in bed," (Isaacson and Jordan, 2003) and that the program was a truly ingenious method of the Pentagon subtly imposing censorship on the media. (Berkowitz, 2003) The argument goes that the very act of being physically embedded within a military unit—sharing all their hardships, privations, and dangers—would effectively eliminate journalistic objectivity, and provide de facto censorship on the news coming out of the battlefield. (Anderson, 2003, Berkowitz, 2003) Others labeled the embedded journalists as "cheerleaders" for the military. (Brookings, 2003, Kurtz, 2003) Said one commentator: "There was cheerleading going on. There was a certain amount of gushing." (Ranade, 2003) Bob Franken, commenting on the possible loss of objectivity of the embeds, reported, "I, quite frankly, think that some were [losing their objectivity]. There was a sort of Stockholm syndrome. It's very tempting to become part of the unit." (Brookings, 2003) Others complained that the entire program was "something that ensured favorable coverage of the military. You are more connected to the military organization than you are to your own news organization." (Ranade, 2003) More harsh criticism was offered by Norman Solomon of the Institute for Public Accuracy, who said that the war correspondents were "so embedded with the troops,

they may as well be getting a P.R. retainer from the Pentagon." (Zwirko, 2003)

The issue of objectivity and censorship remains the largest question emerging from the embedded program. A workshop conducted at the U.S. Army War College's Center for Strategic Leadership entitled *Reporters on the Ground: The Military and the Media's Joint Experience During Operation Iraqi Freedom* "failed to come to a consensus as to whether an embedded reporter can report about a unit with complete objectivity." (Pasquarett, 2003) "Most journalists who are honest will tell you it's impossible to be totally objective...In wartime, you probably wouldn't want to," commented author Michael Sweeney. (Karras, 2003) Steve Bell, a journalism instructor at Ball State University offered the following thoughts once the news stories began to flow from the embedded reporters:

There's a lot of criticism now that the embedded journalists are in bed with their units...I haven't seen real examples of that. I think that we are getting good journalism, of course, they're the home team. We're Americans, they're Americans. When you report from a military unit consistently, you get to know the people, you are sharing their daily life, there is an emotional connection and attachment that comes with it, but...that doesn't mean you're going to hide things that are embarrassing or negative, not if you're a good reporter. (Berkowitz, 2003)

C. CHAPTER SUMMARY

The tale of war correspondents during the 150 years that they have plied their trade has been one of many highs and lows. They have endured excessive censorship, questions of objectivity, and troubles with access to the front lines. Conversely, they have experienced tremendous

access and freedom on the battlefield. Advances in technology have greatly enhanced the ability of war correspondents to transmit breaking news almost instantaneously to a news hungry public. The events of September 11, 2001 catapulted the United States into a global war on terrorism, which demands to be reported on. Recall Pulitzer Prize winning war correspondent Chris Hedges' thoughts on war: "War is a force that gives us meaning...the most powerful narcotic invented by humankind is war." (Moyers, n.d.) The war correspondent is the conduit through which the public receives its information on such defining moments in our history. With the embedded media program practiced in Operation Iraqi Freedom, the American public was able to view the face of modern warfare as never before. As the fight continues in Iraq today, reporters embedded with soldiers and Marines in places such as Baghdad, Fallujah, and Mosul continue to offer valuable insight to the struggle to defeat the growing insurgency within that troubled country. The debate will always exist as to the true effectiveness of the embedded war correspondent. The affect that this embedding of journalists within the U.S. military—and how this study will attempt to determine if the program truly does allow the correspondent to report in a different manner than his non-embedded counterpart—is what the next chapters will discuss.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. INTRODUCTION

Nothing can now be believed which is seen in a newspaper. Truth itself becomes suspicious by being put into that polluted vehicle. . . . The man who never looks into a newspaper is better informed than he who reads them: inasmuch as he who knows nothing is nearer to truth than he whose mind is filled with falsehood and errors. - President Thomas Jefferson (Plath, n.d.)

This study addresses the newspaper coverage of Operation Iraqi Freedom by examining the content of the embedded and non-embedded war reporting of various newspapers. This chapter will specifically discuss the research methodology used in completing this study. The corpus will be addressed, as well as discuss ethnographic content analysis and the ten exploratory factors that were used to compare the work of both groups of reporters.

B. NEWSPAPERS SELECTED FOR ANALYSIS

After examining a wide variety of national, state, and local newspapers, as well as major news magazines, an initial list of potential sources was compiled. Following careful consideration it was determined that those newspapers with a large, national circulation would be examined rather than smaller, local newspapers—because national newspapers were able to fund numerous journalists to cover the war. This fact alone made the corpus of this study much easier to identify. The five top U.S. newspapers ranked by weekday circulation averages for the six months ending March 31, 2003 (AdAge.com, 2003) are listed in Table 1:

Table 1. U.S. newspapers by circulation

Rank	Newspaper	Average Daily Circulation	Sunday Circulation
1	<i>USA Today</i>	2,162,454	2,602,556
2	<i>Wall Street Journal</i>	1,820,600	0
3	<i>New York Times</i>	1,130,740	1,672,965
4	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	979,549	1,396,045
5	<i>Washington Post</i>	796,367	1,049,322

The newspapers that included a sufficient and equal number of embedded and non-embedded correspondents, as well as published articles were:

- 1) *The New York Times*
- 2) *Los Angeles Times*
- 3) *Washington Post*

An initial reading of the articles revealed that they could sufficiently answer the research questions of this study. As a review, the research questions are: (1) How did embedded journalists affect the content of U.S. news reporting of Operation Iraqi Freedom? (2) Was the reporting of the embedded and non-embedded journalists balanced? (3) Were the critics' accusations of "soda straw" reporting justified? Or in other words, is the embedded corpus more narrow in scope and depth than the non-embedded corpus?

C. REPORTERS SELECTED FOR ANALYSIS

Concurrent with selecting which newspapers to be examined in this study was the identification and selection of which reporters' articles would become part of the corpus. Embedded reporters were selected from the official embedded assignments dated 17 February 2003

provided by the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Office of Public Affairs (ASDnames, 2003) and open sources on the internet (MarineParents.com, 2003). Non-embedded reporters were obtained by searching the various newspaper websites and newspaper databases such as *LEXIS/NEXIS* and *Proquest*. Tables 2 and 3 list the selected embedded and non-embedded reporters affiliated with each newspaper.

Table 2. Embedded correspondents

<i>New York Times</i>	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	<i>Washington Post</i>
Dexter Filkins	David Zucchino	Peter Baker
John Kifner	Geoffrey Mohan	William Branigin
Michael Wilson	Tony Perry	Steve Vogel

Table 3. Non-embedded correspondents

<i>New York Times</i>	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	<i>Washington Post</i>
Thom Shanker	Bob Drogin	Vernon Loeb
Eric Schmitt	Michael Slackman	Thomas E. Ricks
David E. Sanger	Greg Miller	Jonathan Weisman
	Alissa J. Rubin	

D. THE CORPUS

The number of embedded and non-embedded stories included in the original corpus was 311 embedded and non-embedded articles. Upon a thorough reading of these articles, it was decided to choose certain dates within this time period around which this study would be centered. The dates were chosen according to major events in the ground campaign to overthrow the regime of Saddam Hussein. (Cordesman, 2003, Kusnetz, Arkin, and Meigs, 2003)

Once these dates were identified, the next days' news articles for the selected embedded and non-embedded reporters were chosen for inclusion in the final corpus. For example, the above sources state that the initial invasion of Iraq by U.S. and United Kingdom (UK) forces occurred during the evening 20 March 2003. Taking into account the time difference between print reporters in the war zone and their respective newspapers located in the United States, the news articles from 21 March 2003 were selected to be part of the corpus. In this manner, the major news events of the ground campaign served as a focus to examine the body of work produced by the embedded and non-embedded reporters to see how the content of their reporting in light of these events differed as a function of their embedded or non-embedded status.

By selecting specific dates during the 20 March-14 April 2003 time period, the corpus was reduced from 311 to 93 stories total. This number reflects 31.8 % of the all embedded and non-embedded news articles written by the selected journalists selected for this study. Table 4 lists the major news events of the war and the news dates chosen for this study.

Table 4. Major news events of Operation Iraqi Freedom

Date	Event	News Day
20 March 2003	U.S. and UK forces cross into Iraq; seizure of the Rumalyah oil fields	21 March 2003
23 March 2003	The "Worst Day of the War": The ambush of the U.S. Army 507 th Maintenance Company; heavy U.S. Marine casualties in An Nasiriyah	24 March 2003
25 March 2003	Fierce sandstorms and Iraqi paramilitary attacks threaten to bring drive to Baghdad to a halt; intense fighting in Najaf and An Nasiriyah; U.S. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld warns that Iraqi military may use chemical weapons as U.S. forces cross "red line" south of Baghdad	26 March 2003
27 March 2003	Sandstorms abate in central Iraq; heavy fighting continues in Najaf and An Nasiriyah;	28 March 2003
01 April 2003	U.S. prisoner of war PFC Jessica Lynch rescued in An Nasiriyah; U.S. forces prepare to cross Karbala Gap; U.S. 101 st Airborne Division secures Najaf airfield	02 April 2003
05 April 2003	U.S. 3d Infantry Division conducts "Thunder Run" into Baghdad; U.S. Marines reach Diyala River east of Baghdad;	06 April 2003
09 April 2003	U.S. Marines reach downtown Baghdad and topple statue of Saddam Hussein in Firdos Square; Looting erupts in Baghdad; Iraqi government effectively disappears	10 April 2003
13 April 2003	U.S. Marines advance on Tikrit, Saddam Hussein's hometown; U.S. Marines rescue seven U.S. prisoners of war north of Baghdad; Looting continues in Baghdad;	14 April 2003

Every attempt was made to examine an equal number of embedded and non-embedded reporters for each newspaper, with the endstate being an equal number of embedded and non-embedded news articles. Table 5 addresses the total number of embedded and non-embedded articles analyzed, while Table 6 is a summary of the corpus.

Table 5. News articles by source

Newspaper	Embedded Articles	Non-Embedded Articles	Total
<i>New York Times</i>	15	14	29
<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	19	8	27
<i>Washington Post</i>	16	21	37
Total	50	43	93

Table 6. Summary of corpus

	Number of Reporters	Percentage of Total	Number of Articles	Percentage of Total
Embedded	9	45	50	54
Non-Embedded	11	55	43	46
Total	20	100	93	100

The *New York Times* trio of Dexter Filkins, John Kifner, and Michael Wilson, all embedded with U.S. forces, penned 15 articles chronicling their experiences (Table 7). Their non-embedded counterparts Thom Shanker, Eric Schmitt, and David E. Sanger wrote 14 articles covering the progress of the war (Table 8).

Table 7. *New York Times* Embedded reporters

Embedded Reporter	Number of Articles
Dexter Filkins	7
John Kifner	5
Michael Wilson	3
Total	15

Table 8. *New York Times* Non-embedded reporters

Non-Embedded Reporter	Number of Articles
David E. Sanger	3
Eric Schmitt	6
Thom Shanker	5
Total	14

The Los Angeles Times provided three embedded reporters and 4 non-embedded reporters. Their body of work includes 19 embedded articles (Table 9) and eight non-embedded articles (Table 10).

Table 9. *Los Angeles Times* Embedded reporters

Embedded Reporter	Number of Articles
Geoffrey Mohan	4
Tony Perry	8
David Zucchino	7
Total	19

Table 10. *Los Angeles Times* Non-embedded reporters

Non-Embedded Reporter	Number of Articles
Bob Drogin	3
Greg Miller	3
Michael Slackman	1
Alissa J. Rubin	1
Total	8

The final newspaper examined was the Washington Post. A total of six reporters—three embedded and three non-embedded—wrote 16 (Table 11) and 21 (Table 12) articles, respectively.

Table 11. *Washington Post* Embedded reporters

Embedded Reporter	Number of Articles
Peter Baker	8
William Branigin	6
Steve Vogel	2
Total	16

Table 12. *Washington Post* Non-embedded reporters

Non-Embedded Reporter	Number of Articles
Vernon Loeb	10
Thomas E. Ricks	6
Jonathan Weisman	5
Total	21

Appendix B (Daily News Coverage) illustrates in detail the news coverage during the time period of the study, listing the number of stories each reporter submitted each day from March 20, 2003 to April 14, 2003.

E. ETHNOGRAPHIC CONTENT ANALYSIS

Ethnography is the systematic recording of human cultures. (Merriam-Webster, 1987) Ethnographic Content Analysis (ECA) was first introduced in 1987 by Dr. David E. Altheide of Arizona State University and is currently regarded as "a specific method of qualitative analysis." (Altheide, 1987) According to Altheide, "ECA is an integrated method, procedure, and technique for locating, identifying, retrieving, and analyzing documents for their relevance, significance, and meaning. The emphasis is on discovery and description, including search for contexts, underlying meanings, patterns, and processes, rather than mere quantity or numerical relationships between two or more variables." (Altheide, 1996)

ECA was derived from Altheide's attempt to combine traditional objective content analysis with participant observation, or "how a researcher interacts with documentary materials so that specific statements can be placed in proper context for analysis." (Altheide, 1996) Documentary materials—documents—are defined by Altheide as "any symbolic representation that can be recorded or retrieved for analysis." (Altheide, 1996) Of the three classes of documents available for researchers—primary, secondary, and auxiliary—this study focuses on newspaper

articles, which are defined in primary documents. (Altheide, 1996)

As mentioned above, ECA differs from traditional quantitative content analysis (QCA) in that "the major tact of QCA is to verify or confirm hypothesized relationships rather than discover new or emergent patterns." (Altheide, 1996) Table 13 compares ECA and QCA on 14 different areas. (Altheide, 1996)

Table 13. Comparison of QCA and ECA

Topic	Quantitative Content Analysis	Ethnographic Content Analysis
Research goal	Verification	Discovery; verification
Reflexive research design	Seldom	Always
Emphasis	Reliability	Validity
Progression from data collection, analysis, interpretation	Serial	Reflective, circular
Primary researcher involvement	Data analysis and interpretation	All phases
Sample	Random or stratified	Purposive and theoretical
Prestructured categories	All	Some
Training required to collect data	Little	Substantial
Type of data	Numbers	Numbers; narrative
Data entry points	Once	Multiple
Narrative description and comments	Seldom	Always
Concepts emerge during research	Seldom	Always
Data analysis	Statistical	Textual; statistical
Data presentation	Tables	Tables and text

The goal of ECA is "to be systematic and analytic but not rigid." (Altheide, 1996) Altheide states that categories and variables do indeed play a part in the framework of the study, in that they serve as initial guides for the researcher. However, ECA embraces two unique tenets: other variables will come to surface as the researcher collects and analyzes data, and the fact that ECA has "an orientation toward constant discovery and constant comparison of relevant situations, settings, images, meanings, and nuances." (Altheide, 1996) It is

critical for the reader to understand that "although items and topics can still be counted and put in emergent categories, it is also important to provide good descriptive information." (Altheide, 1996)

F. STUDY FACTORS

To answer the research questions listed above, the embedded and non-embedded writings were examined using the factors listed below:

- News sources
- Lead paragraph
- Inverted pyramid
- Scope
- Depth
- Angle
- Framing
- Balanced reporting
- Theme development

G. NEWS SOURCES, LEAD PARAGRAPH, AND INVERTED PYRAMID

Perhaps one of the most important decisions a reporter can make in writing a news article is from where they will gather their information. The sources a reporter depends upon can vary from wire reports to news conferences to interviews. Of course, for a reporter who depends upon interviews, it is essential to understand that each source has a specific view and opinion of events. This varying level of situational awareness dramatically affects the content of a news story. An interview conducted in the "D" ring of the Pentagon will likely yield different results

than one conducted in the back of an armored vehicle as it speeds across the desert.

Each news article written for public consumption is constructed according to certain journalistic techniques. Being organizational products, they are assembled for public review according to a certain routine and standard. Altheide labels this as *process*, or "how something is actually created and put together." (Altheide, 1996) Journalism instructor Lisa Greeves identifies one of the more important techniques every journalist uses as the "Lead," or the opening elements of story. (Greeves, n.d.) The lead can be crafted in one of three ways: (1) news lead, (2) quote lead, and (3) description lead. (Freep.com, n.d.) The following are examples of each:

News lead: In one of their bloodiest raids into Lebanon in years, Israeli warplanes killed dozens of Muslim guerrillas with rockets and machine-gun fire Thursday as they pounded a training camp of the pro-Iranian party of God. (Freep.com, n.d.)

Quote lead: "I have the worst job in the Army." This is an example of a good quote lead because the reader asks, "What could that possibly be?" (Freep.com, n.d.)

Description lead: Penciled sketches of an air strike, complete with renderings of F14s and Patriot missiles. And on the ground, tiny people run for cover. That's how 8-year-old Jimmy Zayas pictures war in the Middle East... (Freep.com, n.d.)

Another technique used by journalists in organizing and constructing their stories is the "inverted pyramid." Inverted pyramid describes a form of news story with the most newsworthy facts first and remainder in order of descending importance. (Greeves, n.d.) According to Rich

Cameron, chair of the journalism department at Cerritos College in California:

An example of a regular pyramid story might be an old-fashioned mystery where the reader is introduced to more and more important clues as he or she reads on...With an inverted pyramid story we give away the solution (or in our case the summary) at the very beginning. The rest of the story contains less and less important information until we just stop. (Cameron, n.d.)

H. ANGLE, SCOPE, AND DEPTH

The unique prism of the embedded or non-embedded reporter directly translates to the several factors of the reporters' writing when making an evaluation of the content of an article. These include the angle the journalist addresses his subject, resulting in either "soft" or "hard" news, the scope of the article, the depth of the reporting, and the specific framing used by the author.

