University of Pennsylvania
ScholarlyCommons

Departmental Papers (ASC) | Annenberg School for Communication

1-1-2005

Death in Wartime: Photographs and the "Other War" in Afghanistan

Barbie Zelizer
University of Pennsylvania, bzelizer@asc.upenn.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://repository.upenn.edu/asc_papers

Part of the Journalism Studies Commons

Recommended Citation
Zelizer, B. (2005). Death in Wartime: Photographs and the "Other War" in Afghanistan. *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics, 10* (3), 26-55. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1081180X05278370

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. http://repository.upenn.edu/asc_papers/68
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.

Death in Wartime: Photographs and the "Other War" in Afghanistan

Abstract
This article addresses the formulaic dependence of the news media on images of people facing impending death. Considering one example of this depiction — U.S. journalism's photographic coverage of the killing of the Taliban by the Northern Alliance during the war on Afghanistan, the article traces its strategic appearance and recycling across the U.S. news media and shows how the beatings and deaths of the Taliban were depicted in ways that fell short of journalism's proclaimed objective of fully documenting the events of the war. The article argues that in so doing, U.S. journalism failed to raise certain questions about the nature of the alliance between the United States and its allies on Afghanistan's northern front.

Disciplines
Journalism Studies

This journal article is available at ScholarlyCommons: http://repository.upenn.edu/asc_papers/68

Death in Wartime
Photographs and the "Other War" in Afghanistan

Barbie Zelizer

This article addresses the formulaic dependence of the news media on images of people facing impending death. Considering one example of this depiction—U.S. journalism's photographic coverage of the killing of the Taliban by the Northern Alliance during the war on Afghanistan, the article traces its strategic appearance and recycling across the U.S. news media and shows how the beatings and deaths of the Taliban were depicted in ways that fell short of journalism's proclaimed objective of fully documenting the events of the war. The article argues that in so doing, U.S. journalism failed to raise certain questions about the nature of the alliance between the United States and its allies on Afghanistan's northern front.

How images are used to depict death in wartime has long been a troublesome practice for those who cover war. Ever since journalists at newspapers, newsmagazines, television, and the Internet began to accommodate the inclusion of images as part of war's coverage, the fundamental question of whether, how, and in which fashion to include images of death has never been sufficiently clarified.

The topic of death raises profound moral questions over who has the right and ability to live and die, and under which circumstances. It fascinates and repels simultaneously, provoking the imagination in deep unarticulated ways. A more general discomfort regarding the encounter with death is exacerbated by its visual representation, where photos, films, and video clips of death increase ambivalence whenever they become available. Recent examples have been remarkable in their similar address to the dissonance that surrounds death: the graphic images of the corpses

of four U.S. contractors in Falluja, Iraq; the display of coffins of the military dead from Iraq; the pictures of the dead in Abu Ghraib prison; and the images of the beheading of U.S. entrepreneur Nick Berg are all cases in which the photographic depiction of death forces journalists into a self-conscious and reflexive space, by which they air—not always to positive result—their conflicting expectations about how they are to process images of death.

The ambivalence over images of death derives from a broader incertitude characterizing the use of images in general. Journalists practicing all types of journalism, not just war journalism, remain unclear about what to do with images. From their earliest uses, images have been looked at as the fluff of news, material that is secondary and adjunct to the words at their side. Even today, in an age of still photos, television and cable images, and the interactive displays of the Internet, there are no standards regarding how to use images in news: where to put an image, how to title an image, how to caption an image, and how to position an image alongside words all remain generally unarticulated in the journalistic community.[1] This means that when difficult targets of news depiction present themselves to journalists, there is no clear way to discern what might be a workable, appropriate, or even relevant image.

And yet in wartime, the topic of death frequently becomes the focus of news images. While pictures of war combine the cool mechanics of the camera with the hot passions of the battlefield to address the stubborn proximity and inevitability of death, they also force an address to the fundamental question of what news images are for. For while journalists tend to recount stories of death verbally in elaborated accounts that detail the most intricate dimensions of how or why one died, they do not offer the same detailed treatment to death's visualization. Instead, the very

depiction of death pushes journalists into debates over whether, where, and how they should publish images of death, debates that often result in a narrowed set of imaging practices. Arguments - about our dead versus their dead; about civilian versus military dead; about showing the faces of the dead; about class, race, and the dead; about identifying the dead before their next of kin are notified - inevitably draw in news editors, media ombudsmen, and readers in letters to the editor, suggesting at a fundamental level that Western journalism has no problem using words in news to verbally recount the stories of death in wartime but it has many problems using news pictures showing those who have died. In this respect, journalists' decisions about what to do with images of death reflect more broadly on the role and function of journalism as a whole. How death is depicted visually in the news during wartime is the broad focus of this article. More specifically, the article traces how an ambivalence and lack of standards for showing images of death in wartime have helped develop an alternative depiction of death in the news, specifically depictions of people facing impending death. The frequent and patterned substitution of this visual trope for images of individuals who die in wartime raises questions about how much publics need to see to make sense of the war being covered, and how photographers, journalists, and photo editors help publics visually make sense of war in certain ways. These questions are considered in conjunction with the images of impending death that were displayed in the coverage of one specific war, that waged by the United States against Afghanistan in 2001. Its emergence into what Time called "the other war"[2] can be explained in part by the prevalence of certain photographs of people about to die that proliferated during its early stages. Such images, this article argues, offered ambivalent information about what was happening in the battlefield that affixed public response largely on the basis of partial yet highly strategized visual documentation.

How Images Function in War News

The ambivalence over images in news derives from a long tradition of unrequited expectations regarding how images can be expected to function in journalism, generally, and in war journalism, specifically. Although seeing has long been equated with believing and vision with perspective,[3] the incorporation of images into news challenges many expectations about how images work. Images that are composite, more schematic than detailed, conventionalized, and simplified work particularly well in journalism.[4] Used as pegs not to specific events but to stories larger than can be told in a simple news items, news images are a tool for interpreting events in ways consonant with long-standing understandings about the world.

To a large extent, the unspoken faith in vision as a corollary for belief has generated a widespread assumption that news images are evidence. The extent to which they shape public opinion - if at all and under which circumstances - thus appears to be central to much thinking about news images, with images held responsible for the swaying of public sentiments regarding numerous wars around the world. Images are thought to have effects - on public sentiment for and against a war and on the public policy that follows in its stead. One of the most well-known photos from Vietnam - the Nick Ut photograph of a girl running naked in a Vietnamese village after her clothes were burned off by napalm - has been held responsible for dissipating public support for that war and for legitimating the military ban on cameras in battlefield areas to block the publication of disturbing images of death and destruction.[5] The assumption has been that images matter as a reflection of the world at large, seen not as constructions - the result of

actions taken by individual photographers, their corresponding photo editors, and the larger institutional setting that engages both - but as mirrors of the events that they depict. Their authority is thereby thought to grow when the news of war increases in magnitude or importance. As one observer said of U.S. journalism, "it is a tradition . . .that when the event or history is raised to a level of great importance, we use pictures to reflect that importance."[6] War news, then, exhibits a turn to the visual side of information relay, by which news organizations readily turn over column-inches and airtime to accommodate an increased and more central presence of pictures in the news.[7]

Connected here has been an assumption that seeing photos of wartime is enough to promote action or responsiveness of some kind. Particularly following the Holocaust, the sentiment prevailed that had we only had pictures of the atrocities then unfolding, the Holocaust would never have happened. Though that notion was laid to rest in later wars whose related atrocities were depicted but still received no sustained official attention, the presumed connection between public action and photographs persists nonetheless.[8] Four groups have been particularly invested in articulating assumptions about the value of images and their concomitant authority.

1. Images are valued by journalists, who appreciate the message of "eyewitness" authority, the notion of "having been there" that a photograph implies by virtue of its display. Photographs show that one "was there" to witness an event. Commonly called "photographic verisimilitude" and associated with realism, the image helps journalists credential their accounts of events as they happen. In the view of one photographer who covered the battlefields of Vietnam and Lebanon, the draw to pictures is undeniable: "Many people ask me 'why do you take these

pictures?' . . . It's not a case of 'There but for the grace of God go I'; it's a case of 'I've been there.' "[9] In this regard, images help journalists do a better job of being journalists, and journalists readily rely on images to help substantiate their stories.

2. Images are similarly valued by newspaper publishers and chief executives of media organizations, who recognize that images compel public attention. After large-scale crises, images literally come to the fore of the journalistic record. Following September 11, the New York Times experienced a "sea change" in its then-current use of images, by which its pages displayed more than double the number of images it tended to display in non-crisis times.[10] During the beginning of the war in Iraq, broadcast and cable news organizations turned to photographic galleries and interactive visual displays, showing, in the words of U.S. news anchor Dan Rather, a "literal flood of live pictures from the battlefield"; the New York Times again doubled its daily display of photographs, while certain TV networks featured slide shows of photographs, profiling them against background music.[11]

3. Officials and politicians regard images as valuable tools for shaping public opinion and justifying policy in wartime, and they remain among the first vehicles of information relay to be discussed in times of war. In the final stages of World War II, images of the victims of the concentration camps were used to help secure waning support for the war effort. In 1993, when images surfaced of a U.S. soldier being dragged through the streets of Mogadishu, the assumption was that officials changed policy due to the uproar it generated. Regardless of whether that was true, the images' impact was widely invoked as an impetus for withdrawing troops from Somalia. In the recent action in Iraq, the Bush administration's ban on showing

coffins of the military dead was justified on the basis that showing the coffins was insensitive to the dead soldiers' families. This remained the administration's stance, even though it went against public polls, which as early as December 2003 sided with the caskets' public display.[12]

4. Publics see images as a way of coming to grips with the news of war, helping them grapple with the world in a more manageable, reliable, and readily understandable fashion. And yet publics have definitive assumptions about what should and should not be shown, and this has gravitated in the past decade toward the display of less gruesome images in wartime. While in 1993, members of the U.S. public were evenly divided over whether pictures should be used to show violence rather than simply relying on words to tell the stories of murder and war,[13] by the following decade the preference toward a more limited display of photos was widely articulated. In 2001, the Boston Globe, Newsweek, and Time were each deluged by readers' letters, which protested the display of photos of Osama bin Laden - "We don't need to look at that evil face, big and bold on the cover of your magazine," wrote one angry woman to Time - and the face of an angry anti-American protestor in Pakistan.[14] In March 2003, 57 percent of the U.S. population felt that the U.S. media should not show pictures of captured U.S. soldiers in Iraq.[15] One year later, when the gruesome images of the mutilation of four U.S. contractors in Fallujah, Iraq, were published, a full 71 percent of the American public felt that the pictures had been either too gruesome or sufficiently explicit. Only 7 percent sided with the display of more explicit imagery than what was shown.[16] That this took shape against the background of journalists pondering the lack of explicit images in Fallujah suggested how disparate journalists and the public were on the display of explicit images of death in the news.

