

Regimes of Press Freedom Restriction During Armed Conflict: Institutional Dynamics in the Context of the War in Ukraine

Author

Oleh Tytarenko

ORCID: 0009-0008-9343-0427

Peer Reviewers

Khrystyna Nedeva

ORCID: 0009-0005-1135-9582

Oleksandr Hryhoriev

ORCID: 0009-0002-3975-358X

Abstract

Armed conflicts often lead to significant transformations in media environments and the regulatory frameworks governing press freedom. Governments engaged in wartime frequently introduce exceptional measures intended to protect national security, manage information flows, and counter hostile propaganda. While such measures may be justified within the logic of national defense, they also raise important questions regarding the boundaries between legitimate security policies and restrictions on freedom of expression.

This study examines the institutional regimes that shape press freedom during armed conflict, focusing on developments associated with the war in Ukraine. Through analysis of media regulation, wartime information policies, and the interaction between state institutions and journalistic practice, the article explores how press freedom operates under conditions of military emergency.

The research aims to identify the institutional mechanisms through which wartime governments regulate media activity and to analyze how these mechanisms affect journalistic autonomy, information pluralism, and the broader media ecosystem.

Keywords

press freedom

armed conflict

media regulation

wartime information policy

journalism

Ukraine war
media governance

1. Introduction

Freedom of the press is widely regarded as a fundamental component of democratic governance and a cornerstone of modern information societies. Independent journalism plays a critical role in informing the public, scrutinizing government actions, and facilitating pluralistic debate.

However, the institutional environment in which journalism operates can change significantly during periods of armed conflict. Governments engaged in war often introduce extraordinary regulatory measures designed to manage information flows, protect operational security, and counter hostile propaganda.

These measures may include restrictions on military reporting, limitations on access to certain territories, centralized coordination of information channels, and legal sanctions for the dissemination of information considered harmful to national security.

Such policies reflect the tension between two important principles. On the one hand, governments have a legitimate interest in preventing the disclosure of information that could endanger military operations or national security. On the other hand, excessive restrictions on media activity may undermine the transparency and pluralism that are essential to democratic societies.

The war in Ukraine has created a particularly complex media environment in which these tensions are clearly visible. Since the beginning of the full-scale invasion in 2022, Ukrainian authorities have implemented several measures aimed at coordinating national media messaging, countering disinformation, and managing wartime information policy.

At the same time, journalists and media organizations have had to adapt their professional practices to the realities of reporting in an active war zone. Issues such as accreditation procedures, restrictions on frontline reporting, and the dissemination of military information have become central to the daily work of reporters.

The purpose of this article is to examine how regimes of press freedom restriction emerge and function during armed conflict. By analyzing the institutional mechanisms that shape media regulation during the war in Ukraine, the study aims to contribute to a broader understanding of how democratic societies balance the requirements of national security with the principles of press freedom.

2. Literature Review: Press Freedom and Armed Conflict

The relationship between press freedom and armed conflict has long been a subject of interest in media studies, political science, and international law. Scholars generally agree that wars tend to reshape the institutional environment of journalism by introducing new regulatory measures, altering access to information, and transforming the relationship between governments and media organizations.

Research on wartime journalism often emphasizes the structural tension between two competing imperatives: **national security and freedom of expression**. Governments engaged in armed conflict frequently argue that certain restrictions on information are necessary to prevent the disclosure of military positions, protect operational plans, and counter hostile propaganda campaigns. At the same time, media scholars note that excessive restrictions on journalistic activity may undermine democratic accountability and reduce the transparency of wartime decision-making.

Studies conducted by Reporters Without Borders indicate that armed conflicts often lead to measurable declines in global press freedom indicators. In many cases, wartime governments introduce emergency legislation, strengthen information control mechanisms, or impose accreditation requirements on journalists reporting from conflict zones.

Similarly, reports by the Committee to Protect Journalists document the increased risks faced by journalists covering armed conflicts. These risks include physical danger in combat zones, restrictions on movement, limitations on access to information, and legal sanctions for reporting deemed harmful to national security.

Academic research has also explored the concept of **information warfare**, which has become increasingly important in modern conflicts. Information campaigns, disinformation operations, and strategic communication policies are now widely recognized as central components of contemporary warfare. Governments therefore often view the control of information flows as part of broader national defense strategies.