The "angle" of an article is defined as "the outlook we [reporters] take on the subject, the point of view we adopt." (YRE, n.d.) For example, if a reporter chooses to write about the U.S. Army's M1A1 battle tank, they could focus on the soldiers who operate it, their training, or the technical aspects of the machine. In writing about a battle, a reporter could choose to simply describe the events in a fact-driven, no-nonsense manner, or delve into the actual personalities of a certain soldier or Marine that fought in that same battle. The "angle" one adopts as a reporter in writing on a subject is applicable in determining if a story is "hard" or "soft" news. "Hard" and "soft" can also be translated as "news" and "feature" stories. Both are defined below:

News stories are the basis for all of the paper - often opinion and feature pieces are built on news stories. They follow the basic rules of journalism and are usually most concerned with reporting events and other news in a straightforward, informative manner...Features are in-depth human-interest stories. They are often not bound by breaking stories and can be covered at any given time, [and]...allow the reader to take a look at something they have not seen before, to bring to visibility that which is invisible. (Jteacher.com, n.d.)

The scope and depth of an article as well address the content of a news article. Scope is concerned with the either narrow or broad expanse of the article. For example, an article focused solely on a single event would be more narrow in scope than an article dealing with multiple events or issues. Using the above example of an article about the M1A1 battle tank, a story focusing only on the initial training and qualifications of the soldiers operating the tank would be narrow in scope compared to an article discussing the initial training, advanced training, maneuvers, exercises, and eventual deployment overseas.

Depth of an article simply refers to the richness and profundity—thoroughness and completeness in detail—of the reporters' writing. Both scope and depth are essential to affirming or denying the accusations listed in Chapter II that describes embedded reporters' work in Operation Iraqi Freedom as "soda-straw" reporting. (Pasquarett, 2003, Smith, 2003) Scope and depth are closely related to the episodic or thematic framing of a news story.

I. EPISODIC AND THEMATIC FRAMING

Shanto Iyengar, a professor of political science and communication studies at the University of California at Los Angeles, explores the framing effects of television

news on political issues in his book, *Is Anyone Responsible? How Television Frames Issues*. (Iyengar, 1991) Framing is "the selection, emphasis and exclusion of particular pieces of information that lead observers to particular conclusions or narrow possible courses of action." (Kilpatrick and Leweke, 1997) Communicators, (in this study, embedded or non-embedded reporters) "select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation and/or treatment recommendation for the item described." (Entman, 1993)

Iyengar states that television frames topics in two ways—episodic and thematic. (Iyengar, 1991) Episodic framing shows an "event-oriented report and depicts issues in terms of concrete instances." (Iyengar, 1991) Thematic coverage describes issues in more general terms rather than specific instances: "The thematic frame, by contrast, places public issues in some more general or abstract context and takes the form of a 'takeout' or 'backgrounder' report directed at general outcomes or conditions" (Iyengar, 1991) In summation, the difference in the two is, "[E]pisodic framing depicts concrete events that illustrate issues, while thematic framing presents collective or general evidence." (Iyengar, 1991)

Episodic and thematic framing is easily applied to newspaper reporting. It is important to note that every news story contains both episodic and thematic to different degrees, but, in general, newspapers tend to be more episodic in reporting. (Iyengar, 1991) As applied to this study, episodic framing would be used to describe a single

firefight or capturing an objective-specific events or cases. Thematic framing would be used to describe an article about the overall progress of the war to date, strategy, and other larger issues.

J. BALANCED REPORTING

Of major concern to the critics of the embedded media program was the thought that the reporters' close proximity to the soldiers and Marines racing to Baghdad would cost them their journalistic objectivity. A common comment was that "embed" really meant "in bed," (Isaacson and Jordan, 2003) and that the program was a truly ingenious method of the Pentagon subtly imposing censorship on the media. (Berkowitz, 2003) Accordingly, another factor useful in examining the news content of the embedded and non-embedded reporters is to explore how balanced the reporting was from both sources. Presenting only one side of an issue, or avoiding controversial subjects such as friendly fire casualties, equipment malfunctions, or illegal killings by U.S. personnel would obviously not equate to balanced reporting—as feared by the critics of the embedded program. As one critic opined: "[It was] something that ensured favorable coverage of the military. You are more connected to the military organization than you are to your own news organization." (Ranade, 2003)

K. THEME DEVELOPMENT

Context is the social situation surrounding the document that assists the audience "to grasp the significance of the document itself, even independently of the content of the document." (Altheide, 1996) For this study context can be applied to the actual embedding or non-embedding of journalists within ground forces. Simply by virtue of their physical location, the context of the

embedded reporters articles—the circumstances in which the article is authored—is obviously different from those non-embedded journalists. The difference lies in the prism through the journalist views the events—from the back of a Bradley Fighting Vehicle racing into Saddam International Airport or within the sterile confines of the offices of the *Los Angeles Times*, *New York Times*, or *Washington Post*.

In tracking discourse, it is understood that meanings and patterns do not immediately appear, but “emerge or become more clear through constant comparison and investigation of documents over time.” (Altheide, 1996) This is the concept of *emergence*—the gradual shaping of meaning—as it applies to ECA. (Altheide, 1996) Through examining both embedded and non-embedded reporting against the backdrop of major events in Operation Iraqi Freedom over a 26-day period, certain themes and nuances are revealed.

The corpus of this study consisted of 93 articles, which were read and analyzed for specific themes, nuances, and meanings to determine general topical categories for analysis. The initial coding, achieved through qualitative data analysis software (Nvivo), produced six topical themes, as well as emergent coding of seven additional topical themes.

L. CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter addressed the research methodology employed to analyze newspaper coverage of embedded and non-embedded reporters during Operation Iraqi Freedom. The initial step taken to determine the corpus of the study involved selecting newspapers that could answer the research questions. Through national circulation figures

as of 31 March 2003, three newspapers were selected. With the newspapers selected, embedded and non-embedded reporters were identified.

With several journalists' names identified, internet literary search engines such as *LEXIS/NEXIS* and *Proquest* were used to determine how prolific they were concerning coverage of the war. If a sufficient number of stories were available, the reporter was selected to become part of the corpus. Once the corpus was identified, individual news days during the time period this study encompasses were chosen according to the major tactical actions occurring on the battlefield. Each day of articles was then thoroughly read and coded for certain themes, nuances, images, and meanings, using NVivo. From this exploration, 13 categorical topics were identified to facilitate the exploration of the research questions. ECA was used for 'tracking discourse,' or following certain issues, words, themes, and frames over a period of time, and across different newspapers. Journalistic techniques, or "study factors," were then used to explore the differing content of these two groups of journalists.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

IV. FINDINGS

A. INTRODUCTION

The public have an insatiable curiosity to know everything. Except what is worth knowing. Journalism, conscious of this, and having tradesman-like habits, supplies their demands. (Wilde, *The Soul of a Man Under Socialism*, 1895)

In the above quote, Oscar Wilde pokes fun at the tendency of the news media's attempt to barrage the reading public with meaningless information. While some may still agree with Wilde's assertion, it is undeniable that the world in which he formed his opinions concerning journalism was a much less complex place than that it is today. Here, at the turn of the 21st century, journalists are the "eyewitnesses to history," providing valuable insight to matters of great interest and importance. This is especially true of the embedded war correspondents that covered the campaign to overthrow Saddam Hussein in 2003.

This study examines a body of news articles produced by embedded and non-embedded journalists during Operation Iraqi Freedom. Nine factors comparing the work of the embedded and non-embedded reporters were then used to explore the differing content of these two groups of journalists. These exploratory factors were determined from universally recognized journalistic techniques employed in constructing news articles (Freep.com, n.d., YRE, n.d., Jteacher.com, n.d.) and previous studies regarding the news media. (Iyengar, 1991, Entman, 1993, Kilpatrick and Leweke, 1997) The factors of the embedded and non-embedded journalists' reporting that were explored are listed in Table 14.

Table 14. Study factors

FACTOR
News sources
Lead paragraph
Inverted pyramid
Scope
Depth
Angle
Framing
Balanced reporting
Theme development

B. FACTORS

The presentation of the findings of this study will follow the same pattern for all nine factors analyzed. The results of each factor will be discussed, addressing the writing of both embedded and non-embedded reporters. Passages from the data set will be cited to support the analysis. Passages will be referenced according to a format identifying the author, newspaper, and date of article. As a review, the following abbreviations apply: NYT is the *New York Times*, LAT is the *Los Angeles Times*, and WP is the *Washington Post*. Embedded journalists are designated by their last name alone, while all non-embedded journalists are designated by the initials "NE" (non-embedded), and their last name. For example, (Baker, WP, 21 Mar) references a passage from embedded journalist Peter Baker in the 21 March 2003 edition of the *Washington Post*. (NE Miller, LAT, 10 Apr) references a passage written by non-embedded journalist Greg Miller in the 10 April 2003 edition of the *Los Angeles Times*.

1. Factor # 1: News Sources

This topic involved the sources that the embedded or non-embedded journalist used in crafting their story for publication. In examining the articles for this factor, the embedded reporters displayed an overwhelming tendency to use soldiers and Marines on the battlefield describing the event or action within their article. These eyewitness accounts gave an air of authenticity and granularity to the war that was not present in the non-embedded reporters' accounts. Embedded reporters, traveling with the 3d Infantry Division and 1st Marine Division included these sources for their reading audience (bolded sections indicate the individual quoted):

Pfc. Justin Davis, 19, of Chattanooga, was guarding the perimeter of this camp, headquarters of the 1st Marine Expeditionary Force. He saw "a big ball of fire" and knew 'we're finally at war.' **Pfc. Mark Johnson, 18**, from Auburn, Ala., saw 'a big fireball and black and smoke.' (Baker, WP, 21 Mar)

Wearing goggles against the sandstorm, their faces covered with dust, Army mechanics toiled by flashlight and 'chem light' to prepare the vehicles for battle. 'Five layers of dirt are keeping me warm,' **one mechanic joked**. (Branigin, WP, 26 Mar)

'The rule of thumb is: If he doesn't put his weapon down, he's not surrendering,' said **a company first sergeant**. 'In that case, take him out.' (Zucchino, LAT, 02 Apr)

By sunset, Corpsman Smith's ambulance overflowed with his wounded Marines, and even some Iraqis he had tried to save. 'All the stretchers were full of blood,' **Corpsman Smith recalled**, looking at interior of his ambulance, now scrubbed clean and reeking of disinfectant. 'I was shooting guys with morphine. Pretty much all of them had gunshot wounds.' (Filkins, NYT, 06 Apr)

'I put about 200 rounds through his windshield from 500 meters,' said **Sgt. Derrick January, 31**, of Missouri, the gunner for the tank. 'I hit him at 175 meters with a HEAT round. Allah was thinking of him today.' (Mohan, LAT, 10 Apr)

'Nasiriyah was supposed to be a six-hour fight,' said **Gunnery Sgt. Tracy Hale, 32**, of Philadelphia, who was injured in the battle and brought to the field hospital here. 'It's already been five days. Five days of nonstop, 24-hour fighting.' (Baker, WP, 28 Mar)

One of the rocket-propelled grenades hit close to **Cpl. Willie Anderson, 23**, from Bossier City, La., 'I saw about five people standing behind the building,' he said. 'They got a (expletive) RPG,' he said. 'All I could do was cover my face. It blinded me and knocked me back. That's all I remember.' (Baker, WP, 28 Mar)

Of note are the persons the reporters are quoting; all individuals on the ground conducting the assault into Iraq. This results in a very personal accounting of the action. Compare this with the sources employed by non-embedded reporters; high-ranking administration officials, the ubiquitous "Pentagon official," or "defense expert."

'Combat is our last choice,' **one Pentagon official** said. 'And if you can tip the balance without a full-scale operation, don't you owe it to your country to do that?' (NE Miller, LAT, 21 Mar)

Daniel Benjamin, a senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, a Washington think tank, said the strike could lead Hussein and other leaders to wonder 'if the United States targeted that particular location because of either a traitor in their midst or communications that were even more compromised than they knew.' (NE Loeb, WP, 21 Mar)

'Iraqi soldiers and officers must ask themselves whether they want to die fighting for a doomed

regime or do they want to survive,' **Mr. Rumsfeld told reporters.** (NE Schmitt, NYT, 21 Mar)

'At a minimum,' added **Tom Donnelly, a defense expert at the American Enterprise Institute,** 'there's surely no downside for making it obvious that we know where he is, we're coming after him, and if we didn't get him this time, we're going to get him one of these times.' (NE Loeb, WP, 21 Mar)

'If I were in Baghdad and I was looking south and I saw a U.S. Army division that is on the outskirts of Baghdad, I don't know that that would be shock, but I'd certainly be a little concerned,' **General Myers** told reporters. 'And they'll have a lot more to be concerned about shortly.' (NE Schmitt, NYT, 26 Mar)

Retired military officers were frequently used as sources by the non-embedded reporters. The non-embedded journalists, lacking front line access, amply sprinkled their writings with quotes from these self-touted experts on the Iraqi military, military planning, military history, military strategy, and infantry tactics—presumably to lend authenticity and credibility to the article.

'We're looking at air power that is 10 times more powerful than it was in the 1991 Gulf War,' **said retired Air Force Lt. Gen. Thomas G. McInerney.** (NE Loeb, WP, 06 Apr)

'It was a big swallow for the land forces to move out with unsecured flanks and a tenuous logistic supply line,' **said retired Air Force Gen. Charles Horner,** the commander of the air campaign in the 1991 war against Iraq. 'But that kept the Iraqis off guard.' (NE Ricks, WP, 10 Apr)

Of interest was that, at times, non-embedded reporters "sampled" sources from their embedded counterparts to better illustrate a larger theme. Peter Baker of the *Washington Post* interviewed Marines wounded during the

fighting in An Nasiriyah at an field hospital called Camp Viper, and provided the following quote in an article titled, "A 'Turkey Shoot,' but With Marines as the Targets."

'Nasiriyah was supposed to be a six-hour fight,' **said Gunnery Sgt. Tracy Hale, 32,** of Philadelphia, who was injured in the battle and brought to the field hospital here. 'It's already been five days. Five days of nonstop, 24-hour fighting.' (Baker, WP, 28 Mar)

Jonathan Weisman, a non-embedded reporter also writing for the *Washington Post* included Baker's source in his article titled, "Casualties, Expectations Might Collide; Experts Warn of Rising Losses as Factor in Support for War."

'Nasiriyah was supposed to be a six-hour fight,' **a wounded gunnery sergeant said at a field hospital** yesterday. 'It's already been five days. Five days of nonstop, 24-hour fighting.' (NE Weisman, WP, 28 Mar)

The assessment of this factor reveals that the use of individual soldiers and Marines as sources was highly employed by the embedded reporters. Embedded access to the personal insights of a 19-year-old Marine or 31-year-old Army sergeant resulted in more personal accounts of combat action from the embedded reporters. Non-embedded reporters, whether thousands of miles from the fighting in the United States or across the border in Kuwait, appeared to rely on government officials, military officers, and retired analysts in their accounts.

2. Factor # 2: Lead Paragraph

The journalistic term "lead paragraph" describes the opening elements or introduction of story. As described in Chapter III, they are classified as being a news, quote, or

descriptive lead. Embedded reporters displayed a tendency to use news and descriptive lead paragraphs in their work. Of the 50 embedded articles, 25 used descriptive leads, 23 used news leads, with the remaining two having used quote lead paragraphs. Examples are provided below:

News lead paragraph:

HEADLINE: A NATION AT WAR: IN THE FIELD NASIRIYA;
A Sudden Iraqi Attack at Sunset Surprises a Key
Marine Center South of the Euphrates
BYLINE: By Michael Wilson
DATELINE: NASIRIYA, Iraq, March 27

LEAD PARAGRAPH: Even as Marine officers proclaimed this Euphrates River city secured after four days of street fighting, Iraqi troops launched at sunset Wednesday the largest and most organized surprise attack yet on the American positions south of the river.

Quote lead paragraph:

HEADLINE: A NATION AT WAR: IN THE FIELD FIRST
MARINE DIVISION; Orders in Place, Word Goes Out
That 'This Is It'
BYLINE: By John Kifner
DATELINE: WITH THE FIRST MARINE DIVISION, in
central Iraq, April 1

LEAD PARAGRAPH: "This is it," said Brig. Gen. John F. Kelly, assistant commander of the First Marine Division.

Descriptive lead paragraph:

HEADLINE: WAR WITH IRAQ / BATTLING THE ELEMENTS;
Troops Face Off With Grit
BYLINE: By Tony Perry and Geoffrey Mohan
DATELINE: Southern Iraq, March 26

LEAD PARAGRAPH: The sand is like thick powder, choking men and machinery. When the rain starts, it becomes the texture of peanut butter.

Everything turns burnt orange, then all goes dark.

During the same time period non-embedded reporters overwhelmingly used news lead paragraphs along with a much smaller amount of descriptive lead paragraphs. From the 43 non-embedded articles in the corpus, 35 contained news lead paragraphs, while eight articles used descriptive lead paragraphs. Of interest was the discovery that the non-embedded reporters, while not directly quoting an individual to begin their article, often stated that the previously penned information in the news lead paragraph was obtained from an official source, i.e., "...defense officials said Friday," or "...the nation's top battlefield commander said yesterday." This occurred in 16 of the 35 news lead paragraphs. The following are examples of the non-embedded journalists' lead paragraphs:

News lead paragraph:

HEADLINE: Missing Soldier Rescued;
U.S. Forces Remove POW From Hospital
BYLINE: Vernon Loeb and Dana Priest, Washington
Post Staff Writers
DATE: April 2

LEAD PARAGRAPH: Jessica Lynch, a 19-year-old private first class missing since the ambush of an Army maintenance company 10 days ago in southern Iraq, has been rescued by Special Operations forces, defense officials said yesterday.

