

# Reporting on Terrorism

*The US War in Afghanistan  
on Local TV News*

A Report by the Grand Rapids  
Institute for Information Democracy  
[www.griid.org](http://www.griid.org)

**GRID**



## Summary of Findings

- \* There was a significant increase in international coverage during this 75-day study compared to previous research.*
- \* News stories from all 3 stations tended to be biased in favor of what the US government was saying and doing.*
- \* There was minimal coverage of International perspectives.*
- \* The human cost of the war received almost no coverage.*
- \* Dissenting opinions on the war were given marginal coverage.*

## Methodology

From October 7<sup>th</sup> through December 21, 2001, GRIID documented Local TV news coverage of the US war in Afghanistan and the domestic war on terrorism. We looked at the 6 & 11pm newscasts from WOOD TV8 and WZZM 13, and the 10pm newscast from FOX 17.

GRIID logged the total amount of stories and people interviewed in all stories. We looked at stories from Afghanistan, from the White House and stories with local connections to the war. GRIID also documented the amount of local stories as it related to the US “War on Terrorism.”

The content analysis was based upon our own observations with some reliance on other national studies of media coverage. Resources that were used for this report can be found on page

GRIID is an organization that is committed to teaching critical thinking skills and monitoring media output.

To view other reports go to <http://www.griid.org/griidreports.shtml>.  
To contact GRIID call (616) 459- 4788 x122 or e-mail [jsmith@grcmc.org](mailto:jsmith@grcmc.org).

The logo for GRIID, with the letters 'GRIID' in a bold, green, sans-serif font.

## Introduction

It is no doubt safe to say that since September 11, 2001 most people in the US look at the world through different lenses. Most people probably couldn't locate Afghanistan on a world map prior to 9/11 nor could they identify Osama bin Laden. Some would even argue that because of 9/11 the news is done differently.

According to an initial study from the Project for Excellence in Journalism *Before And After: How The War on Terrorism Has Changed The News Agenda, Network Television* (June to October 2001) [http://www.journalism.org/publ\\_research/index.html](http://www.journalism.org/publ_research/index.html) all the major networks had made shifts in the amount of coverage. Just prior to 9/11 the major news story was the Gary Condit scandal. Shortly after 9/11 the TV networks saw an increase in viewership, with an obvious emphasis on international affairs. The same was true for the three TV stations that GRIID surveyed. For almost everyday of the 75-day study the local TV stations ran stories related to the "War on Terrorism." This is a vast improvement to previous International coverage (see our 6-month study <http://www.griid.org/pdfs/viewoftheworld.pdf>) since the amount of coverage for the war in Afghanistan equaled that of the entire world previously. Not only did we observe an increase in stories, but we also saw a substantial increase in the length of many of these stories. This increase in length and number of stories by local news dealing with global affairs demonstrates that if local TV news agencies want to give us regular reporting on non-local news, they can do it.

In our study we looked at the amount of stories, whose voices were heard, how the US military campaign in Afghanistan was framed and coverage of military vs. civilian casualties. For all of these categories we made comparisons between what the 3 local news networks reported and a variety of independent national and international information sources. (See Appendix A) We also looked at coverage of local reaction to the "War on Terrorism." In addition we made a comparison of how local support for the war on terrorism was treated as opposed to those with dissenting opinions. (See *Reporting on Local Reaction*)

<u>Number of stories</u>	
WOODTV 8	133
WZZM 13	79
Fox 17	60

Before we get to the content analysis, it is important to ask some serious questions about what role the news media should play during a war, particularly news media based in a country at war. We have recently learned that the US government created immediately after 9/11 a new office of misinformation - the Pentagon's Office of Strategic Influence (<http://www.fair.org/activism/osi-propaganda.html>). One of the functions of this new office is to win the hearts and minds of the public, at home and abroad. As has been the case in past US military interventions providing misinformation is a standard practice. (See Nancy Snow's *Propaganda, Inc.: Selling America's Culture to the World*) Does this mean that the news media did not have full access to what the US military was up to? Should they even have that choice or is it appropriate to withhold some information from the public? We know that early on the Pentagon bought many

of the satellite imagery in order to minimize the amount of potentially damaging photos of civilian casualties. Is this a form of censorship?

