

## **Is Media Terrorists' tool or a silent ally?**

Dr Chaditsa Poulatova

### **Introduction**

The recent bombings in Volgograd are everything but a coincidence, given the location and the timing – with the Winter Olympics just few weeks away. In this article, I aim to evaluate whether the relationship between terrorism and the media is a much complex than a single symbiosis. Though it seems that their interests do really coincide in that the more dramatic the account, the more mysterious, threatening and incomprehensible the terror, the greater its public impact and enhanced audience appeal.<sup>i</sup> For Chalmers Johnson the global expansion of mass media communications is regarded as of equal or greater importance in the growth of terrorism. The media contribute to the publicity for a particular terrorist cause, the contagious triggering of their terrorists' decision to act, the training of terrorists through media-fed pool of experience and inspiration, and international linkages amongst terrorist organisations.<sup>ii</sup> However, there are exceptions to that; e.g. cases in which terrorists aim to terrorise a government into doing something, in which case only government need to be aware of that threat. But even in those cases, terrorising the public at large is often used as a way of putting pressure on governments. At this point, it should be mentioned that by mass media we will mainly refer to here, are print and electronic media.

For the ease of discussion, this article has been divided into three principle sections: the theoretical understanding of the concepts; the terrorists' manipulations of mass media and vice versa; and the right to know versus limiting measures. The first section approaches the theoretical aspect of the notions of terrorism, and media. Then, given the fact that terrorists/terrorism do really gain access to the communication structure, in the second section we argue that not only do the terrorists manage to manipulate mass media, but also visa versa. And last but not least, in the third section we identify, by referring to J.S. Mill's work *On Liberty* and the people's will to know if there should be any measures of limiting the presentation of terrorist acts either by direct government involvement – through censorship – or, by voluntary self-restraint and self-regulation by the media.

## **Defining the Notions**

### **Terrorism**

“Terrorism” may be the most important, powerful word in the political vocabulary<sup>iii</sup> now, it is being used by different people, states, and international organisations in their everyday speeches or documents. For instance, the UK Ambassador to the United Nations Sir Jeremy Greenstock’s remark after the 9/11 attacks was that ‘what looks, smells and kills like terrorism is terrorism’<sup>iv</sup>. But what does this term mean? In 1984 Alex P. Schmid concluded that ‘academic researchers from many fields have spilled almost as much ink as the actors of terrorism have spilled blood’ and yet have reached no consensus on what terrorism is. Now, thirty years later there is still no generally agreed definition of terrorism.

Terrorism’s lack of a commonly agreed definition has an immediate and significant impact on the media too, which as an institution play an important role in the characterisation or labelling of acts of political violence. The definition of terrorism has an impact on whether or not the perpetrators of an act of violence are labelled “criminals”, “terrorists”, or “freedom fighters”. This is highly significant given that the media’s choice of label in their coverage of an act of violence stands to influence tremendously the audiences’ perceptions of the perpetrators of the act.<sup>v</sup>

According to Paul Wilkinson, terrorism<sup>vi</sup> is defined as coercive intimidation, or even as the systematic use of murder, injury and destruction so as to create a climate of terror, to publicise a cause and to coerce a wider target into a wider terrorism aims.<sup>vii</sup> In the same context, for Raymond Aron, an action of terrorism is labelled “terrorist” when its psychological effects are out of proportion to its purely physical result.<sup>viii</sup> The definitions mentioned above make clear the terrorists’ main aim: psychology of (non) victims.

Although many “official” definitions have been proffered, one developed by the United States Department of State comes closest to capturing terrorism in most possible dimensions. The definition is particularly meritorious because it does not exclude states as sponsors or perpetrators of terrorism: “terrorism is the threat or use of violence for political purposes by individuals or groups, whether acting for, or opposition to, established governmental authority, when such actions are intended to influence a target group wider than the immediate or victims”<sup>ix</sup>. Here, we will agree with Augustus Richard Norton who

stated that this definition ensures controversy, not consensus, for it does not clearly separate or delineate political violence from terrorism.<sup>x</sup>

J. Bowyer Bell, on the other hand, observed that the term terrorism “has become a convenient means to identify evil threats than to define a special kind of revolutionary violence” the very word, wrote Bell, “has become a touchstone for postures and beliefs about the nature of man and society, and the relation of law, order and a justice.”<sup>xi</sup> Therefore, very few people can speak of terrorism without a degree of emotional involvement, and there is a strong tendency on the part of potential victims to associate the technique only with enemies who might use it against them.