Descriptive lead paragraph:

HEADLINE: WAR WITH IRAQ; In Shiite Ghetto, a Vacuum Is Filled by Brutal Street Justice
BYLINE: Michael Slackman
DATE: April 14

LEAD PARAGRAPH: Samir Ali Alou had a large knife and a mission: to help die-hard supporters of Saddam Hussein kill and terrorize Shiite Muslims, hoping to spark sectarian violence.

By virtue of their embedded access, the embedded reporters were privy to a seemingly endless source of unique and original insights that were not available for their counterparts thousands of miles away writing about the conflict. This resulted in more descriptive lead paragraphs being written to introduce their work than the non-embedded reporters.

3. Factor # 3: Inverted Pyramid

This factor addresses the journalistic technique known as the "inverted pyramid." This term describes a form of news story with most important facts first and remainder in order of descending importance. Ken Blake, Ph.D. Middle Tennessee State University, summarizes the meaning of the inverted pyramid:

To understand what the 'inverted pyramid' name means, picture an upside-down triangle—one with the narrow tip pointing downward and the broad base pointing upward. The broad base represents the most newsworthy information in the news story, and the narrow tip represents the least newsworthy information in the news story. When you write a story in inverted pyramid format, you put the most newsworthy information at the beginning of the story and the least newsworthy information at the end. (Blake, n.d.)

The corpus revealed that non-embedded reporters utilized the "inverted pyramid" more often in their writing than the embedded reporters.

Of interest was the discovery that among both embedded and non-embedded reporters, the inverted pyramid was more often found coupled with stories that used news lead

paragraphs. Articles with descriptive lead paragraphs were less likely to use the inverted pyramid. They often appeared to start in the present, then flashed back to the past to inform the readers of additional interesting and important details to provide a fuller understanding of the story. The *Washington Post's* William Branigin, embedded with the 3d Infantry Division, used the inverted pyramid in his March 24, 2003 article carrying the headline: Iraqi Militia No Match For Armored Column:

DATELINE: NEAR NAJAF, Iraq March 23

U.S. Army troops led by tanks and armored vehicles overwhelmed Iraqi irregulars firing machine guns from pickup trucks today and, continuing a relentless U.S. advance, pushed on to seize an airfield near the sacred city of Najaf only 100 miles from Baghdad.

The resistance by Iraqi militiamen proved no match for the more than 70 M1 Abrams tanks and 60 M2 Bradley Fighting Vehicles of the 3rd Infantry Division's 2nd Brigade that clanked into the encounter and opened fire. But it tied up some of the unit's gunners for several hours. Afterward, mangled vehicles and the bodies of dead militiamen littered a dirt road within sight of Najaf, a city on the west bank of the Euphrates River that is the most prominent center of worship for Iraq's Shiite Muslims.

Along an earthen berm between a muddy plain and a road used by the advancing U.S. column, the bodies of four men wearing olive green uniforms lay where they fell, apparently waiting in ambush for U.S. forces. Nearby lay assorted military paraphernalia and ammunition, including rounds for a rocket-propelled grenade launcher.

One of the men wore shoulder boards indicating he was a senior officer, according to a U.S. soldier who happened upon the bodies after participating in a recovery operation to pull out tanks and

armored personnel carriers that got stuck in an adjacent marshy plain.

Following the simple formula for the "inverted pyramid," Branigin begins his article with the most important details of the story—the advance to Baghdad continues on despite resistance. He then addresses the resistance in more detail, describing the fight in general terms. He concludes this section with even more granularity as he writes about the grisly results of the fight. Had a reader only time to digest the lead paragraph, they still would be able to understand the theme of the article without reading another sentence.

4. Factor # 4: Scope

Scope addresses the narrow or broad expanse of the article and is linked to framing. Both groups of reporters submitted articles that could be considered "broad" in nature. However, when compared to the non-embedded journalists, the study revealed that embedded reporters, lacking the larger ability to piece together the events of the battlefield beyond their immediate observation, tended to compose articles that were more narrow in scope than the non-embedded journalists. An example of this concerns the fighting by U.S. Marines in An Nasiriyah in March 2003:

Even as Marine officers proclaimed this Euphrates River city secured after four days of street fighting, Iraqi troops launched at sunset Wednesday the largest and most organized surprise attack yet on the American positions south of the river. Infantry units reported as many as 1,000 Iraqi soldiers mustering at a railroad depot just south of Nasiriyah. American artillery units opened fire on them, but the Iraqi fighters had already fanned out southward toward crucial Marine outposts. The regimental headquarters and the central command of the artillery batteries

both received machine-gun fire and faced the threat of being overrun. (Wilson, NYT, 28 Mar)

Elements of at least three regular army units, the 6th Armored, 11th Infantry and 51st Mechanized divisions—whose willingness to fight had been a huge question mark before the war began—are aggressively engaging the coalition forces in Basra, Nasiriyah and Najaf, among other locations, said Anthony H. Cordesman, a former Pentagon official at the Center for Strategic and International Studies who is an expert on the Iraqi military. (NE Loeb, WP, 28 Mar)

Michael Wilson, embedded with the Marines in An Nasiriyah penned a much narrower account of the fighting in comparison to non-embedded reporter Vernon Loeb. Wilson described the Marines' fight for the city, while Loeb discussed the broader implications of the fighting. This trend held true for the embedded and non-embedded articles within the corpus. The embedded reporters, to a degree denied knowledge of the surrounding events across the wide expanse of the battlefield, provided more focused or narrow stories than their non-embedded counterparts.

5. Factor # 5: Depth

Depth of an article refers to the richness and profundity of the reporters' writing. Just as scope is linked to framing, it is also linked to depth. A quick measure of this factor would involve a determination by the reader as to how thoroughly the reporter describes the action of an event in his or her writing. In explaining the same event, two reporters will inevitably emphasize different aspects of the story or dig deeper in their investigation of the facts to expose more information to their reading audience. Consider the following embedded passages:

Colonel Saylor and other intelligence and operations officers here at division headquarters characterized the attackers mainly as members of militias associated with Mr. Hussein and his sons, the **Fedeyeen and Al Quds Brigade along with hard-core Baath Party supporters**. The officers believe that the attackers may be **getting rudimentary military direction from Republican Guard officers**. Their weapons are the light equipment common to guerrillas and armies throughout the third world: **shoulder-fired rocket-propelled grenades, Soviet-era AK-47 assault rifles and some small mortars**. Colonel Saylor and other officers said that they had discovered arms caches along the route and that some of **the guerrillas were traveling in Toyota pickup trucks. Most seemed to be operating in civilian clothes**. The colonel added that in some towns, "it's the Baath Party headquarters, that's where they pour out of." (Kifner, NYT, 28 Mar)

The detail provided by John Kifner paints quite a word picture for his reader. The passage specifically addresses the enemy organizations offering the most resistance (instead of a generic reference to the "Iraqi army"), from where they are getting their guidance ("Republican Guard officers"), and what type of weapons and vehicles the enemy is using in their attacks. Tony Perry also provides incredible granularity in his writing below. Notice the details in his passage: barefoot men armed with rakes and pitchforks, hiding behind agricultural berms, and the exact enemy tactics used against the U.S. forces.

In some cases, these attacks are both futile and bloody, with young men, **armed only with rakes and pitchforks, running barefoot** at U.S. troops, said Col. Ben Saylor, 1st Marine Division chief of staff. The fighters, generally between 18 and 35 years old, **tend to hide behind agricultural berms** -- mounds of dirt that separate fields and often are used as irrigation channels. **They then jump up and charge at Marine positions from as far as**

100 yards away, said Saylor. Some charges are coordinated, albeit ineffective -- **part of delayed ambushes that begin with a rocket-propelled grenade or small arms fire on the U.S.-led forces from one side of the road, followed by a mass charge from the other side by men with small hand weapons.** (Perry, LAT, 28 Mar)

Writing on the same subject of enemy resistance, Thomas E. Ricks of the *Washington Post* wrote:

Iraqi troops and militias used ruses, ambushes and other guerrilla tactics yesterday that exploited the risks inherent in the fast-moving Pentagon war strategy, inflicting more than a score of American casualties and raising questions about how effective the U.S. approach has been in convincing Iraqi troops and civilians that President Saddam Hussein's removal is inevitable. (NE Ricks, WP, 24 Mar)

On March 26, 2003, Vernon Loeb of the *Washington Post* wrote:

Pentagon officials acknowledged that Saddam's Fedeyeen complicates the issue of securing the supply lines, a concern that has plagued senior Army generals for months. Rumsfeld noted that the Fedeyeen had used **battlefield treachery** to attack U.S. forces after feigning surrender. He likened them to **"terrorists."** (NE Loeb, WP, 26 Mar)

Using "battlefield treachery," "guerrilla tactics," and "terrorists" are more generic terms when compared to the in-depth descriptions of "Toyota pickup trucks" and Iraqis "armed only with rakes and pitchforks running barefoot at U.S. troops." One can see from the examples that the embedded reporters' ability to question the soldiers and Marines engaged in combat—or witness the event oneself—allows the journalist to write in greater depth than their non-embedded counterparts.

6. Factor # 6: Angle

The angle is the reporter's point of view and is most usually associated with "hard" news stories or "soft" feature articles. Feature articles usually are not bound by breaking news events and explore a subject from that differing "angle," shedding light on a particular aspect of the larger story that would more than likely be overlooked.

The public appetite for immediate news about the war demanded that both groups of reporters compose "hard" news stories about the actions on the ground. The cold, hard facts about the full-throttle advance to Baghdad, and the fighting along the way dominated the articles of both embedded and non-embedded reporters. Examination of the corpus revealed that complementing these "hard" news stories were comparable numbers of "soft" news stories submitted by both embedded and non-embedded journalists. Each reporter's body of work during the time period of this study was peppered with varying numbers of feature stories. For example, embedded reporter Michael Wilson of *The New York Times* has three articles in the corpus of this work. The dates and headlines of these articles were:

March 24: A NATION AT WAR: WITH THE TROOPS OF TASK FORCE TARAWA; Marines Meet Potent Enemy In Deadly Fight

March 28: A NATION AT WAR: IN THE FIELD IN NASIRIYA; A Sudden Attack at Sunset Surprises a Key Marine Center South of the Euphrates

April 6: A NATION AT WAR: IN THE FIELD WITH MARINE TASK FORCE TARAWA; In 100 Degree Heat, Marines become Traffic Police to Protect Roads in the Rear

The articles of March 24 and March 28 are news articles describing the U.S. Marines fighting in An

Nasiriyah. The third article (April 6) is a feature article—a human-interest story describing the comparatively mundane task of guarding the supply lines, the living conditions the Marines, their worries, their complaints, and the early April heat and mosquitoes of southern Iraq. Non-embedded reporter Jonathan Weisman of the *Washington Post* provided five articles in the study corpus. Of these five, three can be classified as feature stories:

March 28: Casualties, Expectations Might Collide; Experts Warn of Rising Losses as Factor in Support for War

April 2: Rumsfeld And Myers Defend War Plan; Officials Say Criticism Is 'Bogus' and Slap at Troops

April 14: Iraq Chaos No Surprise, but Too Few Troops to Quell It

The above stories were not tied to breaking news events, but rather served to provide additional information to the "hard" news stories written by both embedded and non-embedded reporters. Of special benefit to the reading public was that the feature articles of the embedded reporters played a vital role in putting a "human face" on the war by writing feature stories highlighting the trials and travails of the common soldier or Marine. These articles often focused on such details as the effect of the heat on the soldiers, the biting insects, the quality of the rations, church services, or the lack of mail from home. When compared to the larger events of the drive to Baghdad, they may seem somewhat inconsequential, but stress the point to the reader that war is a human endeavor, fought by husbands, wives, sons, and daughters—not nameless machines or icons on a map.

7. Factor # 7: Framing

Embedded reporters, accompanying soldiers and Marines into battle, provided detailed, episodic first-hand accounts of events as they occurred on the ground. The non-embedded reporters employed more thematic framing within their articles concerning this topic—placing the small, detailed accounts of the embedded journalists into the greater context of the campaign to overthrow Saddam Hussein. The first examples provided are from embedded journalists. Consider the episodic focus of the following:

It began Friday morning, when an American M1 Abrams tank, on the leading edge of the Marines' drive into the capital, was destroyed by an Iraqi missile in an ambush. For the next several hours, street-to-street fighting raged here, with as much horror and confusion as the Pentagon's war planners had imagined. The Americans won overwhelmingly. There was valor here and pointless death. There was fighting in the streets and in tight places, where the tanks and bombs could not go but the men with rifles could. A leading Iraqi officer met an ignominious end. A number of Iraqi civilians, swept up in the whirlwind, died here...The Marines said their Iraqis foes fought harder on Friday than at any other time in the war. Their aim was truer. They held their ground. And they were well armed. By the end of the day, three Marines had been killed; one lieutenant was shot in the throat, another in the head. An M1 tank was destroyed. (Filkins, NYT, 06 Apr)

Filkins' writing about the initial push by the Marines into Baghdad episodically describes a single fight with the Iraqi defenders among many that occurred on that day. The reporting specifically mentions the day of the week ("Friday"), the duration of the fight ("several hours", "by the end of the day"), as well as providing rich detail about the tenacity of the enemy and the casualties suffered

by each side ("M1 tank" destroyed, "leading Iraqi" killed, "three Marines" killed). Similarly, Larry Zucchino wrote the following:

Before it was over, the column had thundered through a Republican Guard gantlet, killing 1,000 Iraqi soldiers and destroying 30 antiaircraft batteries, according to Col. David Perkins, commander of the 3rd Infantry Division's 2nd Brigade. The numbers could not be independently verified. One American tank commander was killed in the three-hour foray from here into Saddam Hussein's capital, which American commanders said was designed to stun an Iraqi leadership that had claimed in news conferences that U.S. forces had not yet crossed the Euphrates River, more than 20 miles southwest of the city's outskirts. (Zucchino, LAT, 06 Apr)

The above passage by Zucchino also includes many indicators of episodic framing. Like Filkins, he discusses a specific time period of the action ("three-hour foray"), and specific details particular to this action ("one American tank commander" killed, "1000 Iraqi soldiers" killed, "30 antiaircraft batteries" destroyed).

The non-embedded journalists' accounts are about the overall progress of the war to date, U.S. strategy, and other larger issues. It was also evident that the non-embedded journalists took the individual accounts of their embedded counterparts and compiled them, providing their reading audience with the larger themes of casualties, resistance, and the blistering advance on Baghdad:

Iraqi troops and militias used ruses, ambushes and other guerrilla tactics yesterday that exploited the risks inherent in the fast-moving Pentagon war strategy, inflicting more than a score of American casualties and raising questions about how effective the U.S. approach has been in convincing Iraqi troops and civilians

that President Saddam Hussein's removal is inevitable. (NE Ricks, WP, 24 Mar)

Thomas Ricks writes thematically about the resistance the U.S. forces began to see on March 23, 2003. He does not specify individual incidents or actions on that day, but rather uses more generic descriptors such as "ruses, ambushes and other guerrilla tactics." The level of detail describing casualties ("scores") is also more generic than that seen in the previous passages provided by embedded reporters. Another example of thematic framing comes from *New York Times* non-embedded reporter Eric Schmitt:

After three days of routing Iraqi forces and even labeling their advance toward the Iraqi capital "the Baghdad 500," U.S. soldiers had a series of sobering engagements. One unit of Iraqi regular troops ambushed a U.S. convoy. Others trapped U.S. troops in what was described as a phony surrender, and some reportedly disguised themselves in civilian clothes. In the south, remnants of an army division moved heavy weapons into a residential area of Basra that U.S. and British forces were reluctant to fire upon. Military experts predicted that the resistance in the south was so disorganized and relatively small-scale that it would die out quickly. (NE Schmitt, NYT, 26 Mar)

Schmitt, writing on March 26, 2003, provides a summary of the resistance encountered thus far by U.S. forces since the beginning of the war. He uses "three days of routing Iraqi forces," and "a series of sobering engagements." While listing specific incidents, Schmitt merely uses them to reinforce the thematic framing of his passage.

It appears that the frontline access of the embedded reporters placed them in a position to compose more episodic accounts. Upon assessing the specific framing employed by the embedded and non-embedded journalists, this trend held true for their individual reports of the

fighting during the period of this study. Access is quintessential to writing episodically. Devoid of this, non-embedded journalists tended to pen more thematic passages concerning the progress of the war.

8. Factor # 8: Balanced Reporting

With the campaign to topple Saddam Hussein complete, it is quite easy to look back over the course of the 26 days between the start of the war on March 20, 2003, and the capture of Tikrit on April 14, 2003, and make an objective evaluation of what truly was of consequence during that time period. It is also easy to see what fears were unfounded. Of course, the reporters covering the conflict did not enjoy the benefit of hindsight and were forced to make a decision concerning the content of their stories.

The corpus reveals that both embedded and non-embedded reporters exercised objectivity in crafting their articles. To be sure, the reporters were quick to write of the impressive successes of the U.S. military, but they were also quick to address some of the not-so-flattering events of the war. The reporters consistently wrote of unsuccessful attacks, difficulty in protecting the supply lines, friendly fire incidents, the advance stalling or falling behind schedule, and equipment malfunctioning. Nothing appeared to be off limits with either the embedded or non-embedded reporters. They wrote of discontent among critics of the war strategy, the relief of a U.S. Marine regimental commander, and exposed to the public when U.S. troops mistakenly killed Iraqi civilians at a checkpoint in late March 2003. The corpus is replete with passages such

as these, which very effectively demonstrate the balanced nature of the reporters' writing:

"The planned assault on Baghdad is now about three days behind schedule... (Kifner, NYT, 28 Mar)

"Spare parts are scarce—mechanics are cannibalizing wrecked Amtracs to keep others running—and many Marine units have had their rations cut to one ready-to-eat meal a day for the last several days." (Kifner, NYT, 02 Apr)

Kifner lets the reading audience know the harsh truth about the U.S campaign falling behind schedule and the lack of spare parts and rations—a startling revelation considering the highly-touted American war machine.