We do not presume to know the answers to any of these questions, but we believe that it is extremely important to ask them. If the news media asks questions like these then the possibility of increased public discourse can take place and that could lead to greater clarity as to expectations about what the news media's responsibility to the public is. It was common practice throughout our study to hear news reporters and news-readers cite public opinion polls that generally ranged between 80-90% in support of the US military action in Afghanistan. However, if people have been given a very biased view from news outlets, is it possible to make a well-informed decision? (<http://staff.stir.ac.uk/david.miller/publications/World-opinion.html>)  
Can opinion polls be accurate if the public has a limited perspective based on mainstream media reporting?



As we will demonstrate in the content analysis section, all three stations took a position on the US "War on Terrorism." How they framed stories and whom they used as sources contributed to that. Even the graphic headings used throughout meant that the stations were taking a position. Headings such as *America at War*, *America Strikes Back*, *The War on Terrorism*, all presume something. The headings and much of the coverage presumed that the US military response is a war on terrorism and that it was a

natural and inevitable response.

Lastly, it is important to mention that both channel 8 and 13 both made very deliberate visual changes to their station "look," changes that reflected, in our opinion, a



bias. Both stations changed their station bug in ways that reflected a more patriotic motif. Channel 8 began their weather section after 9/11 with a virtual American flag and channel 13 initiated Project Patriotism, a paper flag promotion that people could get

at partnering businesses or download from the WZZM web page. In addition channel 13 ran station promos reflecting a very patriotic position. In one promo, reporter Kim Covington sings the National Anthem and another gave viewers a montage of the 9/11 destruction/community response to it, accompanied by music with overtly religious lyrics.



## *Framing the War on Terrorism*

One question that many people began asking after 9/11 was "Why would people want to do this to us," or as President Bush put it "Why do they hate us?" Giving a context to the terrorist attacks and the US military response in Afghanistan is extremely important. Understanding what role the US government played in the Afghan resistance to Soviet occupation in the 1980's or the CIA's relationship to Osama bin Laden before the US War in the Persian Gulf could have significant bearing on how people would understand the current war. However, in the 75-day study GRIID conducted, *not once* were these fundamental facts mentioned. In fact, very little context was given in any of the coverage documented. Some context was given in regards to the Taliban's repressive practices and Osama bin Laden's wealth, but that was the extent of the contextual reporting we observed in the study.

The bulk of the reporting came from Washington. Each of the stations relied on the networks to provide them with coverage of the daily events as they unfolded. This meant that coverage tended to focus on what the US military was doing, the Taliban's response, or the whereabouts of bin Laden. Reporters usually spoke with the White House in the background, reporting on what the President or one of his cabinet members said that day at a news conference. *Not once* did any of the stations investigate question, challenge or provide other news perspectives on what the Bush administration was doing. On every occasion where Taliban, Afghani or humanitarian groups claimed that civilians were killed in a US bombing raid, the news-readers always read the US government response or had a clip of Bush or Rumsfeld defending the US military actions. In one story on alleged civilian casualties Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld said, *"Responsibility of every single casualty in this war, be they innocent Afghanis or innocent Americans, rests at the feet of the Taliban and Al Q'ueda."* (Fox 17)

Besides reporting on what Washington said was happening, all three stations relied on Department of Defense video footage to accompany stories. As was the case with the Persian Gulf War, the TV news used footage that showed visuals of aerial bombings, US troop activities (mostly on base) and computer-generated mapping. Fox 17 went one step further by using DOD created computer animation to explain everything from the US "humanitarian food drops, " C-130 planes, the Daisy Cutter bomb and the elaborate cave construction that allegedly housed bin Laden and the Al Q'ueda network.

At no time did any of the stations even discuss the role of international law, except when reporting on pleas made by local anti-war activists. The role of the United Nations was almost completely absent in coverage, as was the role of the World Court. Again the limited coverage left many questions unanswered. Was there ever a US "War on Terrorism" prior to 9/11, and if so, and what were the results? How was the US government defining terrorism? Was there a consistent application of anti-terrorist policies globally? None of these are easy questions to answer, but could have been extremely important to informing the public as to what policies to support. It should be noted that as an example of possible reporting on terrorism, the international news wire service Reuters does not use the word terrorism, since they believe that one person's terrorism might be another persons act of self-defense. *"Our policy is to avoid the use of emotional terms and not make value judgments concerning the facts we attempt to report*

*accurately and fairly.*" (<http://www.fair.org/media-beat/011004.html>)