International organizations such as United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization have emphasized that while security considerations may justify certain restrictions during wartime, these restrictions should remain **proportionate, temporary, and consistent with international human rights standards**.

Another important theme in the literature concerns the role of media systems in societies experiencing large-scale geopolitical conflict. Researchers note that media institutions may become more closely aligned with national mobilization efforts during wartime, sometimes leading to forms of coordinated information policy designed to strengthen public resilience and counter hostile narratives.

However, such arrangements also raise questions about the boundaries between legitimate strategic communication and limitations on editorial independence.

The war in Ukraine provides a particularly significant case for examining these issues because it combines several factors that are central to contemporary media research: large-scale military conflict, extensive information warfare, and a highly digitalized media environment in which social media platforms, online journalism, and traditional broadcast media interact simultaneously.

Analyzing how press freedom functions within this environment can therefore provide valuable insights into broader patterns of media governance during armed conflict.

3. Wartime Information Governance

Armed conflicts frequently lead governments to introduce systems of **wartime information governance**, designed to regulate the flow of military, political, and strategic information. These systems often combine elements of security policy, media regulation, and strategic communication in order to manage the informational environment during periods of national emergency.

Although the specific forms of such systems vary across countries and conflicts, several common mechanisms can be identified in the literature on wartime media governance.

3.1 Military Information Restrictions

One of the most common regulatory measures during armed conflict involves restrictions on the publication of information that could reveal sensitive military details.

These restrictions may include limitations on reporting:

- troop movements
- military positions
- operational plans
- damage to critical infrastructure
- details of ongoing military operations

Such rules are typically justified by the need to prevent hostile forces from obtaining tactical information through open media sources. In modern conflicts, where digital media and social networks can rapidly disseminate information worldwide, governments often view uncontrolled reporting as a potential security risk.

In many cases, journalists operating near conflict zones are required to follow specific guidelines regarding the timing and content of their reporting.

3.2 Journalist Accreditation Systems

Another important mechanism of wartime media governance involves **accreditation procedures for journalists**.

Accreditation systems allow military or governmental authorities to regulate access to conflict areas and ensure that reporters operating in sensitive zones follow established security protocols. Journalists seeking to report from the front line or other military-controlled territories are often required to obtain official accreditation from relevant authorities.

Accredited journalists may receive access to certain operational areas, briefings, and official information channels. At the same time, accreditation often involves compliance with rules governing:

- movement within military zones
- communication with military personnel
- publication of operational details
- coordination with military press officers

While such systems can improve coordination between journalists and military authorities, they may also limit the independence of reporting if access to information becomes overly centralized.

3.3 Strategic Communication and Information Coordination

Modern conflicts are characterized not only by military operations but also by extensive **information campaigns** conducted by both state and non-state actors. Governments frequently develop strategic communication policies designed to shape public understanding of the conflict, counter hostile narratives, and maintain public morale.

Strategic communication initiatives may include:

- centralized government briefings
- coordinated messaging across public media channels
- counter-disinformation campaigns
- partnerships with media organizations

These policies are often justified as necessary responses to **information warfare**, in which competing actors attempt to influence domestic and international audiences through media narratives.

However, scholars note that such systems may blur the boundary between strategic communication and editorial independence if media organizations become closely integrated into state communication strategies.

3.4 Access Limitations and Operational Security

In addition to accreditation procedures, wartime governments frequently impose restrictions on physical access to certain areas.

Journalists may be prohibited from entering active combat zones, military bases, or territories where military operations are ongoing. In some cases, reporting from the front line is permitted only when accompanied by military personnel or under specific supervision.

Such limitations are often justified by concerns related to both operational security and the safety of journalists themselves.

Nevertheless, restricted access can also affect the diversity of reporting perspectives available to the public. When access to frontline information is tightly controlled, media coverage may rely more heavily on official sources and government briefings.

4. Media Regulation in Ukraine During the War

The full-scale invasion of Ukraine in February 2022 created a highly dynamic and complex information environment. Alongside military operations, the conflict has been accompanied by extensive information campaigns, cyber operations, and strategic communication efforts. Within this context, Ukrainian authorities introduced several measures aimed at coordinating national information policy, protecting operational security, and countering disinformation.

These measures illustrate how wartime governments attempt to balance the need for national security with the principles of press freedom.