The firefight that unfolded today in front of the American caravan illustrated the difficulty the military is having in resupplying its troops at the front line. (Filkins, NYT, 28 Mar)

The fact that Filkins writes of the difficulties the U.S. forces are experiencing in dealing with the enemy was not an aberration. He also makes it clear that this "firefight" is illustrative of a larger problem—not an isolated incident. The readiness with which the reporters displayed in their writing to expose the truth, regardless of how their article or passage painted the military, is evidenced by the following:

A block away, an Iraqi family grieved, smaller than it was a day before. Omar, a 15 year-old boy, sat on the roadside weeping, drenched in the blood of his father, shot dead by American Marines for running a roadblock here...six members of Omar's family were dead, covered by blankets on the roadside. Among them were Omar's father, mother, brother and sister. A two year-old boy, Ali, had been shot in the face. (Filkins, NYT, 06 Apr)

In a separate incident, at least nine Marines died in the fighting. A military source said today that preliminary indications suggested they might have been killed by fire from an A-10 Thunderbolt II ground attack plane trying to help them. (Baker, WP, 28 Mar)

...3rd Infantry soldiers shot at a vehicle at a similar checkpoint, killing ten Iraqi civilians.. (Branigin, WP, 06 Apr)

The elation has since faded following the accidental destruction of a British fighter plane by another Patriot battery, killing the crew of two, and the attack by a U.S. warplane on a Patriot radar. (Zucchini, LAT, 02 Apr)

None of these passages can be classified as being even remotely complementary of U.S. forces. They address soldiers mistakenly killing civilians, and the inept actions of Americans that resulted in fratricide—an understandably explosive and sensitive issue for all involved.

Similar balanced reporting from the non-embedded reporters complemented the even-handed accounts of the embedded journalists:

...Rumsfeld has become a lightning rod for criticism because he has not been frank with the public about the flawed assumptions and the level of force that was on hand at the start of the war as a result. (NE Loeb, WP, 02 Apr)

Vernon Loeb's refusal to merely pen rosy accounts of the administration's handling of the war are even more telling considering the fact that U.S. forces were still engaged in combat with the enemy at the time the above was written. Stating that one of the primary individuals responsible for devising the strategy to topple Saddam Hussein had "flawed assumptions" is illustrative of a non-

embedded reporter not allowing feelings of patriotism to color his writing. Likewise, Loeb's discussion concerning the accidental destruction of a British aircraft by U.S. forces demonstrates his willingness to remain above any personal bias. In fact, using a quote from the U.S. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff stating that the state-of-the-art technology (that supposedly is one of the great strengths of the U.S. military) "broke down some where" does not paint a flattering picture of the military or its leadership:

Air Force Gen. Richard B. Myers, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said on ABC's "This Week" that electronic procedures for identifying and differentiating friendly and enemy aircraft "broke down some where." (NE Loeb, WP, 24 Mar)

Thomas Ricks provides a brutal assessment of the effectiveness of the U.S. strategy—as well as unwittingly providing the Iraqi leadership with a rough estimate of the size of the forces closing in on their capital city:

The continued Iraqi resistance specifically calls into question the efficacy of the biggest psychological operations campaign waged by the U.S. military...[an Army officer] said he continues to worry that the overall U.S. invasion force—a third the size of that which ousted Iraqi forces from Kuwait in 1991—is too small.(NE Ricks, WP, 24 Mar)

In the first week of April 2003, Marine Maj General James Mattis, Commanding General of the 1st Marine Division, relieved one of his regimental commanders. Ricks wrote an 821-word article on the implications of this action.

The Marine Corps relieved one of its top commanders in Iraq Friday, an extremely unusual action, especially for a unit engaged in combat...The U.S. military was unusually guarded

about discussing the reason for the battlefield removal. The Central Command, the U.S. military headquarters for the war, announced the action but offered no explanation for it. (NE Ricks, WP, 06 Apr)

Again, just as with Loeb, Ricks wrote his account, even naming the specific unit, while the 6000 Marines in that unit were still engaged in combat—extraordinary considering the controversial nature of the article and the families of those Marines at war having to read about how the man responsible for their loved ones lives' was relieved of command.

9. Factor # 9: Theme Development

The final factor used in this study to investigate the posited differences in the content of the embedded and non-embedded reporting during Operation Iraqi Freedom are individual themes that were uncovered during the reading of the corpus. The initial coding produced six topical themes, as well as emergent coding of eight additional topical themes. The topics are listed below. (***) annotates an initially coded category.)

- 1) Combat quotes***
- 2) Enemy resistance***
- 3) Enemy warfighting tactics, techniques, and procedures
- 4) Human casualties / destroyed equipment
- 5) Operational tempo/speed of campaign***
- 6) Iraqi reaction to U.S. invasion
- 7) Equipment failures
- 8) Looting***

- 9) Tactical mistakes
- 10) Atrocities***
- 11) Changing plans / flexibility***
- 12) Enemy chemical weapons use
- 13) Caution / warnings of difficulty

Upon completion of coding of the entire corpus, 702 passages grouped in 13 topical themes from embedded and non-embedded journalists were collected into the project database.

While both the embedded and non-embedded reporters included the above themes within their writings, the difference between the two groups existed in the emphasis each placed on certain themes. Comparing the 13 themes against the events of the war, it is natural that embedded reporters would concentrate on particular themes as a result of their proximity to the action. It is just as fitting that non-embedded reporters would gravitate to other themes which they could more effectively write about than not. A simple way to describe the difference in the topical emphasis is that as a result of their access and proximity, non-embedded reporters took a macro view of the war, while embedded reporters took a micro view. The method the U.S. military uses to differentiate between such areas of focus in the conduct of war is termed "levels of war." (MCDP-1, 1997)

"Levels of war" is a doctrinal definition describing the hierarchical levels at which activities in war occur. The three levels of war are the strategic, operational, and tactical. (MCDP-1, 1997) The highest level is strategic, with the lowest level being tactical. The operational level

is the bridge between the two. The following definitions apply:

Strategic: activities focusing on national policy objectives. (MCDP-1, 1997)

Operational: when, where, and under what conditions to engage the enemy in battle—as well as refuse battle in support of higher aims. (MCDP-1, 1997)

Tactical: concepts and methods to accomplish a particular mission in combat or other military operations. (MCDP-1, 1997)

The examination of the corpus revealed that embedded reporters penned articles recounting actions at predominantly the tactical and operational level of war. It is posited that this is a result of the embedded reporters' direct access to the actual events as they occurred on the ground. Because the embedded reporters were positioned at various echelons of units, i.e., platoon, company, battalion, division, and corps, they would naturally write about the tactical and operational maneuvers of the soldiers and Marines to which they were attached. Conversely, non-embedded reporters, whether attending briefings at the Pentagon or the White House, or querying a civilian pundit, submitted articles reporting at the operational and strategic level—simply because that is where these level issues were discussed. For example, non-embedded reporters wrote:

Strategic: Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld summarized this carrot-and-stick approach at a Pentagon briefing yesterday. "We continue to feel that there's no need for a broader conflict if the Iraqi leaders act to save themselves," he said. But, he continued, "what will follow will

not be a repeat of any other conflict. It will be of a force and scope and scale that has been beyond what has been seen before." (NE Ricks, WP, 21 Mar)

Operational: "We have shifted to a very, very robust psy-ops [psychological operations] campaign," the official said. "The message continues to be to surrender." (NE Miller, LAT, 21 Mar)

Strategic: "If this [the invasion] is successful it will open up more flexibility in future operations," said Duke University political scientist Peter Feaver, an expert on the political implications of the use of force. "It would certainly be existence of a proof that other approaches do not lead to certain disaster." (NE Ricks, WP, 24 Mar)

Embedded reporters, being much closer to the action, submitted the passages below. Note the different focus of the actions between the two groups:

Tactical: By this evening, as reports came in of fighting in and around Nasiriyah, where vital bridges span the Euphrates River, and of stiffening resistance by some Iraqi units, the mood had turned much grimmer. In another indication of stiffening local resistance, a Marine officer returned here late tonight with a harrowing tale of a drive through a village near Basra in which two Marine Humvees were ambushed with rocket-propelled grenades, AK-47 assault rifles and light machine guns as they drove into town. They barely escaped after a wild shootout, with the officer blazing away with a shotgun. Two of the Marines were wounded and had to be medevaced. (Filkins, NYT, 24 Mar)

Operational: The rapid advance of American forces through Iraq has left the spearhead of the army 300 miles away from its main base. As a result, the supply lines are stretched thin and are vulnerable to the kinds of attacks that have left this convoy standing still since Tuesday. (Filkins, WP, 28 Mar)

Tactical: The Republican Guard forces mounted an intense counterattack, commanders said. Each of the 29 Abrams tanks and 14 Bradley fighting vehicles that roared into the city was peppered with holes from small arms and grenades. Upon their return, some were still smoking. (Zucchino, LAT, 06 Apr)

It was evident that while embedded journalists focused on the specific and unique events on the ground, the non-embedded reporters described larger strategic objectives that exist at the higher levels of command and government.

Of the 13 coded themes, embedded reporters spoke with much greater emphasis on enemy resistance, human casualties/destroyed equipment, operational tempo/speed of campaign, and enemy tactics, techniques, and procedures by a 2:1 or 3:1 ratio when compared to the non-embedded reporters. For example, the topical theme "enemy resistance" resulted in 76 coded passages from the embedded reporters, while the non-embedded articles yielded 31 passages. "Operational tempo/speed of campaign," was mentioned 31 times by the embedded reporters compared to the eight passages identified in the non-embedded passage database. For embedded reporters traveling with the armored columns racing to Baghdad, personally witnessing combat and its horrific cost, these results are illustrative of the influence the embedded experience had in determining the content of these writers.

Non-embedded reporters placed greater emphasis on subject matter that addressed much larger issues beyond the concern of the embedded reporters. For example, "Caution / warnings of difficulty" was cited twice as many times in the project database by the non-embedded reporters than their embedded counterparts. This is illustrative of the

non-embedded journalists' sources (read access)—administration officials who often tried to assuage the fears of the public, and retired military officers who offered educated opinions from the comfort of their Washington or New York office. The same 2:1 ratio can be applied to the topical category, "Iraqi reaction." Additionally, non-embedded journalists more often addressed this theme at a higher level, i.e., reaction of Iraqi leaders or other Arab governments taken from wire reports compared to the embedded reporter's young Iraqi living in the slums of Baghdad.

C. CHAPTER SUMMARY

In the course of this study, the author examined a corpus of news articles produced by embedded and non-embedded journalists during Operation Iraqi Freedom. From nine embedded journalists and ten non-embedded journalists, eight days of news articles chosen according to the events transpiring on the battlefield were selected for examination.

The examination of the corpus revealed that embedded and non-embedded reporters approached the writing of news articles in different manners on eight of the nine exploratory factors. The above results of this exploration of embedded and non-embedded news articles from Operation Iraqi Freedom, as they apply to the research questions of this thesis, will be addressed in the final chapter of this study.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. INTRODUCTION

Wars are always accompanied by lies. Lies about losses, lies about victories, lies about the war's victims. As a war reporter, you have to try to cut through the lies and their half-brother, war propaganda, to uncover some kind of truth.

Correspondent in Baghdad, Iraq, March 15, 2003
(Anonymous, 2003)

Penned on the eve of Operation Iraqi Freedom, the reporter quoted above succinctly captures the *raison d'être* of the war correspondent ever since the gregarious Billy Russell first set the standard over 150 years ago. Indeed, the ability of journalists to "cut through the lies," and "uncover some kind of truth" was incredibly enhanced by the U.S. Department of Defense's embedded media program instituted for the campaign to topple the Hussein regime in Iraq. While their immediate and highly dramatic accounts offered a perspective not before seen by the news-hungry U.S. public, they also raised questions about the effectiveness of the embedded program. Some critics thought that the journalistic focus at the individual soldier and Marine-level came at the expense of the overall story of the war. (Ayers, 2004) Reporting by the embedded media was negatively described as looking through a "soda-straw," (Smith, 2003, Pasquarett, 2003), or "into a microscope." (Harper, 2004) One embedded war correspondent compared being embedded as being the same as the number-two dog in a sled dog team. "You saw an awful lot of the dog in front of you, and a little to the left and right." (Smith, 2003)

This thesis was written to explore the embedded media program during Operation Iraqi Freedom and to specifically answer the following research questions: (1) How did embedded journalists affect the content of U.S. news reporting of Operation Iraqi Freedom? (2) Was the reporting of the embedded and non-embedded journalists balanced? (3) Were the critics' accusations of "soda straw" reporting justified? Or in other words, is the embedded corpus narrower in scope and depth than the non-embedded corpus?

B. CONCLUSIONS

In attempting to answer the research questions, a review of the literature surrounding the evolution of the war correspondent revealed that the tale of the war correspondent during the 150 years that they have plied their trade has been one of many highs and lows. They have endured excessive censorship, questions of objectivity, and troubles with access to the front lines. Conversely, they have experienced tremendous access and freedom on the battlefield. The reporters of Operation Iraqi Freedom are the inheritors of this checkered legacy. Additionally, advances in technology have greatly enhanced the ability of the war correspondent to transmit breaking news almost instantaneously to a news hungry public. With the embedded media program practiced in Operation Iraqi Freedom, the American public was able to view the face of modern warfare as never before. By applying the ten factors discussed in Chapter IV to the corpus of this study, the author has been able to gain valuable insight to the newspaper reporting of Operation Iraqi Freedom. The following conclusions are offered to the research questions of this study:

1. Research Question # 1

The first research question of this study was "How did embedded journalists affect the content of U.S. news reporting of Operation Iraqi Freedom?"

Through the lens of the ten factors listed in Table 16, the examination of the corpus revealed that embedded and non-embedded reporters approached the writing of news articles in different manners on eight of the ten factors, which ultimately resulted in a markedly different body of work when compared to their non-embedded counterparts.

Table 15. Study results

FACTOR	EMBEDDED	NON-EMBEDDED
News sources	Individual soldiers, and Marines; quotes from enlisted and junior officers in direct contact with the enemy	High-ranking administration and Pentagon officials, general officers, retired officers and civilian military "experts"
Lead paragraph	Equal numbers of descriptive and news lead	Overwhelmingly news lead
Inverted pyramid	Yes	Yes; more so than embedded
Framing	Episodic	Thematic
Scope	Narrow	Broad
Depth	Rich in personal details about combat, personalities, casualties	General statements concerning combat, personalities, casualties
Angle	Equally news and feature articles	Equally news and feature articles
Balanced reporting	Balanced accounts of the combat actions; controversy and problems with plans, enemy and equipment not avoided	Balanced accounts of the combat actions; controversy and problems with plans, enemy and equipment not avoided
Theme	Emphasis placed on subject matter to which they were most exposed (enemy resistance, casualties, etc) Predominantly tactical "level of war"; some operational	Emphasis placed on subject matter to which they were most exposed (warnings of difficulty/caution, Iraqi reaction, etc) Operational and strategic "level of war"

The two groups of reporters differ in their news sources, types of lead paragraphs employed in the construction of their stories, and in the use of the

journalistic technique, "inverted pyramid." They also displayed a distinct tendency to report on different levels of warfare, with the embedded reporters also using a more narrow scope in the coverage of their subject as well as greater depth of reporting. The framing of their respective stories—either episodic or thematic—was also revealed to be a function of being embedded or non-embedded. Each group of reporters also placed greater thematic emphasis on certain coded topics within the project database as a result of their respective status as either embedded or non-embedded.

Although these factors reveal significant differences in their reporting, the two groups do not differ in the angle or point of view they took in producing their body of work during this time period. No reporter appeared to focus solely on news stories or solely on feature stories. Most encouraging was the discovery that both embedded and non-embedded reporters produced a very balanced collection of stories about Operation Iraqi Freedom, readily exposing and reporting on both positive and negative aspects of the military campaign in Iraq. The embedded reporter's presence, proximity, and frontline access provided them exposure to a dramatically different set of raw information from which they ultimately crafted their stories. The above results present a strong argument that the embedded reporters—the act of being embedded within military units—greatly affected the content of the news reporting during Operation Iraqi Freedom.