### *Those who speak always have the last word*

Another indicator of significant bias was with whom viewers were likely to hear from in news coverage on the US "War on Terrorism." As you can see from the chart, most of the voices were from either the US administration or the US military. Bush and Rumsfeld led all individuals that were given air-time, Bush was given 52 sound-bites and Rumsfeld 30 (all 3 stations combined). Glaringly absent are International voices. The United Nations is only heard from once (WOOD TV8), the Taliban once (WOOD TV8), Russian Pres. Putin once (FOX 17), British Prime

Minister Tony Blair once (WOOD TV8), the Pakistani President once (WZZM 13), and a bin Laden spokesperson once (Fox 17). The US-supported Northern Alliance was heard from on a combined total of 12 times and mentioned by reporters on all three stations numerous of

### **Who viewers heard from**

Voices:	Fox	WOODTV8	WZZM13
Bush	23	14	15
Bush administration	18	10	2
Rumsfeld	20	10	
US Military spokesperson	18	15	3
US Soldiers	6	12	10
Taliban		1	
Northern Alliance	6	4	2
United Nations		1	
Tony Blair		1	
US Politicians	8	13	
Experts			1
Former Afghan "Freedom Fighter"	1		
Religious	1	3	2
Bin Laden			
Bin Laden spokesperson	1		
Anti-war	3	1	1
Russian Pres. Putin	1		
Laura Bush		1	
Pakistan Pres.			1
Former Afghan Pres. Rabbani		1	
Family of US soldiers	4	7	6
Unidentified Afghan Rebel	1		
University Prof.	1		
Local Muslim	1	7	4
Arab Journalist			1
FBI		1	

other times. Interestingly enough, not much context was given to their role in overthrowing the Taliban, nor their treatment of the Afghani civilian population, even though it has been well known for years that they equal the brutality of the Taliban. (See Human Rights Watch Report <http://www.hrw.org/background/asia/afghan-bck1005.htm#uf> and from the Revolutionary Association of Women in Afghanistan <http://rawa.false.net/na-killers.htm>)

What difference would it have made for viewers if they heard more international voices, even perspectives from the Taliban, bin Laden or Al Q'ueda on a regular basis? Viewers were shown excerpts of bin Laden interviews on Al Jeezra TV, but that caused such a stir that the Pentagon pressured the networks to stop airing bin Laden interviews for fear that there might be hidden messages/instructions for other potential terrorists. That did not prevent the Pentagon from releasing "the Tape" in which bin Laden is seen celebrating the World Trade Center bombing. All three stations ran multiple excerpts from the "the Tape" with public reaction. WZZM 13 did ask some local Arab Americans if they thought the tape was authentic, both men interviewed thought that it was. WOOD TV 8 was the only local station to run a response by an Arab outside the US who thought the tape was a fabrication, but they followed that up with a longer reaction by a retired New York City police officer who lost a son in the WTC bombing. Many sources since "the Tape" was released have questioned its authenticity, but that questioning didn't really make its way on the local stations.

(See *New York Times*, December 16, 2001; <http://www.commondreams.org/views01/1217-07.htm>)

Local voices were also fairly limited. University professors and those labeled "experts" were heard from only once each. Local Muslims were given voice a combined total of 13 times with reaction to the "War on Terrorism." Religious leaders were heard from on 6 different occasions and those labeled anti-war activists were heard from 5 times. Families in the greater Grand Rapids Area who had husbands or children in the military were heard from 17 times. Not only did we hear from military families more often than those who opposed the war, but the length of stories were usually 4 or 5 times longer. (See *Reporting on Local Reaction*)

### *Worthy and Unworthy Victims*

As in any war there will be casualties - wounded, killed and displaced. Early on the Pentagon said that it would minimize the amount of "collateral damage," a term for civilian casualties that has been used since the US military invasion of Panama in 1989. There were a total of 5 stories on wounded or killed civilians (WOOD TV8 - 2, Fox 17 - 3). In 3 of the stories viewers saw wounded or killed Afghani civilians; a wounded child on a stretcher, a wounded child in a hospital bed and several dead bodies laid out for grieving families. Considering that estimates range between 1,000 (humanitarian groups & the UN) and 4,000 (an estimate by Professor Marc Herold <http://www.zmag.org/herold.htm> based on numerous national and international news reports between October 7 - December 10), showing wounded or dead civilians a total of three times under-represents the "collateral damage." In one story Fox 17 even ran a disclaimer from the Pentagon which said "*We regret the loss of any civilian life. US forces are intentionally striking only military & terrorist targets. They take great care in their targeting process to avoid civilian casualties.*"