### **Is there any Agreed Legal Definition?**

From the legal perspective, as Michael P Scharf has noted, ‘the problem of defining “terrorism” has vexed the international community for years.’<sup>xii</sup> International legal scholars have wrestled with this problem since at least 1920s. For the majority of time international consensus on what constitutes terrorism has been frustrated by the divergent (and intractable) political positions of some states on questions such as whether the actions of States themselves can be characterised as “terrorist”, and whether the violent actions of national liberation movements merit the label.<sup>xiii</sup> International law in an attempt to sidestep the political sensitivity of the broader definitional question has adapted itself to the ‘predominant form of terrorist action at any given time’<sup>xiv</sup>. There are some twelve international conventions relating to terrorism, such as the Convention on the Preventions and Punishment of Crimes Against Internationally protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents<sup>xv</sup>, the International Convention against Taking of Hostages<sup>xvi</sup>, and the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings<sup>xvii</sup>. But still there is no legally agreed definition of terrorism, partially due to the fact that its it really hard to reach an international consensus.

### **Mass Media**

When we refer to the media, in contrast to terrorism, we imply all the methods or channels of information and entertainment. In particular the mass media are taken to encompass print- newspapers and news-magazines – and, electronic media – radio, internet, cable TV, over-the air TV<sup>xviii</sup> and more recently social media.

In Janny de Graaf’s text, Violence as Communication, he argues that the media not only adopts the language of terrorist, but ‘in many cases’ the news media automatically

adopts the nomenclature of the government<sup>xxix</sup>, rather is intimidated by the government's perceived information superiority<sup>xx</sup>. The most recent example is Obama's speech to the American nation and the whole world when he announced that "Tonight I can report to the American people and the world that the United States has conducted an operation that killed Osama bin Laden," adding that "Justice has been done"<sup>xxxi</sup>. Moreover, due to terrorism's enormous emotional impact, there is often a lack of neutral nouns for journalists to describe an insurgent terrorist, as 'terrorist', 'soldier', 'freedom fighter', 'criminal' or 'guerrilla' all require the journalist to make a moral judgement. Therefore, often journalists are forced to employ words which seem to indicate a bias out of lack of a more neutral substitute. An example of Terrorist and Counter-Terrorist Labels and nomenclature for the same thing is when; criminal acts are called revolutionary, a terrorist...is a guerrilla, and, a murderer is a freedom fighter<sup>xxii</sup>.

## **Media- Terrorism/ Terrorist Relationship**

### **Is it a symbiotic relationship?**

Contemporary terrorism can be explained in terms of the reactions that the media, led by television, supposedly provoke in response to acts which are, intrinsically of limited immediate impact. Both public interest and fierce competition among the media leads the latter, unavoidably, to regard terrorism as having high news value<sup>xxiii</sup>. While at the same time, terrorism as propaganda aims at a target of attention named public opinion, by following a Chinese proverb "kill one, frighten thousand"<sup>xxiv</sup>. In other words, terrorism is using propaganda by the deed so as, through carefully planned attacks and immediate reporting they manage to bring about their psychological goals. By the use of a demonstration of their movements' strength, they either gain public sympathy or create fear and chaos. Nevertheless publicity is gained, mainly by the rights exploitation of the media – live action spectacles cannot be ignored by the media – as well as, by a good understanding of the power of the television camera<sup>xxv</sup>. The latter justifies what William Calton claims: that, a terrorist activity is basically a form of theatre. Terrorists play to an audience. Without the mass media they would not be able to reach audiences as large as those from which they do now gain attention.<sup>xxvi</sup> The same view is shared by Brian M. Jenkins when referring to what terrorism is he said "Terrorism is aimed at the people watching, not the actual victims. Terrorism is a theatre".<sup>xxvii</sup> Both 9/11 and 7/7 attacks aimed at easily recognisable symbols, the Twin Towers, the London underground and the double deck buses. It is made clear that terrorism