2. Research Question # 2

The second question posed by the author in this study was "Was the reporting of the embedded and non-embedded

journalists balanced? As discussed in Chapter II, one of the primary criticisms leveled at the embedded program was that their close proximity would breed familiarity, resulting in a hesitancy to write negatively about the military. To a degree, the same can be said of their non-embedded counterparts. Not that they would be reticent in reporting negative stories about the conflict because of an attachment to the forces engaged in combat, but for another reason altogether: patriotism or loyalty. For the non-embedded reporters, *their* country was at war and feelings of patriotism may have softened their writing when it came to addressing controversial issues. The pressure to do just this has historical precedent. During the Vietnam War, "[A]nyone who questioned any aspect of official policy was at best a "liberal," and at worst a "communist." (McLaughlin, 2002) Recall the question leveled at AP reporter Malcolm Browne during a press conference in Saigon by Admiral Harry P. Felt: "Why don't you get on the team?" (Knightley, 1975) Just as telling was the comment by Vice President Hubert Humphrey, addressing correspondents in 1967: "[W]hen you speak to the American people give the benefit of the doubt to our side...We're in this together." (Aronson, 1970)

In examining the writings of the embedded journalists, the author found no loss of objectivity on their part in reporting both breaking news and feature stories. In fact, it appeared that as the campaign progressed, the reporters' evolved in their situational awareness of the inner workings of the American military at war. They became quickly seasoned and aware of the many contradictions, problems, idiosyncrasies of the conflict, and did not

hesitate to report on subjects that in the past would have been considered derogatory or not complementary in nature to the military. This is in direct contradiction to the pre-war criticisms put forth by opponents of the embedded program. Without doubt, the journalists in this study echo the sentiments of Steve Bell, a journalism instructor at Ball State University, regardless of embedded or non-embedded status:

I think that we are getting good journalism, of course, they're the home team. We're Americans, they're Americans. When you report from a military unit consistently, you get to know the people, you are sharing their daily life, there is an emotional connection and attachment that comes with it, but...that doesn't mean you're going to hide things that are embarrassing or negative, not if you're a good reporter. (Berkowitz, 2003)

It is also correct to surmise that the amount of hand-wringing by news pundits and media experts once the embedded program was announced played a subtle part in ensuring balanced coverage of the conflict by the embedded reporters. Fully aware of the pitfalls that awaited them, the reporters appeared to take extra pains to exercise objectivity. Remaining objective in reporting is "something to be aware of, whether you're covering the army or the local sewer district," said Rick Atkinson. "When you're cheek-to-jowl with people you like, you can become attached to them, particularly when you have shared the hazards of combat and of everyday life. It's something to be aware of, but I felt I could keep my distance and report objectively." (Ayers, 2004) "Certainly you talk to people and get chummy with them, but there was always the separation that they were military and we were the media," said John Roberts. (Ayers, 2004) Overall, the balanced

reporting discovered in this study reaffirms the claim of proponents of the embedded program that, "embed does not mean in bed." (Overington, 2003)

3. Research Question # 3

The third research question presented in this study concerned a major criticism of the embedded reporters' work: Were the critics' accusations of "soda straw" reporting justified? Or in other words, is the embedded corpus narrower in scope and depth than the non-embedded corpus?

This question was best answered by examining the results of the exploratory factors of framing, scope, and depth. The very nature of episodic framing, as practiced by the embedded journalists, inevitably resulted in a very myopic glimpse into the events of Operation Iraqi Freedom. The stories of the embedded reporters were specific snapshots in the timeline of the conflict. The embedded reporters understood their job, knowing that their access would produce a narrower scope within their work: "I certainly did not get a clear picture of the war because we were so isolated," said an embedded reporter with the 101st Airborne Division. However, he conceded that it indeed was his job "to look at things through a microscope, not binoculars." (Kurtz, 2003) The corpus results support this statement. When compared to the non-embedded journalists, the study revealed that embedded reporters, lacking the larger ability to piece together the events of the battlefield beyond their immediate observation, tended to compose articles that were more narrow in scope than the non-embedded journalists. The non-embedded reporters, having greater time and resources, pulled the disparate

reports of the embedded reports together, sampling relevant facts, adding additional reporting from other sources, and thereby providing a fuller accounting of the conflict. Therefore it is accurate to state that the critics' accusations of "soda straw" reporting were in fact justified. Although concerning television embedded reporting, the following quote is just as applicable to the print journalists:

The reason you have so many embedded reporters is that every day they each bring a slice, and then when you put all the slices together—with [CBS News National Correspondent] David Martin at the Pentagon, etcetera—then you have the whole pie. (Ayers, 2004)

However, although narrow in scope, the vantage point provided by their embedded access produced an incredibly rich body of work, replete with details not available to the non-embedded reporters. This depth of reporting resulted in vibrant word pictures of the fighting. "I'd like to call it a bright, intense look at a small slice of the war," opined embedded reporter John Roberts of CBS. (Ayers, 2004)

Of interest was the discovery of a slight difference in the manner in which the newspapers in this study presented their coverage of the war, and is directly related to the above question concerning scope and depth of reporting. The *Los Angeles Times* appeared to make an extra effort to ensure that the information in their articles provided wider look at the war than the other newspapers in this study. This accomplished by the frequent inclusion of several embedded reporters' accounts into one article under the byline of the primary contributor of the article. For

example, the April 10, 2003 article written by Geoffrey Mohan of the *Times* contains the footnote, "Times staff writer David Zucchini contributed to this report." Tony Perry's March 26, 2003 article states that "Geoffrey Mohan with the 3d Infantry Division" contributed to the report. David Zucchini's April 2, 2003, article similarly states that "Times staff writer Tony Perry with the Marines in Iraq contributed to this report." This trend was also repeated among the other newspapers, but not to the degree that was found in the *Los Angeles Times* articles.

4. Impact of Embedded Reporting

Regardless of which side of the embedded debate one falls on, "This [the embedded program] is going to change American war coverage forever. The alternative—lack of access—is clearly far worse. People got to see the human side of war in a way that really hasn't happened since Vietnam." (Kurtz, 2003) Overall, the media industry remains divided over the embedded program instituted during Operation Iraqi Freedom. Washington Post reporter Thomas E. Ricks gave the embed program "two thumbs up," (Ayers, 2004) while Normon Solomon said that the embedded program was "not a great moment" for journalism. (Zwirko, 2003) NBC's Jim Alexrod, embedded with the 3ID said after the war:

This will sound like I've drunk the Kool-Aid, but I found embedding to be an extremely positive experience. There was some initial mistrust and suspicion: 'Who are you guys and what are you going to do to harm us?' But we got great stories and they [the military] got very positive coverage—in large part because there were some very compelling stories to tell about the military. (Kurtz, 2003)

Victoria Clarke echoed Alexrod's comments:

You've got hundreds and hundreds of journalists who have now had a very real and enlightening experience with the U.S. military, and that's a good thing. I'm sure there are still some skeptics on the military side, but they're smaller in number, said Victoria Clarke. (Kurtz, 2003)

The skeptics do indeed remain within the media. The embeds were "doing a disservice to their readers or viewers by repeatedly and systematically accepting the assumptions of the [Bush] administration." (Ranade, 2003) "How do you manage [read *control*] the media in times of war?" writes another critic. "Thoroughly embed them." (Berkowitz, 2003) Others called the embedded program "militainment." (Andersen, 2003) This contention finds little support from Peter Copeland of the Scripps Howard News Service. Copeland, himself a former war correspondent, said that, "critics who don't like the coverage should put some of the burden on the media and stop trying to blame everything on 'censorship.' I don't think we should expect the Pentagon to do our jobs for us. It's our responsibility—not the military's—to figure out how to cover the story." (Shafer, 2003)

A March 28, 2003 poll conducted by the Pew Research Center concerning the media coverage of Operation Iraqi Freedom stated that, "[I]n general, the public has a positive opinion of the practice of embedding reporters with military forces." (PRCa, 2003) The poll states that 58 percent of Americans think the embedded program is a "good thing," while 34 percent have a negative view of the program. (PRCa, 2003) A similar poll of 3,620 adults taken from March 20-April 7, 2003 by the Pew Research Center asked the question, "Do you think that reporters who are

traveling with the troops in Iraq are taking the sides of these troops too much, are being critical of the troops they're traveling with, or are they being fair and objective in their reporting?" (PRCb, 2003) The results were overwhelmingly positive, with the following results reported (PRCb, 2003):

Taking side of troops too much:	7%
Too critical of the troops:	7%
Fair and objective:	81%
Don't know/refused to answer:	5%

Today, as the country of Iraq struggles to stand on its own after 30 years of brutal dictatorship, U.S. soldiers and Marines are fighting an intense counterinsurgency against a shadowy enemy. And, just as they did during over a year ago, embedded reporters accompany U.S. troops during their daily firefights and gun battles with insurgent forces. Their unique access as embedded media continues to provide a worldwide reading audience firsthand accounts of the conflict. However, the audience on the receiving end of these reports must be sure to take other factors into account. Considering the previously discussed opposing viewpoints of the embedded program, it is obvious that the program will remain controversial. The picture that Americans received about the war in Iraq was through the media—it is beyond question that the media crafted the public's interpretation of the events on the ground. Previous studies on the influence of the media on public opinion states that the press, "may not be successful much of the time in telling people what to think, but it is stunningly successful in telling its

readers what to think about." (Cohen, 1963) Further studies (McCombs, 1972, Shaw and McCombs, 1977) concerning agenda-setting, defined as "the creation of public awareness and concern of salient issues by the news media," (AST, n.d.) could certainly result from the unfettered access of the embedded program. The major combat phase of Operation Iraqi Freedom was relatively short compared to previous conflicts. Over an extended period, the public could possibly turn against the conduct of the war. Just as after the Vietnam War the perception existed that the barrage of body counts reported daily in the press undermined public support for that war, the access of the embedded reporters could similarly affect America's support for any future conflict. The Marine Corps recognized this dynamic, and stated that, "[B]efore we as a collective military society congratulate ourselves on the 'overwhelming success' of the embed program, we need to pause and remember that we were both good and lucky...What would have been the headlines if the Coalition lost a battalion of infantrymen to a chemical attack?" (1stMardivAAR, 2003)

The launching of the current embedded program during Operation Iraqi Freedom can be compared to releasing a genie from a lamp, never to be confined again. The public, with its voracious appetite for news will continue to demand such coverage of their sons and daughters engaged in the Global War on Terrorism. Regardless of which side of the embedded debate one falls on, CBS News president Andrew Heyward opines: "This [the embedded program] is going to change American war coverage forever. The alternative—lack of access—is clearly far worse. People got to see the

human side of war in a way that really hasn't happened since Vietnam." (Kurtz, 2003b) With doubt, "[T]he age of 'embedded' journalism has arrived." (Kurtz, 2003a)

C. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The topic investigated during the course of this study was limited to embedded and non-embedded journalists reporting for major newspapers with a large national circulation as described in Chapter III. Of equal interest would be examining the embedded and non-embedded reporting of smaller local newspapers located next to large military communities such as Camp Pendleton, California, Fort Bragg, North Carolina, or U.S. Naval Base, Norfolk, Virginia. The content of these reporters' writing could be compared to equally populated areas of the United States without a significant military population in the local community. This study also focused solely on U.S. reporters.

As discussed in Chapter II, the Pentagon also provided embedded "slots" to foreign newspapers. Journalists from the UK, Germany, Japan, Norway, Saudi Arabia, France, Czechoslovakia, Canada, Israel, Russia, Australia, Canada, China, Korea, and even Al Jazeera—the controversial anti-American network based out of Qatar. (ASDnames, 2003, Kurtz, 2003) Foreign news agencies were granted around 150 slots, with Al-Jazeera getting four—one each with the U.S. Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. (Carlson, 2003) Examining the content of these foreign writers when compared to their non-embedded counterparts would provide unique insight to how the United States' actions in Iraq were viewed by the world. As equally interesting would be a comparison between American embedded journalists and a similar number of foreign embedded journalists.

The medium chosen for this study—newspapers—could also be changed to further investigate the news coverage of Operation Iraqi Freedom. News magazines, such as *Time*, *Newsweek*, or *U.S. News and World Report* could be examined for content. More challenging would be an exploration of the context of the numerous live television reports from embedded journalists accompanying the U.S. units into combat. Limited studies have attempted this with fascinating results. (Project for Excellence in Journalism, 2003) What was the context of their reporting? How was their embedded reporting framed for the audience watching the report? Were there nuances in the embedded reporters' language that indicated a loss of objectivity? What was most often shown? Casualties? Fighting? Destroyed equipment? Conducting interviews with embedded reporters—gathering some of their insights as to how the embedded program affected their reporting—would also be an interesting study to compliment the results revealed in this thesis.

APPENDIX A: U.S DEPARTMENT DEFENSE MEDIA POLICY

(<http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Feb2003/d20030228pag.pdf>)

101900Z FEB 03

FM SECDEF WASHINGTON DC//OASD-PA//

TO SECDEF WASHINGTON DC//CHAIRS//

AIG 8777

HQ USEUCOM VAIHINGEN GE//PA//

USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN GE//ECPA//

JOINT STAFF WASHINGTON DC//PA//

SECSTATE WASHINGTON DC//PA//

CJCS WASHINGTON DC//PA//

NSC WASHINGTON DC

WHITE HOUSE SITUATION ROOM

INFO SECDEF WASHINGTON DC//OASD-PA/DPO//

UNCLAS

SUBJECT: PUBLIC AFFAIRS GUIDANCE (PAG) ON EMBEDDING MEDIA DURING POSSIBLE FUTURE OPERATIONS/DEPLOYMENTS IN THE U.S. CENTRAL COMMANDS (CENTCOM) AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY (AOR).

REFERENCES: REF. A. SECDEF MSG, DTG 172200Z JAN 03, SUBJ: PUBLIC AFFAIRS GUIDANCE (PAG) FOR MOVEMENT OF FORCES INTO THE CENTCOM AOR FOR POSSIBLE FUTURE OPERATIONS.

1. PURPOSE. THIS MESSAGE PROVIDES GUIDANCE, POLICIES AND PROCEDURES ON EMBEDDING NEWS MEDIA DURING POSSIBLE FUTURE OPERATIONS/DEPLOYMENTS IN THE CENTCOM AOR. IT CAN BE ADAPTED FOR USE IN OTHER UNIFIED COMMAND AORS AS NECESSARY.
2. POLICY.
 - 2.A. THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD) POLICY ON MEDIA COVERAGE OF FUTURE MILITARY OPERATIONS IS THAT MEDIA WILL HAVE LONG-TERM, MINIMALLY RESTRICTIVE ACCESS TO U.S. AIR, GROUND AND NAVAL FORCES THROUGH EMBEDDING. MEDIA COVERAGE OF ANY FUTURE OPERATION WILL, TO A LARGE EXTENT, SHAPE PUBLIC PERCEPTION OF

THE NATIONAL SECURITY ENVIRONMENT NOW AND IN THE YEARS AHEAD. THIS HOLDS TRUE FOR THE U.S. PUBLIC; THE PUBLIC IN ALLIED COUNTRIES WHOSE OPINION CAN AFFECT THE DURABILITY OF OUR COALITION; AND PUBLICS IN COUNTRIES WHERE WE CONDUCT OPERATIONS, WHOSE PERCEPTIONS OF US CAN AFFECT THE COST AND DURATION OF OUR INVOLVEMENT. OUR ULTIMATE STRATEGIC SUCCESS IN BRINGING PEACE AND SECURITY TO THIS REGION WILL COME IN OUR LONG-TERM COMMITMENT TO SUPPORTING OUR DEMOCRATIC IDEALS. WE NEED TO TELL THE FACTUAL STORY - GOOD OR BAD - BEFORE OTHERS SEED THE MEDIA WITH DISINFORMATION AND DISTORTIONS, AS THEY MOST CERTAINLY WILL CONTINUE TO DO. OUR PEOPLE IN THE FIELD NEED TO TELL OUR STORY - ONLY COMMANDERS CAN ENSURE THE MEDIA GET TO THE STORY ALONGSIDE THE TROOPS. WE MUST ORGANIZE FOR AND FACILITATE ACCESS OF NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL MEDIA TO OUR FORCES, INCLUDING THOSE FORCES ENGAGED IN GROUND OPERATIONS, WITH THE GOAL OF DOING SO RIGHT FROM THE START. TO ACCOMPLISH THIS, WE WILL EMBED MEDIA WITH OUR UNITS. THESE EMBEDDED MEDIA WILL LIVE, WORK AND TRAVEL AS PART OF THE UNITS WITH WHICH THEY ARE EMBEDDED TO FACILITATE MAXIMUM, IN-DEPTH COVERAGE OF U.S. FORCES IN COMBAT AND RELATED OPERATIONS. COMMANDERS AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICERS MUST WORK TOGETHER TO BALANCE THE NEED FOR MEDIA ACCESS WITH THE NEED FOR OPERATIONAL SECURITY.

2.B. MEDIA WILL BE EMBEDDED WITH UNIT PERSONNEL AT AIR AND GROUND FORCES BASES AND AFLOAT TO ENSURE A FULL UNDERSTANDING OF ALL OPERATIONS. MEDIA WILL BE GIVEN ACCESS TO OPERATIONAL COMBAT MISSIONS, INCLUDING MISSION PREPARATION AND DEBRIEFING, WHENEVER POSSIBLE.

2.C. A MEDIA EMBED IS DEFINED AS A MEDIA REPRESENTATIVE REMAINING WITH A UNIT ON AN EXTENDED BASIS - PERHAPS A PERIOD OF WEEKS OR EVEN MONTHS. COMMANDERS WILL PROVIDE BILLETING, RATIONS AND MEDICAL ATTENTION, IF NEEDED, TO THE EMBEDDED MEDIA COMMENSURATE WITH THAT PROVIDED TO MEMBERS OF THE UNIT, AS WELL AS ACCESS TO MILITARY TRANSPORTATION AND ASSISTANCE WITH

COMMUNICATIONS FILING/TRANSMITTING MEDIA PRODUCTS, IF REQUIRED.

2.C.1. EMBEDDED MEDIA ARE NOT AUTHORIZED USE OF THEIR OWN VEHICLES WHILE TRAVELING IN AN EMBEDDED STATUS.

2.C.2. TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE, SPACE ON MILITARY TRANSPORTATION WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE FOR MEDIA EQUIPMENT NECESSARY TO COVER A PARTICULAR OPERATION. THE MEDIA IS RESPONSIBLE FOR LOADING AND CARRYING THEIR OWN EQUIPMENT AT ALL TIMES. USE OF PRIORITY INTER-THEATER AIRLIFT FOR EMBEDDED MEDIA TO COVER STORIES, AS WELL AS TO FILE STORIES, IS HIGHLY ENCOURAGED. SEATS ABOARD VEHICLES, AIRCRAFT AND NAVAL SHIPS WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE TO ALLOW MAXIMUM COVERAGE OF U.S. TROOPS IN THE FIELD.