US military casualties received an equal amount of stories (5 - all on Fox 17), but lengthier coverage than civilian casualties. The death of a CIA operative showed video footage of his coffin being unloaded at the airport and then footage of the funeral. The rest of the stories were about US troops being wounded from friendly fire or from landmines that had exploded while clearing a runway. In one of the stories of the landmine victims a US Marine spokesperson was given 10 seconds of airtime about the delicacies of landmine removal. At no time did we hear Afghani spokespersons after a civilian was wounded, but more importantly Afghanis were never heard from about the delicacies of living in a country with the most land mines of any country in the world. (See information from the International Campaign to Ban Landmines <http://www.icbl.org/>)

Related to landmines is the issue of cluster bombs, which were used by the US military in Afghanistan. Each Cluster bomb releases 202 "bomblets," many of which are know to not explode upon detonation of the bomb. (See Human Rights Watch Report on Cluster Bombs <http://www.hrw.org/backgrounders/arms/cluster-bck1031.htm>) These "bomblets" are roughly the same size and color as the food packages that the US military was dropping randomly throughout Afghanistan. The possibility of children picking up a brightly colored object is high, thus more casualties are likely. Unfortunately, these basic questions were not asked or pursued by the three news stations we surveyed.

*In the year 2000, an average of about eighty-eight casualties per month were attributed to landmines and unexploded ordnance in Afghanistan. This represents a sharp decline from recorded casualties in 1999 when an estimated five to ten people became mine victims every day. In 1993 the daily casualty estimates totaled twenty to twenty-four each day. Almost fifty-percent of mine victims in Afghanistan are still believed to die before reaching a medical facility.*

Landmine Monitor Fact Sheet

[http://www.icbl.org/lm/factsheets/afghanistan\\_sep\\_2001.php](http://www.icbl.org/lm/factsheets/afghanistan_sep_2001.php)

### *Worthy and Unworthy Opinions*

Many local angle stories have been produced to try to come to terms with 9/11. However, most stories tend to be emotional fluff or centered around the hardships that military families must now face. WOOD TV 8 and WZZM 13 have both sent reporters to "ground zero" in New York City and Channel 8 ran holiday greetings from soldiers who have family in West Michigan.

One resource that the local media has failed to utilize is the local educational community. Both university and independent educators have not been tapped into for historical context to shed light on the current political conflicts in both the Middle East and Central Asia. One can only speculate as to why the local "experts" have not been heard from. (See *Those who speak always have the last word* section)

With dissenting opinions the local media has again followed the national trend. It has been difficult for people to even know that there is a dissenting opinion, despite the fact that, like most cities in the US, there was an active anti-war contingent in Grand Rapids. A brief look at

what they organized and what kind of coverage they received is instructive.

Nationally, there is a group of families and friends of 9/11 victims who have been calling for non-retaliatory actions from the US government. What would it have meant for viewers if they would have know about or heard of those directly effected from the terrorist bombings?

<http://www.nonviolence.org/vitw/walkhp.html>

On October 13<sup>th</sup> a 6-hour teach-in was organized to look at the history of US policy in the Middle East and Central Asia, a media panel and several workshop sessions on issues like civil liberties and Islam. The *GR Press* (Oct. 14) did a fairly decent job mostly due to the fact that their reporter was present for most of the event. Channel 17 and 13 ran short stories that evening with neither of them doing justice to what took place, although FOX 17 did report on two of the five arguments against the war that the organizers were promoting. Channel 8 did not cover the Teach-in. An estimate of 100 people were in attendance.

On November 2<sup>nd</sup> there was an event called "Operation Info Drop" Local organizers put together a 20-page reader on the "War on Terrorism" and devised an information dissemination tactic. Channel 8 ran a 20- second piece that mentioned one of the four main points that the group was promoting. Channel 17 and the *GR Press* ran nothing even though they both sent reporters, but WZZM 13 did the worst job. They began their story by saying that "most Americans support the US War, but some citizens disagree." The story cut to their reporter trying to get the woman being interviewed into looking un-American for not supporting President Bush. The reporter also asked if it was "insensitive" for the group to be holding this event at Veterans Park.

On November 19<sup>th</sup> another rally/march was held to draw attention to the plight of Afghani civilians who were at risk from massive starvation. Statements were read from an Afghani women's organization, poetry and international news accounts of human rights abuses. The march lasted for about 1 hour and was followed by a 24-hour vigil in downtown GR. Channel 8 ran a 32-second piece, but left before the event even started. WZZM 13 nor Fox 17 chose to cover the event and the *GR Press* ran only a photo and caption (Nov. 20).