and the media enjoy a symbiotic relationship, where on the one hand, modern technology communications satellites increase the publicity of a terrorist act and sell more news magazines and newspapers. While terrorists, on the other hand, manage a psychological defeat of their enemy either by a simple appearances on television of terrorist leaders or their spokesmen. It promotes their justification, as the presence of the speaker himself may influence the audiences – especially those who accept their actions – more than his/her words, which may even lead to the case of imitation.

However, it is worth mentioning that the terrorist-media relationship can be easily described as strictly one-way symbiosis; due to the fact that, the zoom-lens (symbol of all news gathering) swoops in on its subject at the initiative of the cameramen; it remains in the control of the media on how the subject seeks to exploit it. In other words, terrorism may not live and prosper without the media, but the media can do very nicely without terrorism<sup>xxviii</sup>.

### **Terrorist Manipulation of Mass Media**

Nevertheless, the media not only can provide but also have already provided to an immense and creditable extent a most positive contribution to the containment of terrorism as a result of good manipulative techniques used by the terrorists who in their strategy planning make careful calculations about when and how their actions will take place.

Firstly, during the attack on the Israeli Olympic team in Munich in 1972, by the Palestinian terrorists, the dramatic illustration of the events was relayed to a worldwide television audience of over 500 million<sup>xxix</sup>. This can be regarded as a good example of how terrorist groups plan their attacks to take place in a place when and where media are already gathered for a spectacular event; for it is a direct way of gaining media's attention by giving them, in a meantime, the opportunity not only to make their issue known – such as, in this case about Palestinian people and how they suffer under Israeli occupation - but also, the manipulation of the international press so as to give their cause a worldwide attention, either positive or negative. But for the case of imitation as a result of publicity it is worth mentioning the following example of kidnapping. Within the space of a week in the 1970 a British Diplomat and a Quebec cabinet minister were kidnapped by the separatists' activists acting under the name of Le Front de Liberation du Quebec (FLQ). Despite the first coverage confusion, FLQ succeeded in penetrating the media in such a way that the traditional means of reporting political violence were undermined for a period. Two Montreal radio stations came to be known as the electronic "mailboxes" for the two terrorist cells<sup>xxx</sup>, and the

broadcast of the FLQ manifesto by the state-run television network represented the transition and interpretation of the terrorists' political message; by giving them the power to speak, as well as to be heard<sup>xxxix</sup>. In other words, terrorists will hunger as long as mass media exist, for what the former British Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher, called 'the oxygen of publicity'.

### **Mass Media Pursue Their Own Interests**

This section looks at the cases where reporters instead of terrorists become the leading artists in the production of the events and sometimes even demonstrate the vulnerability of the authorities. For instance, during the 17 days of the hijacking of the TWA Flight 847, by hijackers from Islamic Jihad, NBC devoted almost two thirds of their total news-time to the crisis over the fate of the thirty nine American hostages<sup>xxxix</sup>. As Schmid observes, 'the exposure increased the price of the thirty nine US hostages and made their potential sacrifice extremely costly for the American and Israeli government'<sup>xxxix</sup>. And this, due to the fact that the majority of the Americans would completely identify with the hostages, increased pressure on both governments so as to do any deal with the hijackers that would guarantee the secure release of the hostages<sup>xxxix</sup>. In short, the media's exposure of the hostage families and their grief proved to be a good technique, so as to reach the desirable outcome: both the terrorists and the hostages undermined the American administration's declaratory policy of 'NO bargaining, no concessions' and probably increased the likelihood of imitation by other terrorist groups<sup>xxxix</sup>.