Each of these groups has been consistent in its assumption that seeing is believing. At the same time, seeing is preferred only under certain circumstances. As one writer for the Toronto Star phrased it,

> News organizations have been on the receiving end of grisly photos since the invention of the camera. But there's never any debate over whether we will show the blood-spattered body of a murder victim. . . . We just don't do it. . . .If the victims are not one of us, if they live far away or have no names or cultural commonalities, they're fair game. Hence, it's perfectly acceptable, if not mundane, to show piles of skulls in Rwanda or a skeletal and swollen-bellied African baby on the verge of death. . . . Except. Last year, when the bombs were crashing down on Iraq and houses were flattened, their inhabitants incinerated, the very same networks and newspapers that proclaimed their high moral ground and concern for reader sensibilities refrained from running pictures of the civilian casualties.[17]

News organizations tend not to show certain kinds of photographs in wartime - human devastation on the "other" side, military casualties, battles gone badly, wounded or captured soldiers. As a spokeswoman for the British Independent said in March 2003 of the war in Iraq, "We are not keen on showing US or UK prison-ersofwar."[18] Instead, one's own war tends to be depicted as clean, heroic, and just, with images limited to those that are consonant with prevailing sentiments about the war. When such sentiments involve securing and maintaining support for the war, the images tend to reflect themes of patriotism, civic responsibility, and the good of the nation-state. They also tend not to be graphic.

Some of the fault lines concerning the so-called appropriate display of news images in wartime suggest that images work in more complicated ways than popular perceptions of images suggest. And indeed, scholars of photography have established the often contradictory fashion in which images compel attention and the attributes believed to characterize images - materiality, ease of access, frozen capture of time, an affective and often gestalt-driven view of the world that is thought to bypass the intellect and communicate directly with the emotions. Photographs work by twinning denotative and connotative forces, by which the ability to depict the world as "it is" is matched with the capacity to couch what is being depicted in a symbolic frame that helps us recognize the image as consonant with broader understandings of the world.[19] The two forces are rarely presumed to work equally in journalism, where the former pushes aside the latter. Denotation and the truth value of the photograph, more than connotation, are thought to be critical, because journalism needs photographic realism to enhance its ability to vouch for events in the real world. In fact, however, connotation is as important, if not more, than denotation. In this regard, pictures are frequently used in ways that depict not what is the core of the news story but peripheral, symbolic, associative aspects of its events, sometimes illustrating the key point of a news story but often depicting scenes or people removed from those described in the text. Thus, there is reason to believe that images in journalism are used in uneven ways, and particularly so in wartime, when stakes are high, decision making fraught with unpredictable circumstances and stressful judgment, and resources uneven. What journalists decide to do with the photographs that are incorporated as part of news thus always invokes more than just the photograph itself, with negotiations over selection, placement, prominence, and size involving more than just the photographer who takes the shot and the photo editor who positions it on the page. What is worthy of depiction, how, and why are always issues with many routes to

resolution that are weighed upon by various individuals. This means that in accommodating the visual, war facilitates a turn to the memorable image over the newsworthy one, showing a preference for images that appear in frequent and prominent displays, resemble nonjournalistic depictions like paintings and other modes of artistic representation, and resemble familiar images from earlier wars.[20] In such ways, images can be presented to accommodate the larger climate in which they are received. When war is waged under circumstances that require securing and maintaining public support, the images chosen for depiction can be expected to reflect such concerns.

Nowhere is this clearer than in the pictures of death that journalists face during wartime. Whether to cover, where to cover, and how to cover death are issues that face journalists of all kinds but, given an image's graphic nature, are issues particularly pressing for those making decisions regarding the depictions of war. After the photos of four dead U.S. contractors and the defilement of their bodies by an Iraqi mob in Falluja surfaced in April 2004, the news stories were graphic, detailed, and unrelenting in their verbal accounts of what had happened. Yet the pictures were presented with a marked degree of ambivalence, as journalists pondered questions of decency, appropriateness and the so-called "cereal test," fretted over the protection of children and influencing public opinion either for or against the war, and worried about possible charges of sensationalism, political bias, and lack of patriotism.[21] Guidelines on photo display were published, reviewed, discussed, and revised, and ombudsmen's columns tracked whether the duty to publish changed if the bodies were military rather than civilian, Iraqi rather than American, visible as distinctive human beings rather than charred corpses, women and children rather than men. In the words of one newspaper, the incident "resulted in more mainstream media self-

examination in one day than the entire attack on Iraq had in a year."[22] Similar debates surfaced following the display of military caskets, of photos of prisoner abuse at Abu Ghraib prison, and of photos of Nick Berg's beheading in Iraq. That the fact of death generates debate is itself worthy of contemplation. For as the New Republic's Adam Kushner said, "The Fallujah riots reveal something fundamentally amiss in American journalism - that an instinct to protect viewers is trumping an instinct to inform."[23]

This article argues that the circumstances for using images - the ambivalence over photography's integration into news, the unevenness with which photos are used, and the emotive appeal that images wield - have made such debates a necessary reaction to the photo's centrality in news. They have also helped legitimate the display of a different kind of death photo, photos of people facing impending death rather than photos of people who are already dead. Photos of impending death give journalists a way of picturing contested, problematic public events, but they do so in ways that offset much of the ambivalence about showing death in wartime that seems to throw journalists into disarray almost whenever they are faced with its depiction.

All of this is a long way of saying that when journalists migrate away from pictures of actual death, they reveal much more than just the fact that death does not merit viewing. In that images of dead people are often in fact taken by photographers, though they are not always shown, the responsibility for migrating away from the display of such pictures can be found primarily in the newsroom. Photo editors, page editors, and layout editors all seem to invoke informal, collective judgments about the preference of the about-to-die photo over photos of people who are already dead. Moreover, it is the about-to-die photo that is sustained over time. Photos of people facing

impending death in wartime are repeatedly used, recycled, and displayed over time, taking on a primacy by reducing variant deaths in memory to the visual trope of people about to die. Such a trope positions the viewer in the place of identifying with the target of depictions rather than processing information about the death that occurred, suggesting that about-to-die images stimulate and arouse rather than generate reasoned responsive action. They thus sanitize visualization in much the same way as euphemistic labeling sanitizes language: just as soldiers "waste" people rather than kill them or "collateral damage" obscures the devastation to people and buildings it wreaks, strategically visualizing people about to die hides the more problematic finality of death itself.[24] No surprise, then, that images are used in the news with varying degrees of detail about what they are showing, displaying an unclear relationship with the news story. When dealing with images of death, this is of particular importance, for it can generate what the social psychologist Albert Bandura called moral disengagement,[25] hiding the most problematic aspects of death by calling attention to scenes that are strategically more useful. What this does to our capacity to maintain a healthy body politic, one that can think critically about the circumstances involving death in wartime that are being covered, is worth reflection.

Depicting Death in Afghanistan: What Images and Their Absence Tell Us about the News[26]

Perhaps nowhere did these tensions come to a head as vividly as in coverage of the war in Afghanistan of 2001. Seen as the heralding event for the United States's self-proclaimed "war on terror," the war in Afghanistan began as a series of quick and efficient actions designed to eradicate Al-Qaeda cells and their Taliban sympathizers. Begun on October 7, 2001, U.S. and coalition forces, backed by local anti-Taliban militias, stormed the Afghan countryside. Over the following two and a half months, the media were filled with stories of freshly conquered landscapes.

Prosecuted on the back of the events of September 11, the war in Afghanistan generated emotional and not always reasoned responses on the part of policy makers, the public, and journalists. Called by Pentagon spokesperson Victoria Clarke a "very different, very unconventional war," the battle for Afghanistan was waged on terms that offered journalists few leads; in the words of Washington Post ombudsman Michael Getler, the war remained a "very, very closely held war in terms of information and secrecy.... We don't know what we don't know."[27]

The administration from the beginning called for media restraint: National Security Adviser Condoleeza Rice asked news organizations to refrain from airing unedited video footage of Osama bin Laden, the White House press secretary told reporters "you have to be careful what you say" and then erased his own comments from the transcript of the briefing, and Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld suggested that the images of Afghanistan were undermining political support for the U.S. bombing and accused television of amplifying the Taliban's claims that civilians were being massacred.[28] Even CNN chief Walter Issacson was said to have instructed his international correspondents to avoid displaying an excess of gruesome images of the war, because "it seems perverse to focus too much on the casualties or hardship in Afghanistan."[29] It was thus no surprise that most of the U.S. public supported the war's prosecution, generating one of the few moments in contemporary times with virtually no recognizable dissent.[30] In Michael Getler's view, "The public wants the enemy defeated, and they are really not concerned about press concerns, access concerns, or security concerns."[31] Against this background, images played an important role in etching the war in public consciousness. Though Afghanistan had been a country sunk deep in media oblivion before September 11, it became a mere two months later

"the most reported-from country on earth."[32] Photographs began to appear of whole families in flight from barren mountain homes, of women joyously removing their burkas, of smiling children and hopeful villagers engaging in previously prohibited activities, and of breathtaking mountainous, sometimes pulverized landscapes. One prewar image from Afghanistan - a 1984 photo of a forlorn orphaned twelve-year-old Afghan girl that became an iconic image of war refugees after gracing the cover of National Geographic - reappeared once the girl was located, now grown, in an Afghan village.[33] Images were used in a way that showed less of the war itself and more of the assumptions about the war held by the forces responsible for its prosecution. U.S. journalism was thus complicit, if not consciously so, in using images in ways that upheld larger strategic aims.