In contrast, when stories were done about families who had husbands or children in the military the length and tone were much different. We are not aware of these families sending out press releases about a loved one going to war, so it is safe to assume that the TV stations sought them out. These stories were always 3-5 minutes in length and gave viewers significant insight into the hardships that these families faced. They were emotional stories that gave a very human and personal perspective of individuals who were being effected by the war. The same type of treatment was not afforded individuals and families who opposed the war, even though many of them were making sacrifices and facing hardships for publicly opposing the bombing in Afghanistan. After the story was over, news-readers often followed with comments that were sympathetic or affirming. This was never the case with stories about people who opposed the war.

WOOD TV 8 did a story about a family who's son was coming home for leave with his new fiancé, a woman that he met in the army. The story had interviews with the parents and grandmother who were at the airport to greet their son and his bride to be. Channel 8 also did a lengthy story about a group of students in Rockford who produced a video for the troops in Afghanistan. WZZM 13 covered the same story and also produced a piece about how a family will celebrate the holidays differently since 9/11.

### *Fluff stories and toilet jokes*

The last category of stories that we observed in our 75-day study were stories that many would consider fluff stories, stories that pretty much only have entertainment value. There were several stories about patriotic shopping, both locally and a promotional piece about fashion designers and major label clothing companies. Hollywood also got into the fray promoting patriotic chic.

WZZM 13 did stories about Halloween costumes after 9/11, a business that will clean flags for free and someone who is selling 9/11 Christmas tree ornaments. Fox 17 also did the 9/11 Halloween costume bit, patriotic T-shirts and they featured a new video game where players can kill a virtual bin Laden. WOOD TV 8 did a story on a Lakeview Mall receiving a thank you letter from Bush, a gun show that featured bulls-eye targets with bin Laden's face and a story about one school that celebrated the purchase of a new copier by dropping the old one on a huge tarp with....you guessed it, a target with bin Laden's face.

The most outlandish stories were about a car and a toilet. WZZM 13 did roughly a sixty second piece on a guy who painted his car to look like a big flag and commenting how he just wanted to show his patriotic spirit. WOODETV 8 produced a much longer story about a local bar that featured bin Laden toilet drains in the men's urinals. The female news reporter made it even more dramatic by going into the men's bathroom with the camera operator. A bar tender was interviewed and said that they had to replace them regularly because some men were stealing them. Imagine if the same amount of time had been committed to local educational efforts that sought to make sense of 9/11?

### *Conclusion*

The events of 9/11 and since have had a significant impact on how many Americans view themselves and the rest of the world. The importance of challenging news reporting maybe more urgent than ever before. As was said in the introduction, international news on the local stations increased after 9/11. Since the mid-December when this study ended, the local news has produced significantly less international coverage and reclaimed some of its old habits of reporting on scandals and personalities around the country - the cemetery/crematory scandal in the south, for example.

As the Bush administration looks to other countries to continue its "War on Terrorism" it is extremely important that local news agencies continue to expand their coverage outside of the community and utilize local groups/individuals that have some commitment to educating about global affairs.

At the same time, the fledging efforts to bring stability and peace to Afghanistan should not fade into the distance. News agencies must get out of the business of just focusing on the political "hotspots" where conflicts are occurring and begin to report on long-term developments, particularly as it relates to US involvement.

The images and messages that the news media provide us can have a tremendous impact on what we do as residents and citizens. What news departments produce should not be taken lightly as it can make all the difference in the world in forming public opinion and

<b>Anthrax Stories</b>	<b>Fox 17</b>	<b>WOOD TV8</b>	<b>WZZM 13</b>
	<b>36</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>51</b>

ultimately in what government policies the public will endorse.

There were several stories about the Bush administration encouraging US children to send \$1 for children in Afghanistan (mostly on FOX). For many observers this was a PR ploy on the part of the White House, yet at no time was this questioned by the local TV news. In fact, the role of the PR industry played a significant role during the 75-days of our study.

**Go to PR Watch**  
<http://www.prwatch.org/cgi/spin>.

### *The Anthrax Scare*

There were numerous stories on all three stations about Anthrax. The way these stories were framed tended to promote fear with images of men in bio-hazard suits, microscopic shots of viruses and tag lines like "suspicious packages" or "be on the lookout for..." Fox 17 did one piece that did not promote fear. They interviewed Health Dept officials and a Doctor who said that *"even though it is understandable that people are afraid, influenza is probably a bigger threat to them."* The doctors' comment sums up the reality of fact over fear. Unfortunately the coverage of anthrax did not put in context the real health risks that people are confronted with.