The most vital cause is that the media on some occasions have provided terrorists with direct intelligence by broadcasting information about police movements, possible tactical approaches and so forth. During the hijacking of the Lufthansa flight in 1977, for example, the action of the media contributed directly to the death of a hostage as the hijackers heard radio broadcasters saying that the captain of the airliner was secretly passing information to the authorities during routine transmissions to the ground<sup>xxxix</sup>. There are some incidents where live broadcasting may lead even to unnecessary violence, by providing the terrorist with an unedited platform, which directly changes the whole situation. In the hostage situation in Cleveland, Ohio, the hostage-taker saw the transmission, thought that he was about to be assaulted and terminated negotiations<sup>xxxix</sup>. While during the hijacking of a Kuwaiti airliner by Hezbollah terrorists in 1988 – when the airliner was on the ground at Larnaca, Cyprus – the media presented the hostage rescue operation by an elite commando group to take place. For, the large scale use of portable lighting by TV cameramen during the

hours of darkness would have brought undesirable consequences concerning the safe hostage rescue.

### **Terrorists Attack Journalists**

At this point, and having discussed the complex relationship between terrorists and the way that they reported by the mass media, it is worth mentioning that there are cases, in which journalists become the terrorists' enemies as they refrain from mentioning anything about them; instead, media is playing up the violent aspects at the expense of analysis. The latter, clearly undermines terrorist's claim to legitimacy by depicting him as merely violent and not political. The terrorists themselves feel 'used' by the media which pick up their action, but offer no guarantee of transmitting their message<sup>xxxviii</sup>. So, the only choice that they have is to attack the media; in March 1995 two rockets hit the MEGA TV network studios during the channel's 20:30 main evening news bulletin. The responsibility was taken by November 17 (17N), and hopefully nobody was injured<sup>xxxix</sup>.

Another example of terrorists targeting journalists is in Iraq of an Italian journalist, Giulian Sgena<sup>xl</sup>, who was kidnapped near Baghdad University in the middle of the day on Friday 4 February 2005 – the most worrying of all was that no group had claimed responsibility – and on Friday 4 March 2005 her kidnappers voluntarily released her. This incident came soon after the tragic death of another Italian journalist Enzo Baldoni, who was both a reporter and a volunteer for the Red Cross while being in Iraq<sup>xli</sup>. It is worth commenting, though, that soon after she was released, on 15<sup>th</sup> March 2005, Italian Prime Minister Berlusconi announced that Italy was planning to draw down its troop level in Iraq<sup>xlii</sup>. The latter raises a series of questions that need to be answered by the leading officials at some point in the near future. Looking closer through the lenses of the Committee to Protect Journalists, Syria and Somalia has been labelled as “the most dangerous country in the world for journalists” with 28 journalists killed and 21 abducted.<sup>xliii</sup>

The worrying and at the same time alarming figures have made Chris Cramer, former president of CNN International networks and honorary president of the International News and Safety Institute (INSI) state that “journalists are being killed at an unacceptable and unprecedented rate. Indeed they are more likely to be killed in the line of duty than are members of the armed forces”<sup>xliv</sup>.

### **Measures of Limiting Mass Media Immaturity**

### **i) People Need to Know VS Combating Measures**

If terrorism needs the oxygen of publicity, should terrorism be opposed by cutting off its supply of ‘oxygen’? This is a complicated issue, due to the fact that, on the one hand, there are people who still believe that they have the right to know disregarding all the negative aspects of this claim, while, on the other hand, the fear that publicity could encourage and motivate potential terrorist and keep the publicity and the government in some cases under fear.