The About-to-Die Image

Against these circumstances, the about-to-die image made sense as a way to depict the deaths incurred during the war in Afghanistan. Borrowed from the world beyond journalism—specifically, Greek representations of the Laocoon, the "dying Niobids" of classical art, depictions of the crucifixion during the Middle Ages, and images depicting the deaths of military and other public figures in the 1800s - the about-to-die image freezes a particularly memorable moment in death's unfolding and thereby generates an emotional identification with the person facing impending death. Its importation into journalism involves two inflections of journalistic norms - undercutting newsworthiness at the time of the photo's original display, by which the about-to-die moment is substituted for other images showing actual evidence of the death at hand, and undercutting norms of journalistic selection over time, whereby the photo chosen for

initial display becomes the iconic image by which the ambivalent events surrounding death are remembered. In this regard, journalism's reliance on the about-to-die moment facilitates the collapse of a wide range of events into a depiction of impending death - the assassination of President William McKinley, the herding of a young boy from the Warsaw Ghetto under a Nazi machinegun, a black man ascending the platform to his own lynching, Lee Harvey Oswald being gunned down by Jack Ruby, a starving African child keeling over before a hungry vulture, a Vietcong soldier squinting in anticipation of his death by a South Vietnamese officer, the shooting of a twelve-year-old Palestinian boy - and facilitates its repeated display over time. Acting as a memorable synecdochic stand-in for a variety of complicated public events, the about-to-die image appears widely in the news and then reappears in news retrospectives and anniversary issues, where it is liberally discussed in news articles, ombudsmen's columns, and public forums. How and why an event comes to be seen through an about-to-die image, and how and why dissimilar events might be depicted by similar images, carries various assumptions about the purposes for which images are used to depict the news. In particular, this kind of image creates a contingent and illogical way of understanding events and remembering them in the years that follow. While images of death can be thought to facilitate the information processing that is central to news, images of impending death instead force a subjective identification with the victim and delay the information processing associated with the news. In this sense, the about-to-die image functions as a problematic vehicle for information relay.[34]

The war in Afghanistan offered a fertile set of circumstances for putting the about-to-die image to journalistic use. Journalists used three kinds of impending death images to depict the war, each of which displayed an uneven degree of verbal and visual detailing: Many photos showed

images of presumed death, depicting structural or physical devastation but no persons facing death. Included here were images that used physical circumstance, such as the aftermath of bomb attacks, to suggest the death, impending or actual, of undepicted persons. Examples were prominent during the war's early stages, when reporters were taken on Taliban-sponsored tours of bomb-torn regions in Jalalabad or Kandahar and shown scenes that implied the widespread loss of human life. Pictures from these tours showed massive structural damage - crushed building and shattered landscapes - with varying estimates of the number of undepicted people still missing, unaccounted for, or presumed dead.[35]

Other depictions showed images of synecdochic or symbolic death, recounting the impending death of individuals, though not necessarily those depicted, through summarizing captions. Central here were images of war wounded alongside captions describing large-scale deaths or images of refugees alongside captions describing victims of the humanitarian crisis that had been exacerbated by the war. Afghanistan's "hidden refugee crisis," as Time magazine called it in early December, harbored certain death for many refugees from starvation, exposure, and dehydration,[36] and in that regard a caption to a New York Times photo told readers of one father in Shebertoo who brought his feverish son back to his mountainside home, fearing "that his two year old son, who is ill, may soon die."[37] Other pictures showed groups of refugees, usually women and children, in refugee camps, alongside captions providing a running toll of how many were expected to die.[38] Though it was never clear whether those depicted in fact died, they stood in for the larger population that did.

The most detailed photos of impending death showed images of certain death, recounting the impending death of depicted individuals through a summarizing caption. An Afghan woman was shown holding her toddler son at the Kabul children's hospital. The caption told readers that he died moments after the picture was taken, in part because the war-torn capital's only children's hospital had no central heating or stock of medicine.[39] These photos portrayed victims as still alive and identified them as dying in the caption; some photos were accompanied not only by a caption but by extensive efforts to establish the impending death of those depicted - an adjoining news story, sequenced photos, and possibly recurrent photos. Closest in demeanor to the about-to-die images in art, these photos relied on text to complete the story. And yet the visualizing practices typical of these impending death photos were unusual by journalistic standards: typically, the same photo appeared across newspapers, on different days, more than once in the same newspaper, in visible places like front pages and above the fold, and in sequence with other photos taken around them. Often, the photo of a person about to die was presented in place of available documentation that showed the person already dead. Additionally, these photos often stimulated public conversation about the appropriate role of news photography, drawing discussion among journalists, ombudsmen, and the public alike. For these reasons, viewers tended to know that the person being depicted in an image of certain death was dead before seeing the photo. While each of these attributes was not evident in all of the about-to-die images of Afghanistan, their patterned emergence, full or partial, nonetheless established the visual trope as an effective visual treatment of death in wartime.

While all of these images were similar in their focus on individuals facing impending death, the varied detailing through which images and words were used is here seen as critical to the

establishment of impending death as a useful prism for understanding the war in Afghanistan. Even within this prism, differences in depiction emerged that reflected directly on the strategic uses to which such depictions could be put.

Seeing Afghanistan through the Prism of Impending Death

The prism of impending death made sense in depicting Afghanistan for various reasons. The display of individuals in death-related activities dated to the mid-1990s, when members of a then relatively unknown Islamic fundamentalist group, the Taliban, were aggressively executing citizens in public places throughout Afghanistan. Elaborate verbal reports of the public executions began to appear in the U.S. press from the middle of the decade, and depictions surfaced around the same time: They included pictures of Afghan citizens strewn up on cranes or traffic posts for committing robbery, adultery, and murder, with public squares turned into a forum for the display of public beatings, mutilations, hangings, and shootings. One particularly egregious set of images depicted the former Afghan President Najibullah and his brother hanging from a traffic control box in Kabul in 1996, images that signified, in one newsmagazine's view, that "Kabul had fallen to a new set of victors - the Taliban."[40] Pictures of the former president's battered body reopened debate about the role of the United Nations as a protector of those requesting asylum.[41]

Pictures of this sort visually documented the impact of the Taliban's ascent to power. While stories recounted the increasingly unrestrained and punitive measures being taken against Afghan citizens, pictures documented beatings and other actions with captions that tended to

relay the "unknown fate" of those being depicted. Certain images left no doubt as to the death of the individuals in the photos. In 1996, a story about relatives taking vengeance for the murder of their family member appeared in the U.S. press. The story, which appeared on the front page of the New York Times and on internal pages in other newspapers,[42] recounted how two men had been convicted in an Islamic court for the murder of a taxi driver and were executed in public by relatives of the victim. All of the men, who lived in the province of Khost, knew each other. In its piece on the incident, the New York Times noted that one of the men, in his early twenties, begged for forgiveness before being killed by the uncle of his victim. The Times also offered an extended discussion of the increasingly common practice of public executions, noting that they were "becoming increasingly common in eastern and southern Afghanistan, where leaders from the rebel Taliban militia have imposed strict Islamic law."

Pictures were taken by an AP photographer of one of the two men being executed. The first picture of the sequence showed the man - Dur Mohammad - sitting blindfolded across from his soon-to-be executor. A second picture showed him already dead, his body sprawled away from the camera. Tellingly, the picture of an already dead Dur Mohammad was the picture that was published, not the more evocative picture of him about to die. Moreover, its accompanying caption was clear and elaborated: the action was described and contextualized, the victim and the perpetrator were identified at length, and both men were named.[43] Images like these - clear-cut, unambivalent images of individuals killed by the Taliban - continued to appear up until the time that the United States invaded Afghanistan in 2001.[44]

That degree of clear detail did not persist into the following decade, however, when other public executions took place after the U.S. forces invaded Afghanistan in October 2001. Here news organizations treated the issue of public executions differently, displaying depictions of people facing impending death as well as images of people already dead. Such a choice was curious, in that coverage of the war in Afghanistan was filled with relentlessly detailed verbal narratives about battles between the anti- and pro-Taliban forces and about the executions of the Taliban supporters.[45] Pictures of individuals already dead did appear, usually portraying dead Taliban supporters and soldiers, but they tended to focus on shots of Afghan citizens mourning victims of the war or bearing witness to dead Taliban; the press also showed U.S. forces burying dead Afghan soldiers.[46] In a pattern of visual display typical of recent conflicts, the bodies of dead U.S. soldiers were not shown, though pictures were displayed of caskets of the fallen.[47]