## A p p e n d i x A

Terrorism, Television and the Rage for Vengeance - <http://www.fair.org/media-beat/010913.html>  
Media Spin Revolves Around the Word "Terrorist" - <http://www.fair.org/media-beat/011004.html>  
Media Pundits Advocate Civilian Targets - <http://www.fair.org/activism/oreilly-war-crimes.html>  
CNN Says Focus on Civilian Casualties Would Be "Perverse"  
<http://www.fair.org/activism/cnn-casualties.html>  
Op-Ed Echo Chamber: Little space for dissent to the military line  
<http://www.fair.org/activism/nyt-wp-opeds.html>  
Fox: Civilian Casualties Not News - <http://www.fair.org/activism/fox-civilian-casualties.html>  
How Many Dead? Major networks aren't counting  
<http://www.fair.org/activism/afghanistan-casualties.html>  
NYT Buries Story of Air-strikes on Afghan Civilians - <http://www.fair.org/activism/nyt-niazi-kala.html>  
Media March to War- <http://www.fair.org/press-releases/wtc-war-punditry.html>  
Nightly News Glosses Over Anti-Terrorism Act - <http://www.fair.org/activism/wtc-liberties.html>  
Can the New York Times Count-or Quote-Peace Activists?  
<http://www.fair.org/activism/nyt-peace-activists.html>  
Networks Accept Government "Guidance" - <http://www.fair.org/press-releases/network-pressure.html>  
When Journalists Report for Duty - <http://www.fair.org/media-beat/010920.html>  
Killing Civilians: Behind the Reassuring Words - <http://www.fair.org/media-beat/010925.html>  
TV News: A Militarized Zone - <http://www.fair.org/media-beat/011008.html>  
Killing Them Softly: Starvation and Dollar Bills For Afghan Kids  
<http://www.fair.org/media-beat/011012.html>  
War Needs Good Public Relations - <http://www.fair.org/media-beat/011025.html>  
Fear and Numbing in the TV Zone - <http://www.fair.org/media-beat/011115.html>  
Suppressing Dissent At Home, Fighting for Freedom Abroad?  
<http://www.spinsanity.org/columns/20010924.html>  
Will Truth Again Be First Casualty? - [http://www.public-i.org/story\\_01\\_092001.htm](http://www.public-i.org/story_01_092001.htm)  
Polling the War on Terrorism - <http://www.pollingreport.com/terror.htm>  
Across the land, a new sense of vigor and purpose is spurring regional dailies since September 11  
<http://www.mediachannel.org/atissue/conflict/>  
Squelching the News in Democracy's Name  
[http://www.motherjones.com/web\\_exclusives/commentary/opinion/warmedia.html](http://www.motherjones.com/web_exclusives/commentary/opinion/warmedia.html)  
How The War on Terrorism Has Changed The News Agenda, Network Television, June to  
October 2001 - [http://www.journalism.org/publ\\_research/befandaft1.html](http://www.journalism.org/publ_research/befandaft1.html)  
Uncle Sam calling on Hollywood  
<http://www.dallasnews.com/entertainment/STORY.ea3dc58958.b0.af.0.a4.29bd4.html>  
The War for Public Opinion - <http://www.alternet.org/story.html?StoryID=12050>  
AMERICAN ADVERTISING GOES TO WAR - <http://www.adage.com/news.cms?newsId=33639>  
Access to Pentagon by media <http://www.cjr.org/year/02/1/hickey.asp>  
Arab Professor fired/Media smear campaign <http://www.salon.com/tech/feature/2002/01/19/bubba/print.html>  
Northern Alliance hires PR firm <http://www.odwyerpr.com/0117smith.htm>

## **Who to Contact:**

WOOD TV 8  
120 College SE,  
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503  
News Director - [patti.mcgettigan@lintv.com](mailto:patti.mcgettigan@lintv.com)  
phone: 456-8888 fax: 456-5755

WZZM 13  
645 3 Mile Rd NW,  
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49544  
News Director - Sheryl Grant  
phone: 785-1313 fax: 784-8367

WXMI Fox 17  
3117 Plaza Dr. NW,  
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49525  
News Director - Tim Dye  
phone: 364-8722 fax: 364-8506