People’s desire to know could be partially explained by referring to J.S. Mill’s work *On Liberty*<sup>xlv</sup> which contains a rational justification of the freedom of the individual in opposition to the claims of the state to impose unlimited control. Mill was, mainly, concerned with the pursuit of truth through freedom of discussion. And in this case – having taken into account Mill’s work – we could say that he would state the following three – relevant – arguments which could be these: First, it is simply unacceptable to deprive people of the truth. That is to treat people as children and to condone the manipulation of information that is available to them. If we allow a government to do this, we also give it a power that it can easily abuse. We must also remember that sometimes it is governments themselves that engage in terrorism. Secondly, full and correct information is essential to democracy. Democracy can be real only if the ‘demos’ has full and correct information because only then can it make judgements and form opinions that are genuinely its own<sup>xlvi</sup>. The danger of allowing a government to control information is that the government will come to control the demos rather than the demos the government, and would stand democracy on its head. And last but not least, although publicity serves the terrorist’s cause, it is also arguably necessary for combating terrorism in democratic circumstances. Only if a population is aware of the real threat of terrorism will it be willing to support the measures necessary to combat it. Here again though, correct and balanced information is critical. Sometimes it is suggested that governments exaggerate the threat of terrorism to manipulate the public into accepting measures they would otherwise resist.

In the meantime, when it comes to the combating measures aspects of the media themselves will have either to undergo government control of news coverage on terrorism or impose self-regulations; partly in a form of voluntary restraint and partly by cooperation with the government. For instance, the policy of voluntary restraint in reporting terrorist operations was put to the test several times in 1975, and reached its pinnacle of operational efficiency

during the Iranian embassy siege of 1980. The media, here, played a crucial role in the state's counterterrorism strategy, restricting their coverage as specified by the guidelines set out by Metropolitan police, and presenting "live" coverage of the storming of the embassy by the SAS troops. Though, in fact, the moment when SAS actually attacked was videotaped, and evidently the decision to hold back on live coverage for some minutes was the result of an 'understanding' with the authorities<sup>xlvii</sup>.

The Media's second option is that of voluntary self-restraint in order to avoid the dangers of manipulation and exploitation by terrorist groups; by the adoption of guidelines for their staff. CBS News' guidelines for example, commit the organisation to thoughtful, conscientious care and restraint in its coverage of terrorism<sup>xlviii</sup>. And last but not least is the censorship option; the constitutional regulations that sacrifices the media's freedom in the name of combating terrorism. As we have already mentioned, a former Prime Minister's concern was to stop the oxygen of publicity – and the British government banned the broadcasting of the voices of terrorist spokespersons. Instead, you could hear an actor trying to imitate their voices and their accent; in the case of Gerry Adams you had the opportunity to hear a different actor each time, without any success though. Parallel to the media ban on the use of IRA/Sinn Fein voices in interviews is the Irish Republic's ban on carrying interviews with PIRA (Provisional IRA), Sinn Fein and other terrorist spokespersons<sup>xlix</sup>. In the Israeli case you could speak about direct censorship too, as always – with only few exceptions – after a suicide bombing has taken place, we do not see what has happened to the victims. Israeli news show pictures only after the body bags are filled in order the horror part that offends public morality<sup>1</sup>. Nonetheless, government control of media reporting can be regarded as a double edged weapon. While terrorism might reduce the value of a strategy of terrorism for insurgencies, it cannot prevent them from engaging in other forms of political violence. In many countries it is likely that the level of terrorism will increase rather than decrease after the introduction of censorship, or even may lead to popular cynicism, such as in case of Uzbekistan, where the media repeatedly praise the government for being aware of the terrorist threat, and for its account to contain the danger of instability. But, in reality issues such as country's economy are portrayed by authorities to be much better than they really are.