2.C.3. UNITS SHOULD PLAN LIFT AND LOGISTICAL SUPPORT TO ASSIST IN MOVING MEDIA PRODUCTS TO AND FROM THE BATTLEFIELD SO AS TO TELL OUR STORY IN A TIMELY MANNER. IN THE EVENT OF COMMERCIAL COMMUNICATIONS DIFFICULTIES, MEDIA ARE AUTHORIZED TO FILE STORIES VIA EXPEDITIOUS MILITARY SIGNAL/COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES.

2.C.4. NO COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT FOR USE BY MEDIA IN THE CONDUCT OF THEIR DUTIES WILL BE SPECIFICALLY PROHIBITED. HOWEVER, UNIT COMMANDERS MAY IMPOSE TEMPORARY RESTRICTIONS ON ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSIONS FOR OPERATIONAL SECURITY REASONS. MEDIA WILL SEEK APPROVAL TO USE ELECTRONIC DEVICES IN A COMBAT/HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT, UNLESS OTHERWISE DIRECTED BY THE UNIT COMMANDER OR HIS/HER DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVE. THE USE OF COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT WILL BE DISCUSSED IN FULL WHEN THE MEDIA ARRIVE AT THEIR ASSIGNED UNIT.

3. PROCEDURES.

3.A. THE OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS (OASD(PA)) IS THE CENTRAL AGENCY FOR MANAGING AND VETTING MEDIA EMBEDS TO INCLUDE ALLOCATING EMBED SLOTS TO MEDIA ORGANIZATIONS. EMBED AUTHORITY MAY BE DELEGATED TO SUBORDINATE ELEMENTS AFTER THE COMMENCEMENT OF HOSTILITIES AND AT THE DISCRETION OF OASD(PA). EMBED OPPORTUNITIES WILL BE ASSIGNED TO

MEDIA ORGANIZATIONS, NOT TO INDIVIDUAL REPORTERS. THE DECISION AS TO WHICH MEDIA REPRESENTATIVE WILL FILL ASSIGNED EMBED SLOTS WILL BE MADE BY THE DESIGNATED POC FOR EACH NEWS ORGANIZATION.

3.A.1. IAW REF. A, COMMANDERS OF UNITS IN RECEIPT OF A DEPLOYMENT ORDER MAY EMBED REGIONAL/LOCAL MEDIA DURING PREPARATIONS FOR DEPLOYMENT, DEPLOYMENT AND ARRIVAL IN THEATER UPON RECEIPT OF THEATER CLEARANCE FROM CENTCOM AND APPROVAL OF THE COMPONENT COMMAND. COMMANDERS WILL INFORM THESE MEDIA, PRIOR TO THE DEPLOYING EMBED, THAT OASD(PA) IS THE APPROVAL AUTHORITY FOR ALL COMBAT EMBEDS AND THAT THEIR PARTICULAR EMBED MAY END AFTER THE UNIT'S ARRIVAL IN THEATER. THE MEDIA ORGANIZATION MAY APPLY TO OASD(PA) FOR CONTINUED EMBEDDING, BUT THERE IS NO GUARANTEE AND THE MEDIA ORGANIZATION WILL HAVE TO MAKE ARRANGEMENTS FOR AND PAY FOR THE JOURNALISTS' RETURN TRIP.

3.B. WITHOUT MAKING COMMITMENTS TO MEDIA ORGANIZATIONS, DEPLOYING UNITS WILL IDENTIFY LOCAL MEDIA FOR POTENTIAL EMBEDS AND NOMINATE THEM THROUGH PA CHANNELS TO OASD(PA) (POC: MAJ TIM BLAIR, DSN 227-1253; COMM. 703-697-1253; EMAIL TIMOTHY.BLAIR@OSD.MIL). INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE FORWARDED INCLUDES MEDIA ORGANIZATION, TYPE OF MEDIA AND CONTACT INFORMATION INCLUDING BUREAU CHIEF/MANAGING EDITOR/NEWS DIRECTOR'S NAME; OFFICE, HOME AND CELL PHONE NUMBERS; PAGER NUMBERS AND EMAIL ADDRESSES. SUBMISSIONS FOR EMBEDS WITH SPECIFIC UNITS SHOULD INCLUDE AN UNIT'S RECOMMENDATION AS TO WHETHER THE REQUEST SHOULD BE HONORED.

3.C. UNIT COMMANDERS SHOULD ALSO EXPRESS, THROUGH THEIR CHAIN OF COMMAND AND PA CHANNELS TO OASD(PA), THEIR DESIRE AND CAPABILITY TO SUPPORT ADDITIONAL MEDIA EMBEDS BEYOND THOSE ASSIGNED.

3.D. FREELANCE MEDIA WILL BE AUTHORIZED TO EMBED IF THEY ARE SELECTED BY A NEWS ORGANIZATION AS THEIR EMBED REPRESENTATIVE.

3.E. UNITS WILL BE AUTHORIZED DIRECT COORDINATION WITH MEDIA AFTER ASSIGNMENT AND APPROVAL BY OASD(PA).

3.E.1. UNITS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR ENSURING THAT ALL EMBEDDED MEDIA AND THEIR NEWS ORGANIZATIONS HAVE SIGNED THE "RELEASE, INDEMNIFICATION, AND HOLD HARMLESS AGREEMENT AND AGREEMENT NOT TO SUE", FOUND AT

[HTTP://WWW.DEFENSELINK.MIL/NEWS/FEB2003/D20030210EMBED.PDF](http://www.defenselink.mil/news/feb2003/d20030210embed.pdf).

UNITS MUST MAINTAIN A COPY OF THIS AGREEMENT FOR ALL MEDIA EMBEDDED WITH THEIR UNIT.

3.F. EMBEDDED MEDIA OPERATE AS PART OF THEIR ASSIGNED UNIT. AN ESCORT MAY BE ASSIGNED AT THE DISCRETION OF THE UNIT COMMANDER. THE ABSENCE OF A PA ESCORT IS NOT A REASON TO PRECLUDE MEDIA ACCESS TO OPERATIONS.

3.G. COMMANDERS WILL ENSURE THE MEDIA ARE PROVIDED WITH EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO OBSERVE ACTUAL COMBAT OPERATIONS. THE PERSONAL SAFETY OF CORRESPONDENTS IS NOT A REASON TO EXCLUDE THEM FROM COMBAT AREAS.

3.H. IF, IN THE OPINION OF THE UNIT COMMANDER, A MEDIA REPRESENTATIVE IS UNABLE TO WITHSTAND THE RIGOROUS CONDITIONS REQUIRED TO OPERATE WITH THE FORWARD DEPLOYED FORCES, THE COMMANDER OR HIS/HER REPRESENTATIVE MAY LIMIT THE REPRESENTATIVES PARTICIPATION WITH OPERATIONAL FORCES TO ENSURE UNIT SAFETY AND INFORM OASD(PA) THROUGH PA CHANNELS AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. GENDER WILL NOT BE AN EXCLUDING FACTOR UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCE.

3.I. IF FOR ANY REASON A MEDIA REPRESENTATIVE CANNOT PARTICIPATE IN AN OPERATION, THEY WILL BE TRANSPORTED TO THE NEXT HIGHER HEADQUARTERS FOR THE DURATION OF THE OPERATION.

3.J. COMMANDERS WILL OBTAIN THEATER CLEARANCE FROM CENTCOM/PA FOR MEDIA EMBARKING ON MILITARY CONVEYANCE FOR PURPOSES OF EMBEDDING.

3.K. UNITS HOSTING EMBEDDED MEDIA WILL ISSUE INVITATIONAL TRAVEL ORDERS, AND NUCLEAR, BIOLOGICAL AND CHEMICAL (NBC) GEAR. SEE PARA. 5. FOR DETAILS ON WHICH ITEMS ARE ISSUED AND WHICH ITEMS THE MEDIA ARE RESPONSIBLE TO PROVIDE FOR THEMSELVES.

3.L. MEDIA ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING THEIR OWN PASSPORTS AND VISAS.

3.M. MEDIA WILL AGREE TO ABIDE BY THE CENTCOM/OASD(PA) GROUND RULES STATED IN PARA. 4 OF THIS MESSAGE IN EXCHANGE FOR COMMAND/UNIT-PROVIDED SUPPORT AND ACCESS TO SERVICE MEMBERS, INFORMATION AND OTHER PREVIOUSLY-STATED PRIVILEGES. ANY VIOLATION OF THE GROUND RULES COULD RESULT IN TERMINATION OF THAT MEDIA'S EMBED OPPORTUNITY.

3.N. DISPUTES/DIFFICULTIES. ISSUES, QUESTIONS, DIFFICULTIES OR DISPUTES ASSOCIATED WITH GROUND RULES OR OTHER ASPECTS OF EMBEDDING MEDIA THAT CANNOT BE RESOLVED AT THE UNIT LEVEL, OR THROUGH THE CHAIN OF COMMAND, WILL BE FORWARDED THROUGH PA CHANNELS FOR RESOLUTION. COMMANDERS WHO WISH TO TERMINATE AN EMBED FOR CAUSE MUST NOTIFY CENTCOM/PA PRIOR TO TERMINATION. IF A DISPUTE CANNOT BE RESOLVED AT A LOWER LEVEL, OASD(PA) WILL BE THE FINAL RESOLUTION AUTHORITY. IN ALL CASES, THIS SHOULD BE DONE AS EXPEDITIOUSLY AS POSSIBLE TO PRESERVE THE NEWS VALUE OF THE SITUATION.

3.O. MEDIA WILL PAY THEIR OWN BILLETING EXPENSES IF BILLETED IN A COMMERCIAL FACILITY.

3.P. MEDIA WILL DEPLOY WITH THE NECESSARY EQUIPMENT TO COLLECT AND TRANSMIT THEIR STORIES.

3.Q. THE STANDARD FOR RELEASE OF INFORMATION SHOULD BE TO ASK "WHY NOT RELEASE" VICE "WHY RELEASE." DECISIONS SHOULD BE MADE ASAP, PREFERABLY IN MINUTES, NOT HOURS.

3.R. THERE IS NO GENERAL REVIEW PROCESS FOR MEDIA PRODUCTS. SEE PARA 6.A. FOR FURTHER DETAIL CONCERNING SECURITY AT THE SOURCE.

3.S. MEDIA WILL ONLY BE GRANTED ACCESS TO DETAINEES OR EPWS WITHIN THE PROVISIONS OF THE GENEVA CONVENTIONS OF 1949. SEE PARA. 4.G.17. FOR THE GROUND RULE.

3.T. HAVING EMBEDDED MEDIA DOES NOT PRECLUDE CONTACT WITH OTHER MEDIA. EMBEDDED MEDIA, AS A RESULT OF TIME INVESTED WITH THE

UNIT AND GROUND RULES AGREEMENT, MAY HAVE A DIFFERENT LEVEL OF ACCESS.

3.U. CENTCOM/PA WILL ACCOUNT FOR EMBEDDED MEDIA DURING THE TIME THE MEDIA IS EMBEDDED IN THEATER. CENTCOM/PA WILL REPORT CHANGES IN EMBED STATUS TO OASD(PA) AS THEY OCCUR.

3.V. IF A MEDIA REPRESENTATIVE IS KILLED OR INJURED IN THE COURSE OF MILITARY OPERATIONS, THE UNIT WILL IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY OASD(PA), THROUGH PA CHANNELS. OASD(PA) WILL CONTACT THE RESPECTIVE MEDIA ORGANIZATION(S), WHICH WILL MAKE NEXT OF KIN NOTIFICATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE INDIVIDUAL'S WISHES.

3.W. MEDIA MAY TERMINATE THEIR EMBED OPPORTUNITY AT ANY TIME. UNIT COMMANDERS WILL PROVIDE, AS THE TACTICAL SITUATION PERMITS AND BASED ON THE AVAILABILITY OF TRANSPORTATION, MOVEMENT BACK TO THE NEAREST LOCATION WITH COMMERCIAL TRANSPORTATION.

3.W.1. DEPARTING MEDIA WILL BE DEBRIEFED ON OPERATIONAL SECURITY CONSIDERATIONS AS APPLICABLE TO ONGOING AND FUTURE OPERATIONS WHICH THEY MAY NOW HAVE INFORMATION CONCERNING.

4. GROUND RULES. FOR THE SAFETY AND SECURITY OF U.S. FORCES AND EMBEDDED MEDIA, MEDIA WILL ADHERE TO ESTABLISHED GROUND RULES. GROUND RULES WILL BE AGREED TO IN ADVANCE AND SIGNED BY MEDIA PRIOR TO EMBEDDING. VIOLATION OF THE GROUND RULES MAY RESULT IN THE IMMEDIATE TERMINATION OF THE EMBED AND REMOVAL FROM THE AOR. THESE GROUND RULES RECOGNIZE THE RIGHT OF THE MEDIA TO COVER MILITARY OPERATIONS AND ARE IN NO WAY INTENDED TO PREVENT RELEASE OF DEROGATORY, EMBARRASSING, NEGATIVE OR UNCOMPLIMENTARY INFORMATION. ANY MODIFICATION TO THE STANDARD GROUND RULES WILL BE FORWARDED THROUGH THE PA CHANNELS TO CENTCOM/PA FOR APPROVAL. STANDARD GROUND RULES ARE:

4.A. ALL INTERVIEWS WITH SERVICE MEMBERS WILL BE ON THE RECORD. SECURITY AT THE SOURCE IS THE POLICY. INTERVIEWS WITH PILOTS AND AIRCREW MEMBERS ARE AUTHORIZED UPON COMPLETION OF MISSIONS; HOWEVER, RELEASE OF INFORMATION MUST CONFORM TO THESE MEDIA GROUND RULES.

4.B. PRINT OR BROADCAST STORIES WILL BE DATELINED ACCORDING TO LOCAL GROUND RULES. LOCAL GROUND RULES WILL BE COORDINATED THROUGH COMMAND CHANNELS WITH CENTCOM.

4.C. MEDIA EMBEDDED WITH U.S. FORCES ARE NOT PERMITTED TO CARRY PERSONAL FIREARMS.

4.D. LIGHT DISCIPLINE RESTRICTIONS WILL BE FOLLOWED. VISIBLE LIGHT SOURCES, INCLUDING FLASH OR TELEVISION LIGHTS, FLASH CAMERAS WILL NOT BE USED WHEN OPERATING WITH FORCES AT NIGHT UNLESS SPECIFICALLY APPROVED IN ADVANCE BY THE ON-SCENE COMMANDER.

4.E. EMBARGOES MAY BE IMPOSED TO PROTECT OPERATIONAL SECURITY. EMBARGOES WILL ONLY BE USED FOR OPERATIONAL SECURITY AND WILL BE LIFTED AS SOON AS THE OPERATIONAL SECURITY ISSUE HAS PASSED.

4.F. THE FOLLOWING CATEGORIES OF INFORMATION ARE RELEASABLE.

4.F.1. APPROXIMATE FRIENDLY FORCE STRENGTH FIGURES.

4.F.2. APPROXIMATE FRIENDLY CASUALTY FIGURES BY SERVICE.

EMBEDDED MEDIA MAY, WITHIN OPSEC LIMITS, CONFIRM UNIT CASUALTIES THEY HAVE WITNESSED.

4.F.3. CONFIRMED FIGURES OF ENEMY PERSONNEL DETAINED OR CAPTURED.

4.F.4. SIZE OF FRIENDLY FORCE PARTICIPATING IN AN ACTION OR OPERATION CAN BE DISCLOSED USING APPROXIMATE TERMS. SPECIFIC FORCE OR UNIT IDENTIFICATION MAY BE RELEASED WHEN IT NO LONGER WARRANTS SECURITY PROTECTION.

4.F.5. INFORMATION AND LOCATION OF MILITARY TARGETS AND OBJECTIVES PREVIOUSLY UNDER ATTACK.

4.F.6. GENERIC DESCRIPTION OF ORIGIN OF AIR OPERATIONS, SUCH AS "LAND-BASED."

4.F.7. DATE, TIME OR LOCATION OF PREVIOUS CONVENTIONAL MILITARY MISSIONS AND ACTIONS, AS WELL AS MISSION RESULTS ARE RELEASABLE ONLY IF DESCRIBED IN GENERAL TERMS.

4.F.8. TYPES OF ORDNANCE EXPENDED IN GENERAL TERMS.

4.F.9. NUMBER OF AERIAL COMBAT OR RECONNAISSANCE MISSIONS OR

SORTIES FLOWN IN CENTCOM'S AREA OF OPERATION.

4.F.10. TYPE OF FORCES INVOLVED (E.G., AIR DEFENSE, INFANTRY, ARMOR, MARINES).

4.F.11. ALLIED PARTICIPATION BY TYPE OF OPERATION (SHIPS, AIRCRAFT, GROUND UNITS, ETC.) AFTER APPROVAL OF THE ALLIED UNIT COMMANDER.

4.F.12. OPERATION CODE NAMES.

4.F.13. NAMES AND HOMETOWNS OF U.S. MILITARY UNITS.

4.F.14. SERVICE MEMBERS' NAMES AND HOME TOWNS WITH THE INDIVIDUALS' CONSENT.

4.G. THE FOLLOWING CATEGORIES OF INFORMATION ARE NOT RELEASABLE SINCE THEIR PUBLICATION OR BROADCAST COULD JEOPARDIZE OPERATIONS AND ENDANGER LIVES.

4.G.1. SPECIFIC NUMBER OF TROOPS IN UNITS BELOW CORPS/MEF LEVEL.