However, what was not published was a full visual record of the atrocities committed against the Taliban forces. While numerous photos were taken that depicted the desecration of dead Taliban forces, with local residents kicking the heads of dead Taliban supporters or anti-Taliban fighters looting their bodies during November and December 2001, by and large such images were not published in the U.S. press.[48] Even Newsweek, which featured a photographic essay on the fall of the Taliban, did not include a graphic photograph of how the Taliban sympathizers had died.[49] One limited set of photos, however, did depict the atrocities, and it did so through the prism of impending death. From early November, when scores of Taliban were beaten to death publicly in the streets of Kunduz, Mazar e-Sharif, Taloqan, Qala-I-Nasro, and elsewhere, eyewitness reports began documenting the brutal killing by Northern Alliance forces of surrendering and wounded Taliban soldiers. Said to be bent on avenging the deaths of families and friends who had perished

under Taliban rule, the Northern Alliance forces engaged in tortuous actions toward their captives: tying up Taliban soldiers before killing them, gouging out their eyes, castrating them, tying up their toes to prevent escape before shooting, and kicking, looting and desecrating their bodies after their deaths. Reports also suggested that the Northern Alliance forces targeted foreigners, including Arabs, Pakistanis, and Chechens who had fought with the Taliban forces. The reports were problematic for the United States, because its on-ground objectives in the war on terror were facilitated by its association with the Northern Alliance. As the actions of the Northern Alliance soldiers drew complaints from the International Committee of the Red Cross, other governments, and the non-U.S. media, the lack of response in U.S. governmental circles generated additional criticism. One human rights lawyer was quoted within days of the killings as saying that "the United States has turned a blind eye to what is going on. [There has] been a signal to the Northern Alliance that they can do what they want [with the prisoners]."[50] As the U.S. reluctance to reign in the Northern Alliance was linked with earlier statements by George W. Bush that he wanted Osama bin Laden "dead or alive" and with Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld's admission that American forces attacking the Taliban were "under order to take no prisoners," complaints about the nature of the alliance began to build and targeted more than just the U.S. government. Complaints came particularly from abroad and from the non-mainstream media. The Progressive noted that the "foreign press has done a better job of reporting all varieties of gruesome deaths and human rights violations,"[51] while the Toronto Star lamented that "the war establishment, including its media boosters and editorial cheerleaders, has remained gamely supportive of the unpleasant and untidy events."[52] The London Times wrote that "the implication that a dead enemy is better than a live one will not have been lost on the murderous warlords of the Alliance. If they think they can get away with killing their Taliban prisoners, they

will do so."[53] Once the United States signaled that the fate of prisoners depended on the Northern Alliance, it became clear that even if the fighters surrendered, they might still be massacred. As one journalist wrote, "Our common humanity should not be put to death on the bloody streets of Kabul. . . . There can be no comfort in averting our eyes from the scene. As a people and as a society we still have to look in the mirror at ourselves."[54] And yet no punitive or responsive action was taken by the United States. Nor did the incidents receive more than a flurry of media attention during the two-week long rampage of killings across the northern sector of Afghanistan.

Against these circumstances, depictions of the Taliban killings migrated to a very restricted display of about-to-die images. Although the killings resembled the public executions in prewar Afghanistan, where the public had seen explicit photos of individuals killed at the behest of the Taliban, the later images instead displayed a narrowed version of the about-to-die photo. Such photos were unlike other about-to-die photos in that they were not displayed at numerous points in time or at numerous places in the newspaper. Nor were they presented for the most part as front-page images or in sequence with other shots. They were also not generally the target of discussions in accompanying news articles, ombudsman's columns, or readers' letters. However, they resembled other about-to-die photos by focusing on the moment of impending death and its associative emotion, fear, and intensity. They also bore other attributes often associated with news images: They tended to be mislabeled, erroneously captioned, and insufficiently contextualized. Not only were the Taliban soldiers generally not depicted as dead, but in very few instances were they shown in ways that even hinted at the brutality by which they had died. Such ambivalent visual documentation of a problematic aspect of the U.S. coalition in the region

made sense, however, for it obscured clear and definite visual documentation of a series of events that could provoke questioning about the U.S. role in the war.

In this sense, images of impending death constituted visual bookends by which the strife in the war-torn region of Afghanistan could be read, and these bookends reflected U.S. strategy in the region. Used first to depict the circumstances leading up to war in the 1990s, when those responsible for victimizing were seen as unilaterally evil, and later to reflect the waging of war in 2001, when those responsible for victimizing were part of an alliance necessary for achieving U.S. strategic and military aims, their different photographic treatment reflected inverted strategic mindsets that put the images to differing use. In that the killings of Taliban soldiers by Northern Alliance forces rested within the intersection of conflicting expectations regarding wartime behavior and its coverage, these depictions reflected more than just what the public saw. Whether to depict the brutality had impact on humanitarian and journalistic standards, but it was further complicated by the question of how to provide coverage while accommodating the questionable nature of the alliance between the United States and the Northern Alliance. Underlying the decision to publish certain pictures as part of that coverage was the recurrent wartime tension of whether journalists were to act as patriotic citizens, supporting a sanitized and strategically supportive version of the unfolding events of the war, or to inform as fully as they could about what was happening.

Depicting Certain Death in Afghanistan

Images of the executions of Taliban fighters appeared over a two-week period during late November 2001, portraying numerous instances of the same phenomenon in different localities and captured by different photographers. Though these photos constituted a small sample of all of the photos of Afghanistan that appeared, they nonetheless occupied a central place in the larger corpus of still images by which publics saw the war unfolding, revealing some of the ways in which pictures could be put to larger strategic aims.

What did the images show? While the verbal accounts of these executions provided horrific detail - Taliban soldiers pleading for their life throughout the beatings, banknotes or cigarette butts stuffed into their mouths, noses and what remained of their skulls, limbs hacked away - the visual trope was simple and formulaic: a lone turbaned man, surrounded by five to ten usually younger and more robust other men, was depicted in the center of the shot. Various activities went on with him at their center: he was portrayed as being beaten by hands, sticks, and rocks; he was also shown as being taunted, kicked, stripped, and made the target of more vicious actions, many of which resulted in the victim's death. Often the victim's hands were tied behind his back, and he was inevitably portrayed as fearful, couched in a supine or otherwise inferior bodily position, and often bloodied. The men crowding around him laughed, jeered, and looked angry. From many of the verbal accounts that accompanied these pictures, it became clear that the men in the middle of the shot were in fact tortured, castrated, shot, and beaten to death. Yet they were depicted as still alive - following the established trope of the about-to-die image.

Numerous images documented the killings in progress. Photos by a range of photographers and photographic agencies - Dusan Vranic for the AP, Tyler Hicks for Getty Images, Lois Rajmondo

for the Washington Post, unnamed photographers for the Agence France-Presse - were displayed in the front sections of each of the newspapers examined - the New York Times, Philadelphia Inquirer, Washington Post, Los Angeles Times, and Chicago Tribune; the Boston Globe featured a picture on its front page, while Time and Newsweek featured one in internal stories on the war.[55] Telling, however, was the amount of missing or ambivalent information that characterized these photos' display. Absent from their accompanying captions was basic information: Neither the victim nor perpetrators were named, there was little contextualizing information to explain what was being depicted, and the actions depicted were not labeled as killings. Both the Philadelphia Inquirer and the Chicago Tribune said that "the fighter was later taken away by truck and his fate is unknown."[56] The Boston Globe and the Los Angeles Times maintained that the victims in their stories were "beaten." The Washington Post caption said that the victim was "roughed up"; in its story, it recounted an incident in which the captors relented and allowed the victim to live, but it left unclear the fate of the Taliban fighter in the photo.[57] No captions mentioned that any of the depicted Taliban fighters were killed. No newspaper or newsmagazine stated that any of the victims were castrated, as evidenced by the bloodied trousers evident in some of the photos. Moreover, all of the newspapers and newsmagazines, except the New York Times and Time, separated the depictions of the "finished murders" from those of the sequence, depicting the executions instead with single images of individuals about to die.

The New York Times and Time provided two exceptions to the restrained visual coverage, by offering a more extended visual treatment of this about-to-die moment. A three-photo sequence appeared in the New York Times that showed members of the Northern Alliance forces executing a Taliban soldier on the way to Kabul. One picture showed the Northern Alliance

soldiers dragging the man; a second, similar to images that appeared elsewhere in the press, showed him begging for his life; and a third showed him lying prostrate on the ground. The Times captioned the sequence as follows:

> Northern Alliance troops dragged a wounded Taliban soldier out of a ditch yesterday on the front lines on the way to Kabul. After he had begged for his life, they pulled him to his feet, shot him in the chest and beat him with a rifle butt and a rocket-propelled grenade-launcher. Other casualties from the fleeing Taliban forces in the area were also looted.

Though it was not explicitly mentioned in the caption that the man died, the Times recounted the man's death in detail in the accompanying story, mentioning how three soldiers shot the man and smashed the grenade launcher into his head: "They chose to celebrate with executions."[58] The story also provided additional detail about the looting taking place and mentioned other Taliban soldiers who lay dead along the road into the nearby village of Qala-I-Nasro. And though questions were raised about the nature of the alliance with the United States, the Times called the killings an "ugly end to what began as a well-executed tank and infantry assault," suggesting merely that "that alliance soldiers might prove difficult to control as their victories build." In a word, the level of detailing, though more extensive than that offered elsewhere in the media, still did not give the story the kind of sustained attention accorded other about-to-die moments. Neither did it address fully the questions raised by the killings concerning the alliance. And finally, its coverage in word and image did not match, with its words remaining substantially more graphic than its pictures, even to the extent that readers only considering the image and its caption would not know that the man being depicted was dead - significantly, dead at the hands

of the United States's partner in prosecuting the war. As one atypical reader's letter queried, "If your article had noted that Northern Alliance troops were committing war crimes as they executed wounded Taliban soldiers and looted nearby villages, it would have helped readers understand the real implications of the war in Afghanistan."[59]

A similarly ambiguous display was found in Time, which used some of the same photos as part of a larger photographic essay on Afghanistan. Called "Blood and Joy," the photo essay brought together eighteen separate images, five of which depicted a Taliban's public execution under the title "Vengeance." Calling the Northern Alliance's actions "summary executions," the newsmagazine focused on how "the bodies of the Taliban's Arab and Pakistani fighters were branded with the mark of contempt reserved for mercenaries."[60] But in the concrete verbal information given about what was depicted in each separate photo - (1) "Northern Alliance soldiers find a wounded Talib after the battle"; (2) "They drag him further from the ditch and into the road"; (3) "They pull him to his feet, but he resists, begging for his life"; (4) "He again pleads for mercy. Instead the soldiers tear off his trousers to humiliate him"; and (5) "They shoot him several times in the chest" - nowhere did the captions say that he had been killed. Nor did they mention that he had been castrated. Instead, an accompanying paragraph discussed the collective deaths of persons not depicted in the photos that Time chose to display:

During their advance, Northern Alliance troops were restrained, by Afghan standards, but reserved special brutality for Taliban jihadis from Pakistan and the Arab lands. Many Afghans saw them as an occupying army of mercenaries, and some showed them no mercy - killing them while they tried to surrender and stuffing money into their wounds.[61]

That the newsmagazine devoted such extensive space - ten pages total - to a photo essay but did not bother to explicate the death that viewers were shown in the images is bewildering, at best. It also again underscored the ambivalence which showing photos of this sort tends to raise. In both cases - the New York Times and Time - the news organizations stopped short of using the photos to full evidentiary force in documenting the brutality that had ensued.