## Conclusion

To sum up, from all the above mentioned it is easy to talk about a complex kind of symbiotic relationship between the mass media and terrorists and terrorism. And this because of the fact that terrorism is lacking definition, which allows the mass media to label their actions as they feel suitable; and so affecting the audiences' psychology. Hence, we should make clear that it is perhaps not true that there could be no terrorism without the modern mass media. In the past what we could now call terror tactics have been used especially by governments, to quell populations. For instance the tactics used by the Normans in England after the 1066 Conquest might now be described as terror tactics designed to frighten people into submission. But certainly the evolution of the mass media has made life much easier for the terrorist. The 9/11 attack on Twin Towers could not have had the effect it did without the mass media. It is hard to think of examples of non-state terrorism before the age of mass media. In short, it can be stated that there are cases when media do passively report terrorists and terrorism, and other when media actively shape their image; probably because the media feel that it is absolutely convenient for them to deal with such an issue that affects everybody – even the government. On the other hand, as we have already stated above, there are measures to eliminate terrorists' presentation in the mass media, either by the use of censorship or self-voluntary restraint. The first measure may in some cases bring good outcomes, but nevertheless it is an extreme measure that violates the rights of free expression and raises questions about the democratic principles that govern most of the states around the world. Whereas, the latter measure is more democratic, and at the same time gives an opportunity to the mass media to show to what extent they are willing to contribute to counter-terrorism measures or not. Are they ready to sacrifice their audiences in order to bring harmony in the society? And who can guaranteed that those who will set the rules are the “right” people to do so? For the time being we should not be too optimistic, as reality shows that the media are not ready yet to take such a responsibility and the whole network of interconnectedness does nothing but create a good ground for positive measures to be taken and applied in the same time.

---

<sup>i</sup> Indeed, it is often argued that the new media, the terrorists' specialists and the terrorists themselves require one another in order to thrive. Joseba Zulaika and William Douglas, *Terror and Taboo: The Follies, Fables and Faces of Terrorism* (New York: Routledge, 1996): 4.

---

<sup>ii</sup> It was published in an article titled “Terror” in 1977 however it seems to reflect the present relationship between terrorism and the media. David L. Palez and Alex P. Schmid, *Terrorism and the Media* (Newbury Park, California: Sage, 1992):92

<sup>iii</sup> Transnational Terrorism, Security and the Rule of Law, *Defining Terrorism*  
<http://www.transnationalterrorism.eu/tekst/publications/WP3%20Del%204.pdf> (April 25, 2011):7.

<sup>iv</sup> Quoted in A. Schmid ‘Terrorism: The Definitional Problem’, *Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law*, vol. 36 (2004), no. 375.

<sup>v</sup> A. Osasuo Alali and Kenoye Kelvin, *Media Coverage and Terrorism: Methods of Diffusion* (Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, 1991):3.

<sup>vi</sup> The English terms terrorism, terrorist and terrorise did not come into use until the equivalent French words *terrorisme*, *terroriste*, *terroriser* had developed in the revolutionary period between 1793 and 1798. The term *terrorist* came into general use to denote those revolutionaries who sought to use terror systematically either to further their views or to govern; in France or elsewhere. Paul Wilkinson, *Political Terrorism* (London: Macmillan, 1974):9.

<sup>vii</sup> Paul Wilkinson and Alasdair M. Steward, *Contemporary Research on Terrorism* (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1987).

<sup>viii</sup> Wilkinson, *Political Terrorism*, 13.

<sup>ix</sup> US Department of State, *Patterns of International Terrorism: 1982* (Washington: September 1983):2 also look at Alali and Eke, *Media Coverage of Terrorism: Methods of Diffusion*, 5.

<sup>x</sup> Augustus R. Norton, ‘Drawing the Line on Opprobrious Violence’ *Ethics and International Affairs* 4 (1990): 126

<sup>xi</sup> J. Bowyer Bell, ‘Trends of Terror: The Analysis of Political Violence’ *World Politics* 29 (1977): 477.

<sup>xii</sup> Scharf, Michael P ‘Defining Terrorism as the Peace Time Equivalent of War Crimes: A Case of too much Convergence between International Humanitarian Law and International Criminal Law?’ *International Law Students Association Journal of International and Corporate Law* 7 (2001):391

<sup>xiii</sup> Geoffrey, Levitt, ‘Is “Terrorism” Worth Defining?’ *Ohio University Law Review* 13 (1986):97.

<sup>xiv</sup> Jean-Marc Sorel, ‘Some Questions about the Definition of Terrorism and the Fight Against its Financing’ *European Journal of International Law* 14/2 (2003): 368.

<sup>xv</sup> Convention on the Protection and Punishment of Crimes Against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, opened for signature 14 December 1973, 1035 UNTS 167 (entered into force 20 February 1977).