4.G.2. SPECIFIC NUMBER OF AIRCRAFT IN UNITS AT OR BELOW THE AIR EXPEDITIONARY WING LEVEL.

4.G.3. SPECIFIC NUMBERS REGARDING OTHER EQUIPMENT OR CRITICAL SUPPLIES (E.G. ARTILLERY, TANKS, LANDING CRAFT, RADARS, TRUCKS, WATER, ETC.).

4.G.4. SPECIFIC NUMBERS OF SHIPS IN UNITS BELOW THE CARRIER BATTLE GROUP LEVEL.

4.G.5. NAMES OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS OR SPECIFIC GEOGRAPHIC LOCATIONS OF MILITARY UNITS IN THE CENTCOM AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY, UNLESS SPECIFICALLY RELEASED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OR AUTHORIZED BY THE CENTCOM COMMANDER. NEWS AND IMAGERY PRODUCTS THAT IDENTIFY OR INCLUDE IDENTIFIABLE FEATURES OF THESE LOCATIONS ARE NOT AUTHORIZED FOR RELEASE.

4.G.6. INFORMATION REGARDING FUTURE OPERATIONS.

4.G.7. INFORMATION REGARDING FORCE PROTECTION MEASURES AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS OR ENCAMPMENTS (EXCEPT THOSE WHICH ARE VISIBLE OR READILY APPARENT).

4.G.8. PHOTOGRAPHY SHOWING LEVEL OF SECURITY AT MILITARY

INSTALLATIONS OR ENCAMPMENTS.

4.G.9. RULES OF ENGAGEMENT.

4.G.10. INFORMATION ON INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION ACTIVITIES COMPROMISING TACTICS, TECHNIQUES OR PROCEDURES.

4.G.11. EXTRA PRECAUTIONS IN REPORTING WILL BE REQUIRED AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF HOSTILITIES TO MAXIMIZE OPERATIONAL SURPRISE. LIVE BROADCASTS FROM AIRFIELDS, ON THE GROUND OR AFLOAT, BY EMBEDDED MEDIA ARE PROHIBITED UNTIL THE SAFE RETURN OF THE INITIAL STRIKE PACKAGE OR UNTIL AUTHORIZED BY THE UNIT COMMANDER.

4.G.12. DURING AN OPERATION, SPECIFIC INFORMATION ON FRIENDLY FORCE TROOP MOVEMENTS, TACTICAL DEPLOYMENTS, AND DISPOSITIONS THAT WOULD JEOPARDIZE OPERATIONAL SECURITY OR LIVES. INFORMATION ON ON-GOING ENGAGEMENTS WILL NOT BE RELEASED UNLESS AUTHORIZED FOR RELEASE BY ON-SCENE COMMANDER.

4.G.13. INFORMATION ON SPECIAL OPERATIONS UNITS, UNIQUE OPERATIONS METHODOLOGY OR TACTICS, FOR EXAMPLE, AIR OPERATIONS, ANGLES OF ATTACK, AND SPEEDS; NAVAL TACTICAL OR EVASIVE MANEUVERS, ETC. GENERAL TERMS SUCH AS "LOW" OR "FAST" MAY BE USED.

4.G.14. INFORMATION ON EFFECTIVENESS OF ENEMY ELECTRONIC WARFARE.

4.G.15. INFORMATION IDENTIFYING POSTPONED OR CANCELED OPERATIONS.

4.G.16. INFORMATION ON MISSING OR DOWNED AIRCRAFT OR MISSING VESSELS WHILE SEARCH AND RESCUE AND RECOVERY OPERATIONS ARE BEING PLANNED OR UNDERWAY.

4.G.17. INFORMATION ON EFFECTIVENESS OF ENEMY CAMOUFLAGE, COVER, DECEPTION, TARGETING, DIRECT AND INDIRECT FIRE, INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION, OR SECURITY MEASURES.

4.G.18. NO PHOTOGRAPHS OR OTHER VISUAL MEDIA SHOWING AN ENEMY PRISONER OF WAR OR DETAINEE'S RECOGNIZABLE FACE, NAMETAG OR OTHER IDENTIFYING FEATURE OR ITEM MAY BE TAKEN.

4.G.19. STILL OR VIDEO IMAGERY OF CUSTODY OPERATIONS OR INTERVIEWS WITH PERSONS UNDER CUSTODY.

4.H. THE FOLLOWING PROCEDURES AND POLICIES APPLY TO COVERAGE OF WOUNDED, INJURED, AND ILL PERSONNEL:

4.H.1. MEDIA REPRESENTATIVES WILL BE REMINDED OF THE SENSITIVITY OF USING NAMES OF INDIVIDUAL CASUALTIES OR PHOTOGRAPHS THEY MAY HAVE TAKEN WHICH CLEARLY IDENTIFY CASUALTIES UNTIL AFTER NOTIFICATION OF THE NOK AND RELEASE BY OASD(PA).

4.H.2. BATTLEFIELD CASUALTIES MAY BE COVERED BY EMBEDDED MEDIA AS LONG AS THE SERVICE MEMBER'S IDENTITY IS PROTECTED FROM DISCLOSURE FOR 72 HOURS OR UPON VERIFICATION OF NOK NOTIFICATION, WHICHEVER IS FIRST.

4.H.3. MEDIA VISITS TO MEDICAL FACILITIES WILL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH APPLICABLE REGULATIONS, STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES, OPERATIONS ORDERS AND INSTRUCTIONS BY ATTENDING PHYSICIANS. IF APPROVED, SERVICE OR MEDICAL FACILITY PERSONNEL MUST ESCORT MEDIA AT ALL TIMES.

4.H.4. PATIENT WELFARE, PATIENT PRIVACY, AND NEXT OF KIN/FAMILY CONSIDERATIONS ARE THE GOVERNING CONCERNS ABOUT NEWS MEDIA COVERAGE OF WOUNDED, INJURED, AND ILL PERSONNEL IN MEDICAL TREATMENT FACILITIES OR OTHER CASUALTY COLLECTION AND TREATMENT LOCATIONS.

4.H.5. MEDIA VISITS ARE AUTHORIZED TO MEDICAL CARE FACILITIES, BUT MUST BE APPROVED BY THE MEDICAL FACILITY COMMANDER AND ATTENDING PHYSICIAN AND MUST NOT INTERFERE WITH MEDICAL TREATMENT. REQUESTS TO VISIT MEDICAL CARE FACILITIES OUTSIDE THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES WILL BE COORDINATED BY THE UNIFIED COMMAND PA.

4.H.6. REPORTERS MAY VISIT THOSE AREAS DESIGNATED BY THE FACILITY COMMANDER, BUT WILL NOT BE ALLOWED IN OPERATING ROOMS DURING OPERATING PROCEDURES.

4.H.7. PERMISSION TO INTERVIEW OR PHOTOGRAPH A PATIENT WILL BE

GRANTED ONLY WITH THE CONSENT OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN OR FACILITY COMMANDER AND WITH THE PATIENT'S INFORMED CONSENT, WITNESSED BY THE ESCORT.

4.H.8. "INFORMED CONSENT" MEANS THE PATIENT UNDERSTANDS HIS OR HER PICTURE AND COMMENTS ARE BEING COLLECTED FOR NEWS MEDIA PURPOSES AND THEY MAY APPEAR NATIONWIDE IN NEWS MEDIA REPORTS.

4.H.9. THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN OR ESCORT SHOULD ADVISE THE SERVICE MEMBER IF NOK HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED.

5. IMMUNIZATIONS AND PERSONAL PROTECTIVE GEAR.

5.A. MEDIA ORGANIZATIONS SHOULD ENSURE THAT MEDIA ARE PROPERLY IMMUNIZED BEFORE EMBEDDING WITH UNITS. THE CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL (CDC)-RECOMMENDED IMMUNIZATIONS FOR DEPLOYMENT TO THE MIDDLE EAST INCLUDE HEPATITIS A; HEPATITIS B; RABIES; TETANUSDIPHThERIA; AND TYPHOID. THE CDC RECOMMENDS MENINGOCOCCAL IMMUNIZATIONS FOR VISITORS TO MECCA. IF TRAVELING TO CERTAIN AREAS IN THE CENTCOM AOR, THE CDC RECOMMENDS TAKING PRESCRIPTION ANTIMALARIAL DRUGS. ANTHRAX AND SMALLPOX VACCINES WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE MEDIA AT NO EXPENSE TO THE GOVERNMENT (THE MEDIA OUTLET WILL BEAR THE EXPENSE). FOR MORE HEALTH INFORMATION FOR TRAVELERS TO THE MIDDLE EAST, GO TO THE CDC WEB SITE AT [HTTP://WWW.CDC.GOV/TRAVEL/MIDEAST.HTM](http://www.cdc.gov/travel/mideast.htm).

5.B. BECAUSE THE USE OF PERSONAL PROTECTIVE GEAR, SUCH AS HELMETS OR FLAK VESTS, IS BOTH A PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CHOICE, MEDIA WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PROCURING/USING SUCH EQUIPMENT. PERSONAL PROTECTIVE GEAR, AS WELL AS CLOTHING, WILL BE SUBDUED IN COLOR AND APPEARANCE.

5.C. EMBEDDED MEDIA ARE AUTHORIZED AND REQUIRED TO BE PROVIDED WITH, ON A TEMPORARY LOAN BASIS, NUCLEAR, BIOLOGICAL, CHEMICAL (NBC) PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT BY THE UNIT WITH WHICH THEY ARE EMBEDDED. UNIT PERSONNEL WILL PROVIDE BASIC INSTRUCTION IN THE PROPER WEAR, USE, AND MAINTENANCE OF THE EQUIPMENT. UPON TERMINATION OF THE EMBED, INITIATED BY EITHER PARTY, THE NBC EQUIPMENT SHALL BE RETURNED TO THE EMBEDDING UNIT. IF

SUFFICIENT NBC PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT IS NOT AVAILABLE FOR EMBEDDED MEDIA, COMMANDERS MAY PURCHASE ADDITIONAL EQUIPMENT, WITH FUNDS NORMALLY AVAILABLE FOR THAT PURPOSE, AND LOAN IT TO EMBEDDED MEDIA IN ACCORDANCE WITH THIS PARAGRAPH.

6. SECURITY

6.A. MEDIA PRODUCTS WILL NOT BE SUBJECT TO SECURITY REVIEW OR CENSORSHIP EXCEPT AS INDICATED IN PARA. 6.A.1. SECURITY AT THE SOURCE WILL BE THE RULE. U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL SHALL PROTECT CLASSIFIED INFORMATION FROM UNAUTHORIZED OR INADVERTENT DISCLOSURE. MEDIA PROVIDED ACCESS TO SENSITIVE INFORMATION, INFORMATION WHICH IS NOT CLASSIFIED BUT WHICH MAY BE OF OPERATIONAL VALUE TO AN ADVERSARY OR WHEN COMBINED WITH OTHER UNCLASSIFIED INFORMATION MAY REVEAL CLASSIFIED INFORMATION, WILL BE INFORMED IN ADVANCE BY THE UNIT COMMANDER OR HIS/HER DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVE OF THE RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OR DISCLOSURE OF SUCH INFORMATION. WHEN IN DOUBT, MEDIA WILL CONSULT WITH THE UNIT COMMANDER OR HIS/HER DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVE.

6.A.1. THE NATURE OF THE EMBEDDING PROCESS MAY INVOLVE OBSERVATION OF SENSITIVE INFORMATION, INCLUDING TROOP MOVEMENTS, BATTLE PREPARATIONS, MATERIEL CAPABILITIES AND VULNERABILITIES AND OTHER INFORMATION AS LISTED IN PARA. 4.G. WHEN A COMMANDER OR HIS/HER DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVE HAS REASON TO BELIEVE THAT A MEDIA MEMBER WILL HAVE ACCESS TO THIS TYPE OF SENSITIVE INFORMATION, PRIOR TO ALLOWING SUCH ACCESS, HE/SHE WILL TAKE PRUDENT PRECAUTIONS TO ENSURE THE SECURITY OF THAT INFORMATION. THE PRIMARY SAFEGUARD WILL BE TO BRIEF MEDIA IN ADVANCE ABOUT WHAT INFORMATION IS SENSITIVE AND WHAT THE PARAMETERS ARE FOR COVERING THIS TYPE OF INFORMATION. IF MEDIA ARE INADVERTENTLY EXPOSED TO SENSITIVE INFORMATION THEY SHOULD BE BRIEFED AFTER EXPOSURE ON WHAT INFORMATION THEY SHOULD AVOID COVERING. IN INSTANCES WHERE A UNIT COMMANDER OR THE DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVE DETERMINES THAT COVERAGE OF A STORY WILL INVOLVE

EXPOSURE TO SENSITIVE INFORMATION BEYOND THE SCOPE OF WHAT MAY BE PROTECTED BY PREBRIEFING OR DEBRIEFING, BUT COVERAGE OF WHICH IS IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE DOD, THE COMMANDER MAY OFFER ACCESS IF THE REPORTER AGREES TO A SECURITY REVIEW OF THEIR COVERAGE. AGREEMENT TO SECURITY REVIEW IN EXCHANGE FOR THIS TYPE OF ACCESS MUST BE STRICTLY VOLUNTARY AND IF THE REPORTER DOES NOT AGREE, THEN ACCESS MAY NOT BE GRANTED. IF A SECURITY REVIEW IS AGREED TO, IT WILL NOT INVOLVE ANY EDITORIAL CHANGES; IT WILL BE CONDUCTED SOLELY TO ENSURE THAT NO SENSITIVE OR CLASSIFIED INFORMATION IS INCLUDED IN THE PRODUCT. IF SUCH INFORMATION IS FOUND, THE MEDIA WILL BE ASKED TO REMOVE THAT INFORMATION FROM THE PRODUCT AND/OR EMBARGO THE PRODUCT UNTIL SUCH INFORMATION IS NO LONGER CLASSIFIED OR SENSITIVE. REVIEWS ARE TO BE DONE AS SOON AS PRACTICAL SO AS NOT TO INTERRUPT COMBAT OPERATIONS NOR DELAY REPORTING. IF THERE ARE DISPUTES RESULTING FROM THE SECURITY REVIEW PROCESS THEY MAY BE APPEALED THROUGH THE CHAIN OF COMMAND, OR THROUGH PA CHANNELS TO OASD/PA. THIS PARAGRAPH DOES NOT AUTHORIZE COMMANDERS TO ALLOW MEDIA ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.

6.A.2. MEDIA PRODUCTS WILL NOT BE CONFISCATED OR OTHERWISE IMPOUNDED. IF IT IS BELIEVED THAT CLASSIFIED INFORMATION HAS BEEN COMPROMISED AND THE MEDIA REPRESENTATIVE REFUSES TO REMOVE THAT INFORMATION NOTIFY THE CPIC AND/OR OASD/PA AS SOON AS POSSIBLE SO THE ISSUE MAY BE ADDRESSED WITH THE MEDIA ORGANIZATION'S MANAGEMENT.

7. MISCELLANEOUS/COORDINATING INSTRUCTIONS:

7.A. OASD(PA) IS THE INITIAL EMBED AUTHORITY. EMBEDDING PROCEDURES AND ASSIGNMENT AUTHORITY MAY BE TRANSFERRED TO CENTCOM PA AT A LATER DATE. THIS AUTHORITY MAY BE FURTHER DELEGATED AT CENTCOM'S DISCRETION.

7.B. THIS GUIDANCE AUTHORIZES BLANKET APPROVAL FOR NON-LOCAL AND LOCAL MEDIA TRAVEL ABOARD DOD AIRLIFT FOR ALL EMBEDDED MEDIA ON A NO-COST, SPACE AVAILABLE BASIS. NO ADDITIONAL COSTS SHALL

BE INCURRED BY THE GOVERNMENT TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE IAW DODI 5410.15, PARA 3.4.

7.C. USE OF LIPSTICK AND HELMET-MOUNTED CAMERAS ON COMBAT SORTIES IS APPROVED AND ENCOURAGED TO THE GREATEST EXTENT POSSIBLE.