Not surprisingly, the photos received a largely uncritical response from their viewers. Though the Chicago Tribune ran an editorial that labeled the photos "troubling,"[62] public and journalistic response was limited and implied continued support for the alliance by virtue of its lack of discussion. Few editorials pondered the question of how to reconcile the killings with the alliance. While Time ran one reader's letter complaining that

> the photos of the Taliban soldier being murdered were the saddest things I have seen in a long time.... I urge everyone to look closely at the man who is being brutalized in these photos and remember than when violence is institutionalized, this kind of madness will erupt sooner or later,63

far more prevalent was the sentiment that the war coverage was too graphic. The same letter in Time was positioned alongside a second letter praising images of the smiling faces of Afghan women and children and the "stunning" beauty of the Afghan landscape.[64] Photos of women and children were called "extraordinary and humane," "a glorious testament to the timeless beauty of innocence."[65] Said one Los Angeles Times reader of a photographer's images of Afghanistan, "They're not sensational or sentimental, just beautiful. She gets right in the middle of things and

shoots at the precise moment when reality unfolds."[66] The photos of the soon-to-be-executed Taliban soldiers went largely without comment, though one person lamented their display as "some kind of circus event." How was it possible, he wrote,

> that a man's execution was displayed as a justified and natural part of victory in war? It is sad to think about North American journalists standing by, taking not one but many photos as people are dragged in the street, tortured and then shot with rifles.[67]

By contrast, these same photos were treated and received differently elsewhere in the world. In the United Kingdom, the same photos appeared on the front pages of two tabloids—the Daily Mirror and the Daily Mail - where they were destined within days, in the Guardian's view, to become "one of the defining images of the Afghan conflict."[68] In the Daily Mirror, the four-photo sequence not only included the image of the Taliban soldier begging for his life but also other images that led up to the chronological end of the sequence of action - the Taliban soldier lying dead. That photo appeared on the front cover of both the Daily Mirror and the Daily Mail. Bearing the title "Our 'Friends' Take Over ... "in the DailyMirror, its caption left no aspect of the depiction unstated: "Vengeful: Alliance troops kill a Taliban supporter outside Kabul."[69] Not only was the man depicted and identified as having died from the beatings and the photo itself made the center of the story, but an accompanying page showed the same photo a second time, together with three other shots of the beating leading up to his death. Titled "The Executioners," the display also bore a small inset picture of U.S. President George Bush. The accompanying text recounted both what happened to the person depicted in the pictures and to other Taliban soldiers too: "In full view of press cameras Taliban prisoners were bound with electric cable, searched

and taken to makeshift POW camps. There, away from prying eyes, a single gunshot proclaimed instant justice from the vengeful victors."[70] Lest the point be missed by its readers, the newspaper's staff articulated the photo's role in explaining the war. The photo, said the Daily Mirror editor, "shows the people we have stood shoulder to shoulder with. They are particularly unsavory and savage people. The image represents the whole story."71 The picture was displayed again at year's end, as part of the paper's special on the year's unforgettable images.[72] The Daily Mail gave the photos similar treatment. Its bold-type headline proclaimed "No Mercy," while the accompanying caption explicitly labeled the sequence of images as an execution shot: "Savage Retribution: A Taliban fighter who stayed too long is summarily executed by Northern Alliance troops."[73] A question posed atop the front cover amplified the image's status as evidence: "On a historic day, Kabul falls without a fight, and Kandahar could be next. But this horrific picture begs the question: Is the Alliance any better than the Taliban?" The accompanying story continued to force the issue, querying, "Have Taliban's terrors been replaced by callous killers of the Alliance?" Its graphic verbal description of what happened to the man in the sequence of pictures went substantially beyond that accorded the incident in the U.S. press:

It was a scene chilling in its brutality. A wounded Taliban soldier lay helpless in the dirt on the road to Kabul. He had lost his weapon. He had been stripped of his trousers and mutilated and then kicked to the ground where he lay - terrified, arms outstretched, pleading for his life....Ignoring the begging screams of his captors, one of the Alliance soldiers raised his AK-47 to his shoulder and fired two burst of bullets into the man's chest. ... A second Alliance man stepped forward and beat the lifeless body with his rifle butt. A third then started smashing his

rocket-propelled grenade into the dead man's head. And all the while their comrades, already laden with loot and booty, cheered and laughed.[74]

Calling the action "medieval savagery,"[75] the newspaper commented that the actions constituted "raw vengeance Afghan style—brutal, unforgiving, and deadly."[76]

Not surprisingly, the public followed the tabloids' lead in addressing the photos as evidence, reacting in a more responsive and attentive manner than had the U.S. public. Letters to the editor literally flooded the papers, as British citizens called the photos "horrifying," "sickening," and proof that "the Northern Alliance is no better than the Taliban."[77] One reader of the Guardian went further: Despite the fact that "occasionally, we've glimpsed that people are getting killed [such as] the images of the castrated Taliban fighter pleading for his life before he was shot," she cautioned, the depictions nonetheless remained insufficient. "Our sympathy for these near-feral wildmen is limited. . . . There has been no sense of outrage at these atrocities."[78]

While the treatment accorded the photos in the U.K. tabloids constituted the most direct and elaborated mode of depicting impending death, the fact that such images appeared in the tabloid press rather than the U.K. broadsheets is worth considering. Unlike their more elite counterparts, the tabloids did not self-censor images on the grounds of propriety, decency, or tastefulness but played instead to the image's role as evidence. In other words, the more straightforward reliance on images in the U.K. tabloids made them more amenable to organizing a story around an image's display, regardless of the degree of dissonance it might generate with the larger climate of opinion. That the same images were not widely shown in the U.S. press on the implicit grounds that they might offend the prevailing sentiments for the war was achievable precisely

because there was no similar recognition among U.S. journalists that the photos could be used as autonomous data.

And yet another set of photos associated with the war in Afghanistan did receive such treatment - the photos of the abduction and murder of Wall Street Journal reporter Daniel Pearl. Not surprisingly, such images supported the U.S. prosecution of the war in precisely a way that the photos of the Taliban soldiers did not.

Daniel Pearl and the About-to-Die Photo

The kidnapping and murder of Wall Street Journal reporter Daniel Pearl offered a useful contrast case of about-to-die coverage. Kidnapped during a supposed meeting with a source for a story on the so-called shoe bomber on January 23, 2002, Pearl's whereabouts were unknown until January 27, when select newspapers, including two Pakistani news outlets, the New York Times, the Washington Post, and the Los Angeles Times received e-mail with four photographs of Pearl, one with a gun to his head, another of him holding a copy of the Pakistani Dawn. A follow-up e-mail, with an additional photo showing his hands shackled, stipulated that Pearl would be killed if the demands of the captors - the National Movement for the Restoration of Pakistani Sovereignty calling for the release of Taliban fighters from Afghanistan - were not met. A third e-mail sent on January 31 extended Pearl's execution by one day. On February 1, CNN and Fox News received word that Pearl had been executed. A video of his execution surfaced in May, with less graphic parts airing on CBS News, and in June the Boston Phoenix published graphic images from the video, including one of the severed head of the reporter.[79]

Pearl's abduction and murder were structured as a story of a man about to die. One typical news article lead its news coverage with the uneasiness that riddled those awaiting news of his destiny: "The family, friends, and colleagues of U.S. journalist Daniel Pearl are anxiously awaiting word of his fate today as a deadline for his execution set by his captors in Pakistan expires."[80] As numerous people scrambled to locate the kidnappers before they carried out their threat, photos of the reporter circulated in patterned ways. For the six days of his captivity, they were published repeatedly, in tandem and in sequence, and shared across newspapers. Sometimes they appeared more than once in one newspaper, and when they reappeared on different days it was without indication of the time that had elapsed between their first appearance and the more recent stories they were brought to illustrate. Though attributed variously to the AP, Reuters, and the Washington Post, in fact the images all referenced the same photos that had come by e-mail to the news organizations.

At least one, if not two, of the four original photos appeared in most U.S. newspapers. They were published on either the front page or an internal page in the front section of the New York Times, Washington Post, Philadelphia Inquirer, and Los Angeles Times, and at one day's delay in the Boston Globe.[81] One of the photos appeared as a Newsweek cover photo, and it was displayed a second time in the same issue alongside two other photos from the same sequence. A full-page photo displayed the shot of a gun being held to his head. It appeared in Time as well.[82]

When a second shot of Pearl shackled in captivity arrived in a later e-mail, that picture too appeared widely, used to illustrate the continuing story in the New York Times, the Chicago Tribune, and the Boston Globe. It appeared twice on two consecutive days in the Washington Post.[83] Photos that appeared the first day of Pearl's captivity were reprinted on the day that news arrived of his death.[84] In other words, the appearance and reappearance of the photos had little relevance to what was actually going on in the story. Their recycling, however, was central to establishing the about-to-die moment as reflective of the larger story of the war on terror.