<sup>xvi</sup> International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, opened for signature 17 December 1979, 1316 UNTS 205 (entered into force 3 June 1983).

<sup>xvii</sup> International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, opened for signature 15 December 1997, 2149 UNTS 284 (entered into force 23 May 2001). A list of international treaties or conventions on this

---

subject (both United Nations and non-UN instruments) can be found at Peter J Van Krieken,, *Terrorism and International Legal Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

<sup>xviii</sup> In World War I war reporting was for the first time put on a respectable and practical basis. During WWII, civilians found themselves in the front line for the first time. People were able to keep their nerve. This was mainly to BBC Sound Radio, which offered a magnificent steadying influence in what became a national institution, the Nine O'clock News. Jennifer Sha, *Ten Years of Terrorism: Collected Views* (London: Royal United Services Institute for Defence Studies, 1979):87.

<sup>xix</sup> Alex Schmid and Janny Graaf, *Violence as Communication: Insurgent Terrorism and the Western News Media* (London: Sage Publications, 1982).

<sup>xx</sup> Noam Chomsky and Edward S. Herman, *Manufacturing of Consent: The political Economy of the Mass Media* (New York: Pantheon, 1988). In manufacturing of Consent, Herman and Chomsky explain their highly influential 'propaganda model', which aims to explain why the media in the USA rarely deviates the opinion of the US corporate and political elites. The other four model filters are: 'corporate filters' (pp3-14), 'advertising' (p.17), 'flank' (p.27) and 'ideological filters' (p.29).

<sup>xxi</sup> Huffold Post, 'Osama Bin Laden Dead, Obama Announces'  
[http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/05/01/osama-bin-laden-dead-killed\\_n\\_856091.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/05/01/osama-bin-laden-dead-killed_n_856091.html) (May 8, 2011).

<sup>xxii</sup> A similar table appears in de Graaf, op.cit., p.88.

<sup>xxiii</sup> As they fulfil the ingredients of the news for all media; such as conflict and drama. So as to build up an audience and keep it to remain in business. Charles Kegney, *International Terrorism: Characteristics, Causes, Control* (New York: St. Martin's, 1990).

<sup>xxiv</sup> A. Schmid Alex, 'Terrorism and the Media: The Ethics of Publicity' *Terrorism and Political -Violence* 1 (1998): 540.

<sup>xxv</sup> Richard Glutterbuck has stated that, the shooting war must support propaganda war but never supersede it. It continues that the most powerful weapons in the terrorist war is the TV camera. Kegney, *International Terrorism: Characteristics, Causes, Control*, 158

<sup>xxvi</sup> Paletz and Schmid, *Terrorism and Media*, 30 Brigitte L. Nacos, *Terrorism and the Media* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994).

<sup>xxvii</sup> Brigitte L. Nacos, *Terrorism and the Media* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994): 75.

<sup>xxviii</sup> Geoffrey, Jackson, 'Terrorism and the News Media' *Terrorism and Political Violence* 2/4 (1990): 526.

<sup>xxix</sup> Russell Farnen, 'Terrorism and the Mass Media: A systematic analysis of the Symbiotic Relationship' *Terrorism* 12/2 (1990):11

<sup>xxx</sup> The one was the Liberation cell of the FLQ, while the Minister's kidnappers called themselves the Chenier cell. Wilkinson and Steward, *Contemporary Research on Terrorism*, 424-4. With the reading of their communiqués on the radio and their appearance in the daily newspapers, the FLQ finally succeeded in penetrating the communication network.

<sup>xxxi</sup> Wilkinson and Steward, *Contemporary Research on Terrorism*, 428.

---

<sup>xxxii</sup> One American military man, Robert D. Stethem was killed while the fate of the rest was unknown and unpredictable.

<sup>xxxiii</sup> Paul Wilkinson, 'The Media and Terrorism: A Reassessment' *Terrorism and Political Violence* 9/2 (1997):57

<sup>xxxiv</sup> A. Schmid, 'Terrorism and the Media: The Ethics of Publicity', 549.