8. OASD(PA) POC FOR EMBEDDING MEDIA IS MAJ TIM BLAIR, DSN 227-1253, CMCL 703-697-1253, EMAIL TIMOTHY.BLAIR@OSD.MIL.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX B: DAILY NEWS COVERAGE

	Mar 20	Mar 21	Mar 22	Mar 23	Mar 24	Mar 25	Mar 26	Mar 27	Mar 28	Mar 29	Mar 30	Mar 31	Apr 1	Apr 2	Apr 3	Apr 4	Apr 5	Apr 6	Apr 7	Apr 8	Apr 9	Apr 10	Apr 11	Apr 12	Apr 13	Apr 14	
NY Times																											
Filkins			3	2	1	1		1	1	1		3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2
Kifner			1		1				1					1								1			1	1	1
Wilson					1	1		2	1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1	1		1				
Sanger	1			3	1	1				1	1			1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1		1	1	1		
Schmitt		1			1	1	2	1			1			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1			1	1
Shanker			1					1	1	1	1	2		1	1	1			2	1	1		1		3	1	1
Wash Post																											
Baker	1	2	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1		1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2
Branigin		1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	2	1	1			
Vogel								1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1		1	1	1	1		
Loeb		1	1		2	2	1	1	1		1			2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1		2	1	1	1
Ricks		1	1	2	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1		1	1	2			1					
Weisman	1						1		2	1	1	1	1	1						1			1				1
LA Times																											
Mohan			1	1	1	2		1	1	1			1		1	2			1	2	1	1		1			
Perry		2		1	1	1	2		1		1	1		1		1	3				1						1
Zucchino										1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1	1	2		2	1
Drogin										1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1				1
Miller		1				1	1					1				1	1	1		1		1	1	1	1	1	1
Slackman										1						1	1	1					1	1	1	2	1
Rubin	1				1																						
TOTAL		9			14		8		12				15					14				11				13	

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

LIST OF REFERENCES

- 1st Marine Division (Rein) After Action Report - Operation Iraqi Freedom (1stMardivAAR). (2003, May). Retrieved March 8, 2004, from http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/report/2003/1mardiv_brief.pdf
- 3d Infantry Division (Mechanized) After Action Report - Operation Iraqi Freedom (3IDAAR). (2003, July). Retrieved March 16, 2004 from <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/report/2003/3id-aar-jul03.pdf>
- AdAge.com (2003, March 31). *Newspaper circulation for six months ended 03/31/2003*. Retrieved January 12, 2004, from <http://www.adage.com/page.cms?pageId=1037>
- Agenda Setting Theory (AST). (n.d.). *Core assumptions and statements*. Retrieved May 24, 2004, from <http://www.tcw.utwente.nl/theorieenoverzicht/macro/agenda-setting%20theory.html>.
- Altheide, D.L. (1996). *Qualitative Media Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Anderson, R. (2003, May/June). *That's Militainment! The Pentagon's Media-Friendly "Reality" War*. Retrieved November 26, 2003 from <http://www.fair.org/extra/0305/militainment.html>
- Anonymous. (2003, May). *My instincts tell me to stay*. *World Press Review*, 50(5).
- Antietam Image Gallery. (n.d.) *Historic photographs by Alexander Gardner*. Retrieved October 12, 2003, from <http://www.nps.gov/anti/gallery.htm>

- Arnett, P. (1996). The Clash of arms in exotic locales. *Media Studies Journal: Journalists In Peril*, Vol. 10, (4), Fall.
- Aronson, J. (1970). *The Press and the Cold War*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Aukofer, F. & Lawrence, W.P. (1995). *America's Team; The Odd Couple—A Report on the Relationship Between the Media and the Military*. Nashville, TN: Freedom Forum First Amendment Center.
- Ayers, T. (2004, February). The war in primetime. *Military Officer*, February 2004. Retrieved January 27, 2004 from <http://ebird.afis.osd.mil/ebfiles/e20040127252091.html>
- Ben-Zedeff, E.H. (2003, June 19). *Lessons of News Management in the Gulf Wars*. Retrieved March 12, 2004 from <http://www.ict.org.il/articles/articledet.cfm?Articleid=493>
- Berkowitz, B. (2003, April, 4). *Embedded, enthusiastic, and unencumbered by truth*. Retrieved March 16, 2004, from <http://www.workingforchange.com/article.cfm?itemid=14813>
- Blake, K. (n.d.) *Inverted pyramid story format*. Retrieved May 25, 2004, from Middle Tennessee State University Web site: <http://mtsu32.mtsu.edu:11178/171/pyramid.htm>
- Blanchard, M. (1992). Free expression and wartime: lessons from the past, hopes for the future. *Journalism Quarterly*, Vol 69(1), Spring, 5-17.
- Boot, W. (1991). The pool. *Columbia Journalism Review*, May/June, 24-27.

- Braestrup, P. (1985). *Battle Lines: Report of the Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on the Military and the Media*. New York: Priority Press.
- Cameron, R. (n.d.). *Basic Journalism*. Retrieved June 4, 2004, from <http://www.teachervision.fen.com/lesson-plans/lesson-6042.html>
- Campagna, J. (2003, March 19). Media concerns about covering the war. *The Boston Globe*. Retrieved November 25, 2003 from http://cpj.org/op_ed/Campagna19mar03.html?p
- Carlson, P. (2003, April 3). In the line of fire. *The Washington Post*, p.C01.
- Cohen, B.C. (1963). *The Press and Foreign Policy*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Cordesman, A.H., (2003). *The Iraq War: Strategy, Tactics, and Military Lessons*. Washington: CSIS Press.
- Cortes, N. (2002, April 10). Panel: media-military tension intensifying during war on terrorism. Retrieved March 16, 2004, from <http://www.freedomforum.org/templates/document.asp?documentID=16047>
- Engel, R. (2004). *A Fist In the Hornet's Nest: On the ground in Baghdad Before, During, and After the War*. New York: Hyperion.
- Entman, R.M. (1993). Framing: toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), pp. 51-58.
- Evans, H. (2003, Jan 17). *The War Correspondent*. Retrieved October 19, 2003 from <http://www.newseum.org/warstories/essay/index.htm>

- FM 46-1: Public Affairs Operations. (1997). Washington, D.C.: Headquarters Department of the Army.
- Freep.com. (n.d.). *Newspaper 101*. Retrieved May 20, 2004, from <http://www.freep.com/jobspage/academy/writing.htm>.
- Friedman, P. (2003, May/June). *The real time war*. Retrieved March 19, 2004, from <http://www.cjr.org/issues/2003/3/tv-friedman.html>
- Gilbert, M. (1994). *In Search of Churchill*. London: Harper Collins Publishing.
- Greeves, L. (n.d.). Reporting on war in the 21st century. Retrieved May 24, 2004, from http://www.pbs.org/newshour/extra/teachers/lessonplans/iraq/war_21century.html.
- Harper, J. (2004, March 17). Liberal war wonks dissect news. *The Washington Times*, p.A4.
- Harris, B. (n.d.). *The media and the military*. Retrieved January 16, 2004, from <http://www.civil-war-newspapers.com/military-media-relations.htm>.
- Hersh, S. (2001, November 12) *Escape and evasion*. Retrieved March 17, 2004, from http://www.newyorker.com/fact/content/?01112fa_FACT
- Hickey, N. (2002, January/February). *Access denied: The Pentagon's war reporting rules are the toughest ever*. Retrieved December 15, 2003 from <http://cjr.org/year/02/1/hickey.asp>
- Hickey, N. (2002, January/February). *Afghanistan and beyond: Q & A with Victoria Clarke*. Retrieved March,

- 19, 2004, from <http://www.cjr.org/issues/2002/1/qa-hickey.asp?printerfriendly=yes>
- Higgins, M. (1951). *The Report of a Woman War Correspondent*. New York: Doubleday.
- Issacson, W., & Jordan, E. (2003, January 7). CNN executives: let reporters cover war. Retrieved January 31, 2004, from <http://www.cnn.com/2003/US/01/07/isaacson.jordan.letter/>
- Iyengar, S. (1991). *Is Anyone Responsible? How Television Frames Political Issues*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jteacher.com. (n.d.). *Handbook on how to research*. Retrieved May 20, 2004, from <http://www.jteacher.com/PDF/melton/handbook.pdf>
- Karras, C. (2003, March 16). *Reporting from the front*. Retrieved February 27, 2004, from <http://www.sltrib.com/2003/Mar/03162003/arts/38433.asp>
- Katovsky, B., & Carlson, T., (2003). *Embedded: The Media at War in Iraq*. Guilford, CT: The Lyons Press.
- Kennedy, W.V. (1993). *The Military and the Media*. London: Praeger.
- Kilpatrick, B. & Leweke, R.W. (1997, Oct 9). *Mediating the media: frames, attribution of responsibility, and the individual media*. Retrieved May 10, 2004, from <http://list.msu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind9710b&L=aejmc&F=&S=&P=2382>.
- Knightley, P. (1975). *The First Casualty: From the Crimea to Vietnam: The War Correspondent as Hero*,

Propagandist, and Myth Maker. New York: Harcourt
Brace Jovanovich.

Kurtz, H. (2003a, March 10). After invading Kuwait,
reporters need boot camp. *The Washington Post*, p. C01.

Kurtz, H. (2003b, April 28). For media after Iraq, a case
of shell shock; battle assessment begins for
saturation reporting. *The Washington Post*, p. A1.

Kusnetz, M., Arkin, W.M., Meigs, M., & Shapiro, N. (2003).
NBC News: Operation Iraqi Freedom. Kansas City:
Andrews McMeel Publishing.

Lande, N. (1996). *Dispatches From the Front: A History of
the American War Correspondent.* Oxford: Oxford
University Press.

Lee, S. (2002, January 28). *Media access in war.* Retrieved
March 12, 2004, from <http://www.newsaic.com/ftvsnl27-06n.html>

Leedy, J.B. (2003, July 9). *The Return on sustaining base
investment in embedded media.* Retrieved March 15,
2004, from <http://www.amsc.belvoir.army.mil/articles/03-2/leedy.htm>

Madore, J.T. (2003, March 3). Journalists: Back to the
front; some skepticism over 'embedding' of media.
Newsday, A14.

MarineParents.com. (n.d.). Archived list of all embedded
journalists. Retrieved October 27, 2003 from
<http://www.marinemoms.us/USMC/embed-list.asp>

Martin Savidge: looking back on Anaconda. (2002, March
19). Retrieved March 17, 2004, from

- <http://www.cnn.com/2002/WORLD/asiapcf/central/03/19/savidge.otsc/>
- Matthews, L.J. (Ed.) (1991). *Newsmen and the National Defense*. Washington: Brassey's, Inc.
- McLaughlin, G. (2002). *The War Correspondent*. London: Pluto Press.
- McPherson, J.M. (1982). *Ordeal by Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction*. New York: Alfred A Knopf. Inc.
- Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary (9th ed.). (1987). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.
- Miracle, T.L. (2003). The army and the embedded media. *Military Review*, September-October 2003, 41-45.
- Moore, M. (1993). *A Woman at War: Storming Kuwait With the U.S. Marines*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Morgan, T. (n.d.). *War reporting*. Retrieved January 17, 2004 from http://college.hmco.com/history/readerscomp/mil/html/ml_057300_warreporting.htm
- Moyers, B. (n.d.). Bill Moyers Talks with Chris Hedges. Retrieved January 17, 2004 from http://www.pbs.org/now/printable/transcript_hedges_print.html.
- Newseum. (n.d.). *Civil war coverage*. Retrieved October 27, 2003, from <http://www.newseum.org/warstories/technology/flash.htm>.
- Overington, C. (2003, April 5). *From the back of an army jeep*. Retrieved December 1, 2003, from <http://www.theage.com.au/articles/2003/04/04/1048962934977.html>.

- Pasquarett, M. (2003, October). *Reporters on the ground: The military and the media's experience during Operation Iraqi Freedom*. Retrieved December 3, 2003, from <http://www.iwar.org.uk/news-archive/iraq/oif-reporters.pdf>
- PBS, Inc. (2002, December 17). *Battlefield bylines: The Pentagon's boot camp for journalists*. Retrieved November 25, 2003, from http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/military/july-dec02/bylinesb_12-17.html
- PBS, Inc. (2003, February 18). *Battlefield bylines: Two views on news coverage of a potential Iraq war*. Retrieved November 25, 2003, from http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/military/jan-june03/bylinesb_2-18.html
- Pew Research Center (PRCa). (2003, March 28). *TV combat fatigue on the rise*. Retrieved December 17, 2003, from <http://people-press.org/reports/display.php3?reportID=178>
- Pew Research Center (PRCb). (2003, April 9). *War coverage praised, but public hungry for other news*. Retrieved December 17, 2003, from <http://people-press.org/reports/display.php3?reportID=180>
- Plath, J. (n.d.). *A writer's resource: journalism quotes*. Retrieved Apr 7, 2004, from <http://titan.iwu.edu/~jplath/Quoth.html#Journalists>.
- Plenzer, J.M. *Conducting Expeditionary Public Affairs. Marine Corps Gazette*, February 2004, 26-29.
- Pool, J. (n.d.). *Taking the media inside Operation Anaconda*. Retrieved March 16, 2004, from http://www.prsa.org/_publications/magazines/1002news1b.asp

- Porch, D. (2003, July). *Media/military relations in the United States*. Retrieved March 12, 2004, from <http://www.pdgs.org.ar/porch.htm>
- Porch, D. (n.d.). *No bad stories: The American media-military relationship*. Retrieved March 12, 2004, from <http://www.nwc.navy.mil/press/Review/2002/winter/art5-w02.htm>
- Powell, C. & Perisco, J.E. (1995). *My American Journey*. New York: Random House.
- Ranade, V. (2003, July 14). *Analysis: Studying the 'Embeds'*. Retrieved December 1, 2003, from http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/document?_m=aaa39feb8ece346adcafa07a4961a890.html
- Rather, D., Wolfson, C., Bowers, C., Axelrod, J., Cowan, L., Strassmann, M., et al. (2003). *CBS News: America at War; The Battle for Iraq: A View From the Frontlines*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Reporters at War (n.d.). *War Reporting Timeline*. Retrieved March 4, 2004, from <http://times.discovery.com/convergence/reportersatwar/timeline/timeline.html>
- Royle, T. (1989). *War Report: The Correspondent's View of Battle from the Crimea to the Falklands*. London: Gratton Books.
- Schechter, D. (2003). *Embedded: Weapons of Mass Distraction*. Ontario, Canada: Coldtype.net
- Schwarzkopf, N, & Petre, P. (1992). *It Doesn't Take A Hero*. New York: Bantam Books.

- Shafer, J. (2003, May 1). *Embeds and the Unilaterals*. Retrieved January 27, 2004, from <http://slate.msn.com/id/2082412/>
- Smith, H. (Ed.) (1992). *The Media and the Gulf War: The Press and Democracy in Wartime*. Washington: Seven Locks Press.
- Swain, J. (2004, February 29). *The dying game*. London Times Magazine. Retrieved March 2, 2004, from <http://ebird.osd.mil/ebfiles/s20040301262176.html>
- Synovitz, R. (2002, August 5). *Afghanistan: report says Pentagon restricted journalists' access to war sites*. Retrieved March 19, 2004, from <http://www.rferl.org/features/2002/08/05082002154516.asp>
- Taylor, P.M. (1992). *War and the Media: Propaganda and Persuasion in the Gulf War*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- The Brookings Institution. (2003, June 17). *Assessing media coverage of the war in Iraq: press reports, Pentagon rules, and lessons for the future*. Retrieved November 20, 2003, from <http://www.brookings.edu/dybdocroot/comm/events/20030617.pdf>
- Thompson, L.B. (Ed.). (1991). *Defense Beat: The Dilemma's of Defense Coverage*. New York: Lexington.
- Trulock, N. (2003, April 10). *Walter Cronkite denounces the war*. Retrieved November 22, 2003, from <http://www.newsmax.com/archives/articles/2003/4/10/23307.shtml>
- U.S. Marine Corps. (1997). *Tactics (MCDP-1)*. Washington, D.C.

- U.S. Department of Defense, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs (ASDissues). (2001, December 6). *Media coverage issues*. Retrieved March 12, 2004, from [http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Dec2001/d20011213 media.pdf](http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Dec2001/d20011213%20media.pdf)
- U.S. Department of Defense, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs (ASDmeeting). (2001, December 13). *ASD PA Clarke meeting with DoD national media pool bureau chiefs*. Retrieved March 12, 2004, from <http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Dec2001/t12132001t1213asd.html>
- U.S. Department of Defense, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs (ASDwayahead). (2001, December 13). *The way ahead in Afghanistan*. Retrieved March 12, 2004, from [http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Dec2001/d20011213 media.pdf](http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Dec2001/d20011213%20media.pdf)
- U.S. Department of Defense, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs (ASDPAG). (2003, February 10). *Public affairs guidance (PAG) on embedding media during possible future operations/deployments in the U.S. Central Command's (CENTCOM) area of responsibility (AOR)*. Retrieved November 16, 2003, from <http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Feb2003/d20030228pag.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Defense, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs (ASDnames). (2003, February 21) *Media Embed Names*. Washington, D.C.
- Voss, F. (1994). *Reporting the War: The Journalistic Coverage of World War II*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press for the National Portrait Gallery.
- Wall, J.S. (2003, June 9). *Covering the news has many ups, downs for Savidge*. Retrieved March 17, 2004, from Ohio University web site: <http://www.ohiou.edu/infocus/savidge/>

- Willey, B.E. (1999, December-February). *The military-media connection: for better or for worse*. Retrieved March 12, 2004 from <http://www-cgsc.army.mil/milrev/english/DecFeb99/willey.asp>
- Wolfe, B. (2003, April 6). *Looking them in the eye*. Retrieved December 2, 2003, from <http://concordmonitor.com/wolfe/04062003.html>.
- Young, P. & Jesser, P. (1997). *The Media and the Military*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Young Reporters for the Environment.com (YRE) (n.d.) *Fact Sheet 1: Journalistic Writing*. Retrieved May 24, 2004 from <http://www.ac-grenoble.fr/yre/agency/chief/guides/fs1.htm>
- Zangrilli, A. (2003, May). *A Brief History of War Correspondents and Technology*. Retrieved February 27, 2004 from http://practice.findlaw.com/archives/nonbillable_0503.html
- Zucchino, D., (2004). *Thunder Run: The Armored Strike to Capture Baghdad*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.
- Zwirko, W. (2003, April 8). Embedded journalists' reporting questioned. *Dallas Morning News*. Retrieved December 1, 2003, from <http://foi.missouri.edu/jourwarcoverage/embeddedj.html>

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Defense Technical Information Center
Ft. Belvoir, Virginia
2. Dudley Knox Library
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
3. Marine Corps Representative
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
4. Director, Training and Education, MCCDC, Code C46
Quantico, Virginia
5. Director, Marine Corps Research Center, MCCDC, Code
C40RC Quantico, Virginia
6. Marine Corps Tactical Systems Support Activity (Attn:
Operations Officer)Camp Pendleton, California
7. Nimitz Library
U.S. Naval Academy
Annapolis, Maryland
8. PRODEV/Masters Program
U.S. Naval Academy
Annapolis, Maryland
9. Professor Alice Crawford
Graduate School of Business and Public Policy
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
10. Professor Gail Fann Thomas
Graduate School of Business and Public Policy
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
11. Michael J. Mooney
1101 August Drive
Annapolis, Maryland