Images of Daniel Pearl took another turn when CBS aired a portion of the video of his execution in May 2002, so that, in Dan Rather's words, "Americans can see and understand the full impact and danger of the propaganda war being waged."[85] When the Boston Phoenix one month later published shots from the video, including photos of the reporter's severed head, the newspaper was accused of sensationalism, poor judgment, and insensitivity to the family. Though the FBI at first accused the paper of violation of laws against the publication of obscene content, the Phoenix argued that the video and its still photos were no different from the pictures of people jumping from the World Trade Center, footage of the Challenger explosion, or photos of the concentration camps: "The silence on this issue has been deafening. Where's the outrage? Where are our civil libertarians? Our First Amendment absolutists?"[86] Mainstream response to the Phoenix's decision to publish was overwhelmingly negative, as readers and other journalists criticized the paper for "a callous disregard for human decency."[87] Not surprisingly, the coverage of the story of the execution tape was illustrated with the earlier photos of Pearl in captivity, which were recycled yet again into the later story both then and at the one-year marker of the abduction and murder.[88]

The photos of Daniel Pearl were thus shown in the U.S. media in a fashion reminiscent of the about-to-die-moment. Shown repeatedly, across newspapers, and with full supporting verbal documentation, images of Pearl held by his captors, rather than the graphic pictures of his actual execution, became, in a sense, one of the memorable images of the war in Afghanistan, pushing aside other depictions of his murder, even when instances of its photographic display became available. Moreover, the early pictures of a captive Pearl, about to be killed by his abductors, continued to illustrate the story long after he was already dead.

The fact that the Daniel Pearl incident received the kind of coverage typical of an about-to-die photo made sense because visualizing a reporter's death by "the other side" in wartime was consonant with the U.S. prosecution of the war on terror. As a columnist for the Boston Globe saw it, "The video of Daniel Pearl's beheading is searing and nightmarish, but the key to its power is not that it shows him dead. It is that it shows him alive."[89] In that moment - the illogical and contingent suspension of his impending death - leakages were created that allowed for an accommodation to the larger climate by which the war's meaning could be stabilized. Focusing on Daniel Pearl's death kept the U.S. public involved, attentive, and empathetic to the aims of the war's prosecution. That the about-to-die pictures of the Taliban executions did the opposite made their depiction less suited to broad strategic aims. In that regard, not only did it not make sense to publish wide-ranging depictions of the actual deaths of the Taliban soldiers, but freezing their impending deaths in a contingent space carried with it the risk of raising dissonance in a way that could undermine the establishment and maintenance of public support for the war. A restrained

and ambivalent display of the about-to-die moment thus emerged as the least noxious alternative for covering the news while accommodating the broader political climate.

What Does Impending Death Mean for the Body Politic in Wartime?

The coverage of war always proceeds on the basis of a consensus, only partly articulated, by which its events can be made sensical. Pictures, in this regard, tend to reflect key points of that consensus. It is thus no surprise that in wartime one's own war is depicted through images that show its prosecution in an advantageous light.

But what happens to images when the prosecution of war does not support strategic aims reveals much about the uneven uses of photos in wartime, and particularly photos of death. For the pictures that appear in such times suggest that journalists tend to avoid depicting what is most problematic about an existing consensus. Depictions of the about-to-die moment help in this regard, by freezing action in ways that allow the bold impulses of a consensus to be supported while preventing address to the contested nuances of that consensus. In most wars - World War II, Vietnam, the Intifada, to name a few - the moment of impending death has worked as a depiction, because it suspends consensus about the loss of human life, an inevitable outcome of war, on contingency and impossibility, impeding the growth of the discontent that might exist. However, when the about-to-die image is associated with a nuance or complication that could blow open an existing consensus, it no longer makes sense as a way to depict death in wartime. And so it is presented in only a partial and ambivalent sense. The problematic nature of the U.S. coalition with the Northern Alliance was revealed in the about-to-die photos of the Taliban

killings, and as international concerns arose that the United States was turning a blind eye to atrocities being committed by its partner, the pictures highlighted these concerns. By contrast, the images of Daniel Pearl's kidnapping and execution legitimated the war on terror for which the U.S. went to war in the first place. The choice, then, of whom to display as a victim of impending death was strategically, if subconsciously, crafted in conjunction with the preferences and aims of the larger political and military imperatives of the United States in Afghanistan.

We have long been told that a picture is worth a thousand words. But it reflects only those words that fit the larger climate of opinion. The limited value of such a qualification demands pause. For pictures of death in wartime need to be seen, regardless of whether words exist that make them fit more or less abrasively, obviously, or advantageously. In wartime, a healthy body politic deserves no less.

Acknowledgments

Thanks to Frederick Schauer, Thomas Patterson, Alex Jones, Ingrid Lehmann, Narasimhan Ravi, Dermot Tatlow, and Santiago Lyon for their comments on this project. Thanks to Claudia Schmidt for research assistance and to the staff of the Shorenstein Center, especially Edith Holway and Vanessa Schultz, for technical help.

Notes

1. See Barbie Zelizer, "Journalism's 'Last' Stand: Wirephoto and the Discourse of Resistance," Journal of Communication 45, no. 2 (Spring 1995):78—92.
2. "Afghanistan: The Other War," Time, Mar. 8, 2004, cover. The story was subheadlined "Remember Afghanistan?" For material on the war in Afghanistan, see Barbie Zelizer and Stuart Allan, eds., *Journalism after September 11* (New York: Routledge, 2002); Stephen Hess and Marvin Kalb, eds., *The Media and the War on Terrorism* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 2003); and Nancy Palmer, ed., *Terrorism, War and the Press* (Cambridge, MA: Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy, Harvard University, 2003).
3. Richard Rorty, *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981); RolandBarthes, Camera Lucida (London: Hill and Wang, 1981); and Roland Barthes, "The Rhetoric of the Image," in Image/Music/Text (New York: Hill and Wang, 1977).
4. See Barbie Zelizer, *Remembering to Forget: Holocaust Memory through the Camera's Eye* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).

5. Albert Bandura, "Selective Moral Disengagement in the Exercise of Moral Agency," *Journal of Moral Education* 31, no. 2 (2002):101-19. Also see D. Chong, The Girl in the Picture (New York: Penguin, 1999).
6. Bill Marinow cited in P. Nesbitt, "Designing for a Tragedy," in *Crisis Journalism: A Handbook for Media Response* (Reston, VA: American Press Institute, October 2001), 23.
7. Barbie Zelizer, "When War Is Reduced to a Photograph," in *Reporting War: Journalism and Wartime*, ed. Stuart Allan and Barbie Zelizer (London: Routledge, 2004).
8. See Barbie Zelizer, *Remembering to Forget: Holocaust Memory through the Camera's Eye* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).
9. Don McCullin, "Notes by a Photographer," in The *Photographic Memory: Press Photography - Twelve Insights*, ed. Enile Meijer and Joop Swart (London: Quiller Press and World Press Photo, 1987), 11.
10. Philip Gefter cited in Marianne Hirsch, "The Day Time Stopped," *Chronicle of Higher Education* 25 (January 2002): B11; also see Barbie Zelizer, "Photography, Journalism and Trauma," in *Journalism after September 11*, ed. Barbie Zelizer and Stuart Allan (London: Routledge, 2002), 48-68.
11. Quoted in David Hilbrand and Gail Shister, "A Flood of Images into Homes," Philadelphia *Inquirer*, Mar. 27, 2003:A1, A20; and Zelizer, "When War Is Reduced to a Photograph."
12. In December 2003, a New York Times/CBS Poll found that 62 percent of Americans were in favor of seeing pictures of military caskets. The event in April was sparked by a Tami Silicio photo, appended to "The Somber Task of Honoring the Fallen," Seattle Times, Apr. 18, 2004: A1; and by photos taken by Defense Department photographers and displayed under a Freedom of Information Act request filed by Russ Kirk (see www.thememoryhole.com).
13. A Times Daily Mirror poll, conducted by the Center for the People and the Press on Mar. 24, 1993, asked respondents whether they agreed or disagreed with the idea that "TV news should just tell us about violent news but not show pictures of murder and war." Fifty percent of respondents disagreed; 45 percent agreed.
14. Readers' Letters, *Boston Globe*, Oct. 6, 2001:A14; Readers' Letters, *Newsweek*, Oct. 15, 2001:15-16; Readers' Letters, *Time*, Oct. 22, 2001:14; Readers' Letters, *Time*, Nov. 5, 2001:5; Readers' Letters, *Newsweek*, Dec. 10, 2001:16.
15. Time/CNN Poll, 2003.
16.Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, Apr.5,2004. Fifty percent of respondents said that the press did a good job of covering the events in Fallujah, while 21 percent felt that the images were too graphic.
17. Antonia Zerbisias, "Humanity Is First Casualty of War," Toronto Star, Apr. 4, 2004:D10.
18. Cited in Annie Lawson, "Editors Show Restraint with War Images," *The Guardian* (online), www.media.guardian.co.uk, posted Mar. 31, 2003.
19. Stuart Hall, "The Determinations of News Photographs,"in *The Manufacture of News*, ed. Stanley Cohen and Jock Young (London: Sage, 1974); and Alan Sekula, "On the Invention of Photographic Meaning," in *Photography against the Grain* (Halifax, Canada: Press of the Nova Scotia College of Arts and Design, 1974/1984).
20. Zelizer, "When War Is Reduced to a Photograph."Also see Zelizer, "Photography, Journalism and Trauma."
21. CNN, Fox News, and MSNBC initially declined to show the charred bodies being strung up and beaten by Iraqi crowds, while CBS and ABC showed the burnt bodies, along with cautionary notes a blurring of the images. In a survey of the twenty highest-circulating newspapers, Editor

and Publisher found that only five - the New York Times, Chicago Tribune, Philadelphia Inquirer, San Francisco Chronicle, and the New York Post - elected to show graphic photos of the bodies strung along the bridge on their front pages (Charles Geraci, "Seven of Top 20 Papers Published Front Page Fallujah Body Photos," Editor and Publisher, Apr. 1, 2004). Moreover, the buzz among journalists over what to do was noteworthy. Newspaper ombudsmen and editors offered readers an inside look at the editorial decision making that went into the display or lack thereof of the photos. Comparisons were offered, likening the photos to those of Somalia, Vietnam, or Tianenman Square, or even to the removal of Saddam Hussein's statue from Firdus Square.