<sup>xxxv</sup> Exactly as the Teheran hostage crisis in 1979 with the TV networks' constant and disproportionate emphasis on the fate of the hostages and their portrayal of an administration; apparently powerless to obtain their release, helped to undermine Carter and to pave the way for the election of the Ronald Reagan. Wilkinson, 'The Media and Terrorism: A Reassessment', 57-8.

<sup>xxxvi</sup> Grant Wardlaw, *Political Terrorism: Theory, Tactics and Counter-Measures* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989): 79.

<sup>xxxvii</sup> Wardlaw, *Political Terrorism: Theory, Tactics and Counter-Measures*, 80.

<sup>xxxviii</sup> Schmid, 'Terrorism and the Media: The Ethics of Publicity', 559.

<sup>xxxix</sup> Claiming responsibility for the attack on Mega TV, 17N argued that the intent was never to cause mass casualties but its 15-minute warning to Eleftherotypia newspaper was deliberately ignored. The mortaring of Mega TV confirmed the group's obsessive hunger for publicity and emphasised its clouded strategic thinking.

George, Kassimeris, *Europe's Last Red Terrorists: The Revolutionary Organisation 17 November* (London: Hurst, 2001): 101.

<sup>xl</sup> Surprisingly for some Italians and US people she is regarded as undermining the "good" will of these two states for helping Iraqi people. She was not regarded as neutral observer simply because she was saying how things were really taking place. Worth looking at; Java Report:

'Guiliana Sgrena's Lies, Inconsistencies and Treason' <http://www.mypetjawa.mu.nu/archives/070680.php>

(20 April 2011).

<sup>xli</sup> International Federation of Journalists (IFJ), 'Media Faces 'hard choices' over Iraq Coverage as Italian Journalist is Kidnapped' <http://www.ifj.org/default.asp?index=2940&Language=EN> (20 April 2011).

<sup>xlii</sup> Informazione dall'iraq occupato (URUKNET.INFO): 'How Sgrena Forced Italy's withdrawal from Iraq' <http://www.uruknet.info/?p=m10439&isize=1&hd=0> (19 April 2011).

<sup>xliii</sup> "Syria" Committee to Protect Journalists: Defending Journalists Worldwide(CPJ) <http://www.cpj.org/2013/02/attacks-on-the-press-in-2012-syria.php> (accessed 7/1/2014).

<sup>xliiv</sup> C. Cramer, 'Danger: Media at Work: Five Hundred Journalists Are Due to Join U.S. Troops. Their Safety is Paramount' *The Guardian* <http://www.theguardian.com/media/2003/feb/24/mondaymediasection.Iraqandthedia2> (accessed 7/1/2014).

<sup>xliv</sup> J. S. Mill, *On Liberty* (London: Longman, Roberts and Green, 1869).

<sup>xlvi</sup> Though in some cases in a representative democracy, if you can control the majority then you can control everyone, by setting the majority to vote for your candidates. And when "democratically elected" candidates

---

pass whatever laws are needed nobody can claim that is “undemocratic”, i.e. Hitler’s agents in 1930s in Nazi Germany and seems to be happening nowadays in many “democratic” states such as USA.

<sup>xlvii</sup> Paletz and Schmid, *Terrorism and the Media*, 90

<sup>xlviii</sup> ...avoiding to give an excessive platform for the terrorist. No live coverage if the terrorist. Avoiding interference with the authorities’ communications...and attempting to achieve such overall balance as to length the terrorist story does not unduly crowd out there important news of the hour/day. Wilkinson, ‘The Media and Terrorism: A Reassessment’, 62-3.

<sup>xlix</sup> Under Section 31 of their 1960 Broadcasting Authority Act. But Sin Fein protested that it was a legal political party in the Republic of Ireland and therefore had the legal right to broadcasting time. Ibid., 61

<sup>l</sup> The British government is using D-notices (Defence Notices) in order to prevent media coverage on any aspects which the government deems relevant for national security. D-Notices are issued to editors, suggesting that an item should not receive publicity. Schmid and de Gaaf, *Violence as Communication*, 158.