22. Roy Peter Clark, "You Be the Editor," *Poynteronline*, posted Apr. 1, 2004; and Antonia Zerbisias, "Humanity Is First Casualty of War," *Toronto Star*, Apr. 4, 2004:D10.

23. Adam B. Kushner, "See No Evil," The New Republic (online), posted Apr. 2, 2004.

24. See, for instance W. D. Lutz, "Language, Appearance and Reality Doublespeak in 1984," in The *Legacy of Language - A Tribute to Charlton Laird*, ed. P. C. Boardman (Reno: University of Nevada Press, 1987), 103 - 19. Also see R. Gambino, "Watergate Lingo: A Language of Non-Responsibility," *Freedom at Issue* 22 (1973): 7-9, 15-17.

25. Albert Bandura, "Selective Moral Disengagement in the Exercise of Moral Agency," *Journal of Moral Education* 31, no. 2 (2002):101 - 19.

26. This analysis examined the photos that appeared about Afghanistan during the first three months of the war, from Oct. 10 to Dec. 31, 2001, with particular attention paid to images of impending death. Photos were examined in six U.S. newspapers and two U.S. newsmagazines - New York Times, Washington Post, Boston Globe, Philadelphia Inquirer, Los Angeles Times, Chicago Tribune, Time, and Newsweek - and additional attention was also paid to the non-U.S. press in Europe and Canada to build comparisons. To ascertain photos that were taken of Afghanistan during this time period but not necessarily published, the photographic archives of AP Multimedia and Factiva were also surveyed during the same time period. The same sources were consulted again surrounding the kidnapping and murder of Daniel Pearl and the subsequent airing of the video of his death, from Jan. 23 to Feb. 10, 2002, and again from June 7 to June 13, 2002.

27. Victoria Clarke, quoted in Hess and Kalb, The *Media and the War on Terrorism*, 98; and Michael Getler, quoted in Hess and Kalb, *The Media and the War on Terrorism*, 99.

28. Sanford J. Unger, cited in Hess and Kalb, *The Media and the War on Terrorism*, 99; and Tim Weiner, "Rumsfeld Says Ramadan Won't Halt U.S. Attacks," *New York Times*, Nov. 5, 2001:B4.

29. Howard Kurtz, "CNN Chief Orders 'Balance' in War News," *Washington Post*, Oct. 31 2001:C1.

30. Marvin Kalb, "Dissent: Public Opinion, Media Reaction," *Nieman Reports* 57, no. 4 (Winter 2003): 72.

31. Michael Getler, in Hess and Kalb, *The Media and the War on Terrorism*, 99.

32. Jeremy Seabrook, "Peep Empathy from Rubble," *The Statesman* (India), Nov. 4, 2001.

33. The photo, called the single most recognized image in the magazine's 114-year history, was also to be featured on a repeat cover (Michael Kilian, "Haunting Afghan Face Gets a Name," Chicago Tribune, Mar. 14, 2002:D10).

34. This is part of a larger project in progress on the about-to-die image in Western journalism, tentatively titled About to Die: Journalism, Memory and the Voice of the Visual and under contract by the author with the University of Chicago Press. For a discussion of this topic in association with the events of September 11, see Barbie Zelizer, "The Voice of the Visual in

Memory," in *Framing Public Memory*, ed. Kendall Phillips (Birmingham: University of Alabama Press, 2004), 157 - 86.
35. For instance, one picture depicted stones being cleared from a ruined building in strife-torn Karam. The caption read, "The Taliban claim that nearly 200 people were killed in the village on Monday. If true, it would be the deadliest single strike by U.S. and British warplanes." See AP Photo/APTN, Karam, Oct. 14, 2001, #LON111. Also see AP photo appended to Robert Nicklesberg and Barry Bearak, "On a Taliban Guided Tour, Facts Prove Elusive," *New York Times*, Nov. 1, 2001:B1. One interesting image, recalling the earlier images of the public hangings by the Taliban, portrayed a stringing up of a U.S. helicopter. Shot down by the Taliban, the burnt shell of the helicopter was strung from a traffic post, suggesting the deaths of those inside (see AP Photo/Amir Shah, Kabul, Nov. 7, 2001, #KAB101).
36. Stephan Goetghebuer, quoted in Alex Perry, "Hunger and Despair in the Camps," *Time*, Dec. 3, 2001:33.
37. Tyler Hicks/Getty Images Photo appended to Barry Bearak, "Where Buddhas Fell, Lives Lie in Ruins Too," *New York Times*, Dec. 9, 2001:B10.
38. Time magazine portrayed a bread line at the crowded camp of Maslakh, said to be the biggest refugee camp in the world, with a caption that told readers that the children "wait for food; many have already died" (photo titled "Bread Line," part of a photo essay by Bill Saporito, "Out in the Cold," *Time*, Dec. 17, 2001:33-35). In a like vein, images of a twelve-year-old boy wounded on his way to school during the bombing of Kabul were appended to stories of "excessive deaths" from the U.S. action; although the boy himself was not known to have died, he stood in for a more general collective fate that others were meeting (AP Photo/Dmitiri Messinis, appended to Bob Kemper, "War on Track, US Insists; Pakistan Says Civilian Deaths 'Excessive," *Chicago Tribune*, Oct. 29, 2001:8); AP Photo/Sergei Grits, Mazar-e-Sharif, Jan. 14, 2002, #MOSB113, #MOSB114.
39. AP Photo/Marco Di Lauro, Kabul, Nov. 18, 2001, #AFG109.
40. Anthony Spaeth, "Kabul's New Islamic Rule Young and Fundamentalist," *Time*, Oct. 7, 1996:48. Also see photo by Alan Chin/NYT, appended to John F. Burns, "Afghan Professionals Fleeing Rule by Clerics," *New York Times*, Oct. 7, 1996. Verbal reports include John F. Burns, "Harsh Laws Way of Life in Afghanistan," *New York Times*, Feb. 17, 1996:E13; John F. Burns, "Afghan Professionals Fleeing Rule by Clerics," *New York Times*, Oct. 7, 1996:A8; John F. Burns, "Stoning of Afghan Adulterers: Some Go to Take Part, Others Just to Watch," *New York Times*, Nov. 3, 1996:18; and John F. Burns, "With Sugared Tea and Caustic Rules, an Afghan Leader Explains Himself," *New York Times*, Nov. 24, 1996:E9.
41. Barbara Crossette, "Afghan Hanging Rouses Debate on UN's Role as Protector," *New York Times*, Oct. 22, 1996:A15. For photos of Najibullah, see Haider Shah/Reuters picture appended to Anthony Spaeth, "Kabul's New Islamic Rule Young and Fundamentalist," *Time*, Oct. 7, 1996:48 - 50; and picture appended to Kathy Gannon, "Taliban Rebels Take Hold as Streets of Kabul Revive," *Washington Post*, Sep. 28, 1996:A19.
42. John F. Burns, "From Cold War, Afghanistan Inherits Brutal New Age," *New York Times*, Feb. 14, 1996:A1, A8; "Victims' Kin Execute Killers in Afghanistan," *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, Feb. 11, 1996:15A; "Two Afghan Murder Convicts Publicly Executed by Victims' Fathers," Agence France-Presse Dispatch, Feb. 10,1996; Rahimullah Yusufzai, "Afghanistan Allows Victims' Relatives to Execute Killers," *Seattle Times*, Feb. 11, 1996:A18; and Kathy Gannon, "Taliban Rebels Take Hold as Streets of Kabul Revive," *Washington Post*, Sep. 28, 1996:A19.

43. AP Photo/Haider Shah, Feb. 9, 1996. The picture was appended to John F. Burns, "From Cold War, Afghans Inherit Brutal New Age," *New York Times*, Feb. 14, 1996:A1. A similar image also appeared alongside "Victims' Kin Execute Killers in Afghanistan," *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, Feb. 11, 1996:15A.
44. For photos, see James Nachtwey photo, appended to Dick Thompson, "Death of a City Devastated by Endless Fighting, *Time*, Jun. 24, 1996:30; AP Photo/B.K. Bankash, Kabul, Sep. 28, 1996, #PES101; AP/Amir Shah, Kabul, Sep. 23, 2000, #Kab101; AP, Kabul, Aug. 8, 2001, #WHICH; AP, Kabul, Aug. 9,2001, #5943212 (3JDT8);AP/Zhiruddin Abdullah, Kabul, Dec. 18, 1996,#AFG101.
45. See, for instance, David Rohde, "Foreigners Who Fought for Taliban Shot in Head," *New York Times*, Nov. 19, 2001:B1; Carlotta Gal, "Fortress Awash with Bodies of Taliban," Chicago Tribune, Nov. 29, 2001:10; "Dispatches," Time, Nov. 26, 2001:58 - 63.
46. For example, see Tyler Hicks/Getty Images photo appended to David Rohde, "The Volunteers," *New York Times*, Nov. 18, 2001:B1; James Hill photo for the New York Times and photos by Anja Niedringhaus/AFP, appended to Carlotta Gal, "At Site of Quelled Prisoner Revolt, Afghan's Fort's Walls Tell a Tale of Death," *New York Times*, Nov. 29,2001:B1; Carolyn Cole photo appended to Paul Watson, "A Roadside Graveyard for Taliban Stragglers," *Los Angeles Times*, Nov. 27, 2001:A10; Alex Perry for Time, titled "Carnage," *Time*, Nov. 26, 2001:61; unaccredited photo for *Time*, Dec. 10, 2001:62. Also see pictures appended to Michael Kilian and Stephen Franklin, "Rebels Seek More Strikes," *Chicago Tribune*, Oct. 24,2001:30; and to Lois Raimondo, "In Attack on Kunduz, Rebels Find Death Instead of Victory," *Washington Post*, Nov. 15,2001:A32. One image - depicting people viewing the remains of an anti-Taliban fighter - was displayed twice in the same edition of one newspaper (photo by Serge Michel appended to "Recovery of Slain Comrades a Grisly Task for Opposition," *Los Angeles Times*, Nov. 21, 2001:A6, A14).
47. See, for instance, AP photo appended to " 'Friendly Fire' Victim Is Buried at Arlington," *Los Angeles Times*, Dec. 18, 2001:A2. This relation to images of death during war is a long-standing tradition, whereby the bodies of one's own dead tend not to be shown.
48. Such images abound in existing online archives. For instance, see AP Photo/David Guttenfelder, Milawa, Dec. 11, 2001, #XDG104; AP Photo/Darko Bandic, Mazar-E-Sharif, Nov. 27, 2001, #XDRB110, #XDRB114, #XDRB116; and AP Photo/Dusan Vranic, Kunduz, Nov. 26, 2001, #DV103.
49. Photos by Luc Delahaye-Magnum appended to "Fall of the Taliban," *Newsweek*, Nov.26, 2001:21 - 29.
50. Peter Rosenthal, quoted in Richard Gwyn and Linda Diebel, "Rage Grows Over War Atrocities," *Toronto Star*, Nov. 28, 2001:A1.
51. Matt Rosenthal, "Just Massacres?" *The Progressive*, Dec. 3, 2001.
52.Dalton Camp,"We Are Silent as Barbarians Are at Gates," *Toronto Star*, Nov. 18, 2001:A13.
53. Ian Cobain, "America Will Take No Prisoners," *London Times*, Nov. 20, 2001:A1.
54. Camp, "We Are Silent as Barbarians Are at Gates."
55. AP/Dusan Vranic Photo appended to Drew Brown and Sudarsan Raghavan, "In Kunduz, Residents Cheer Alliance Arrival," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, Nov. 27, 2001:A11; Lois Ramondo/ *Washington Post* photo appended to Sharon LaFraniere, "Revenge Shapes Struggle for Taliban Holdout," *Washington Post*, Nov. 18, 2001:A1; Agence France-Presse photo appended to Maura Reynolds, "Response to Terror, Taliban Under Seige," *Los Angeles Times*, Nov. 27, 2001:A10; AFP photo appended to Bryan Bender, "Land Force Faces a Two-Front Fight with Bin Laden,"

Boston Globe, Nov. 27, 2001:A1; AP Photo by Dusan Vranic appended to John Diamond and Noreen S. Ahmed, "US Attacks Convoy Near Kandahar," *Chicago Tribune*, Nov. 27, 2001:8; photo appended to Nancy Gibbs, "Blood and Joy," *Time*, Nov. 26, 2001:30.
56. Caption to AP/Dusan Vranic, Kunduz, Nov. 26, 2001, #APA5620925.The photo appeared in the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, Nov. 27, 2001:A11, and in the *Chicago Tribune*, Nov. 27, 2001:8.
57. Caption appended to a photo taken by Lois Ramondo for the *Washington Post*, Nov.18, 2001:A1; caption appended to a photo taken by Agence France-Presse that appeared in the *Los Angeles Times*, Nov. 27, 2001:A10; caption appended to a photo taken by Agence France-Presse that appeared in the *Boston Globe*, Nov. 27, 2001:A1.
58. Tyler Hicks/Getty Images for the New York Times, Nov. 13, 2001, appended to David Rohde, "Executions and Looting as Alliance Nears Kabul," *New York Times*, Nov. 13, 2001:B1, B3.
59. Eric Stover, "The Battle for Afghanistan:The Tide IsTurned,"Reader's Letter, *New York Times*, Nov. 15,2001:A30.
60. Nancy Gibbs, "Blood and Joy," *Time*, Nov. 26, 2001:30.
61. The larger ten-page photo essay, titled "Blood and Joy," appeared in *Time*, Nov. 26, 2001:28-38. The text quoted here appeared on pp. 34-35.
62. "Liberation and Revenge"(Editorial), *Chicago Tribune*, Nov. 14, 2001:22. The editorial asked the obvious question: "Have we supported a band of liberators or a band of thugs?" Or, as a columnist for the paper commented the next day, "The people on our side in Afghanistan are not necessarily folks you'd want baby-sitting your kids" (Steve Chapman, "In Need of the Northern Alliance," *Chicago Tribune*, Nov. 15, 2001:31).
63. Jonathan Brown, "Pictures from a Liberation,"Reader's Letter, *Time*, Dec. 17, 2001:8.
64. Misook Kim, "Pictures from a Liberation," Reader's Letter, *Time*, Dec. 17, 2001:8.
65. Richard M. Takase, "Refugee Children," Letter to the Editor, *Los Angles Times*, Nov.26, 2001:A12.
66. Peter Coonradt, "Afghan Coverage," Letter to the Editor, *Los Angeles Times*, Nov.22, 2001:B12.
67. Simon Neufeld, "Lack of Respect for Life," Reader's Letter, *Toronto Star*, Nov. 17,2001:K7.
68. Dan Milmo, "Morgan Lambasts Sun's Pro-War Editorial," *The Guardian*, Nov. 14, 2001.
69. Tyler Hicks photos appended to "Our 'Friends' Take Over Daily Mirror, Nov. 14,2001, front cover; *Daily Mail*, Nov. 14, 2001:1, 3.
70. Gary Jones and Graham Brough, "Battered, Stripped, Mutilated, and Then Riddled with Bullets . . . A Revenge on the Taliban at Its Most Merciless," *Daily Mirror*, Nov. 14, 2001:5.
71. Piers Morgan, quoted in *Milmo*, "Morgan Lambasts Sun's Pro-War Editorial."
72. "2001: The Year in Unforgettable Images," *Daily Mirror*, Dec. 29, 2001:14.
73. Tyler Hicks photo appended to "No Mercy," *Daily Mail*, Nov. 14, 2001, front cover.
74. Ross Benson and Matthew Hickley. "Have Taliban's Terrors Been Replaced by Callous Killers of the Alliance?" *Daily Mail*, Nov. 14, 2001:2.
75. Gary Jones, "War on Terror: The Executioners," *Daily Mirror*, Nov. 14, 2001:1.
76. Gary Jones and Graham Brough, "Battered, Stripped, Mutilated, and Then Riddled with Bullets."
77. Carl Morrisroe, "War on Terror: A New Taliban," Reader's Letter, *DailyMirror*, Nov.15, 2001; also see Margaret White, "Revenge Atrocity," Reader's Letter, *Daily Mirror*, Nov. 15, 2001.
78. Madeleine Bunting, "A Fairy Tale at Christmas," Reader's Letter, *The Guardian*, Dec. 17,

2001.
79. This action met with extreme protest by the journalistic community, while the newspaper's editor drew comparison between the photo and that of a dead soldier being dragged through Mogadishu, a dying baby being carried out of the Federal Building in Oklahoma City, and pictures of Nazi concentration camps. Those opposing its display said it did nothing to advance the story in that the fact of Pearl's death had been known for months. See, for example, Felicity Barringer, "Paper Published Photo of Head of Reporter Who Was Killed," *New York Times*, Jun. 7, 2002:A24.
80. Andrew Duffy, "Kidnappers' Deadline Expires for U.S. Reporter," *Ottowa Citizen*, Feb.1, 2002:A11.
81. These pictures were appended to Erick Eckholm and Felicity Barringer, "American Reporter Held Captive in Pakistan, a Message Says," *New York Times*, Jan. 28, 2002:A6; Molly Moore and Kamben Khan, "Pakistan Group Says It Has US Journalist," *Washington Post*, Jan. 28, 2004:A16; Bob Drogin, "US Reporter Is Seized in Pakistan," *Los Angeles Times*, Jan. 28, 2002:A1; "Group Claims to Hold US Reporter," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, Jan. 28, 2002:A2; and Farrah Stockman, "Sheikh Sought in Missing Reporter Case," *Boston Globe*, Jan. 29, 2002:A9.
82. "Kidnapped: The Ordeal of Daniel Pearl," *Newsweek*, Feb. 11, 2002, cover photo; picture appended to Unmesh Kher, "The Odd Ordeal of Daniel Pearl," *Time*, Feb. 11, 2002:34.
83. It was appended to Felicity Barringer with Erick Eckholm, "New Message Threatens Execution of US Reporter and Others Who Stay in Pakistan," *New York Times*, Jan. 31, 2002:A14. Picture appended to Molly Moore and Kamben Khan, "We Will Give You One More Day," *Washington Post*, Feb. 1, 2002:A14;picture appended to Molly Moore and Kamben Khan, "Kidnapped US Reporter Is Threatened with Death," *Washington Post*, Jan. 31, 2002:A22; picture appended to Bob Drogin, "Threat on Reporter's Life," *Chicago Tribune*, Jan. 31, 2002:A8; picture appended to Susan Milligan and Mark Jurkowitz, "Death Threat Issued for US Reporter Held Captive," *Boston Globe*, Jan. 31, 2002:A1.
84. Picture appended to Molly Moore and Kamben Khan, "Pakistanis Search Cemeteries for Missing Reporter," *Washington Post*, Feb. 2, 2002:A16.
85. Dan Rather, "Terror, Lies, and Videotape," *CBS Evening News*, May 15, 2002.
86. "Freedom to Choose," *Boston Phoenix*, Jun. 7-13, 2003:6.
87. Bruce Shapiro, "Yes, I Have Looked at It, "Dart Center for Journalism and Trauma, posted Jul. 16, 2003; Bob Steele, "Pearl Photo: Too Harmful," *Poynteronline*, posted Jun. 7, 2002; Ken Beaumont, "Salt in the Wound," Reader's Letter, *Boston Phoenix*, Jun. 14, 2002:4; and Tunku Varadarajan, "Revulsion at the Boston Phoenix," *WallStreetJournal.com*, posted Jun. 11, 2002.
88. "A Year after Daniel Pearl's Abduction, Questions Remain," *Holland Sentinel*, Jan. 23, 2003:A1; "The Daniel Pearl Video," *USA Today.com*, Jun. 20, 2003; "Under the Gun," *World Press Review* (online) 49, no. 5 (May 2002).
89. Jeff Jacoby, "Pearl Video Brings the Horror Home," *Boston Globe*, Jun. 13, 2002:A19.