4.1 Centralized Broadcast Coordination

One of the most visible institutional developments in the Ukrainian media environment during the war has been the creation of a unified national broadcast format known as the **United News telethon**.

The telethon brought together several major television channels in a coordinated broadcast schedule designed to provide continuous news coverage during the early stages of the invasion. The initiative aimed to ensure that reliable information reached the public while reducing the influence of hostile propaganda and misinformation.

Under this system, participating broadcasters produced joint programming that was distributed across multiple channels. Supporters of the telethon argued that such coordination was necessary in the early stages of the conflict in order to maintain informational stability and prevent panic.

However, media researchers have also noted that centralized broadcast coordination may reduce the diversity of editorial perspectives typically present in pluralistic media systems.

4.2 Regulation of Military Information

Ukrainian authorities also introduced restrictions on the publication of certain types of military information. These restrictions were designed to prevent the disclosure of operational details that could potentially be used by opposing forces.

Examples of regulated information included:

- locations of military units
- consequences of missile strikes before official confirmation
- details of military operations
- photographs or videos revealing strategic infrastructure

Journalists were instructed to follow specific guidelines regarding the timing and content of their reporting on military developments.

Such policies are consistent with practices observed in many countries during wartime, where governments attempt to limit the publication of information that could compromise operational security.

4.3 Journalist Accreditation and Access to Conflict Areas

Another important aspect of media regulation during the war has been the implementation of accreditation systems for journalists covering military operations.

Journalists seeking to report from frontline areas or military-controlled territories were required to obtain accreditation from relevant government authorities. Accreditation allowed journalists to access certain areas while also requiring them to comply with operational security rules.

In practice, accredited journalists often worked under specific conditions, including coordination with military press officers and adherence to established reporting guidelines.

Such systems are widely used in conflict reporting, as they allow authorities to manage both security risks and the safety of journalists operating in active combat zones.

4.4 Digital Media and Information Warfare

The Ukrainian conflict has also highlighted the importance of digital platforms in modern information environments. Social media, online news platforms, and messaging applications have become central channels for both official communication and independent reporting.

At the same time, digital platforms have also been used to spread misinformation and propaganda, creating additional challenges for governments and media organizations.

In response, Ukrainian authorities have implemented various initiatives aimed at countering disinformation and coordinating official communication strategies. These efforts have included collaboration with international technology platforms, public communication campaigns, and strategic messaging initiatives.

The interaction between traditional media regulation and digital information environments represents an important dimension of contemporary wartime information governance.

5. Institutional Tensions Between Security and Press Freedom

The wartime media environment described in previous sections illustrates the complex institutional balance between national security and press freedom. Armed conflicts often require governments to regulate information flows in order to protect military operations and counter hostile propaganda. At the same time, democratic societies traditionally regard freedom of the press as a fundamental safeguard against excessive state control over public information.

This duality creates an inherent institutional tension that becomes particularly visible during periods of military crisis.

5.1 Security Rationales for Information Control

Governments engaged in armed conflict frequently justify restrictions on media activity by emphasizing the risks associated with uncontrolled information flows. In modern conflicts, where digital communication allows information to spread globally within seconds, even seemingly minor details may reveal sensitive military information.

From a security perspective, restrictions on the publication of operational information are often presented as necessary measures designed to:

- prevent disclosure of military positions
- protect ongoing operations
- avoid assisting hostile intelligence gathering
- reduce the spread of disinformation

Such arguments are not unique to any particular country. Throughout modern history, states involved in armed conflict have introduced forms of wartime information regulation intended to safeguard national security.

5.2 Risks to Journalistic Independence

While security-based restrictions may be justified in certain contexts, scholars and media organizations have also raised concerns regarding the potential impact of wartime information policies on journalistic independence.

When access to information becomes centralized and reporting rules are tightly controlled, journalists may find it more difficult to conduct independent investigations or present alternative perspectives on wartime developments.

Several risks may arise in such environments:

- increased reliance on official sources of information
- reduced diversity of media narratives
- limited ability to scrutinize government decisions
- potential pressure on media organizations to align with official messaging

These dynamics may alter the traditional watchdog role of journalism, which typically involves independent monitoring of government actions.

5.3 Media Systems Under Conditions of National Mobilization

Another factor influencing press freedom during wartime is the broader social context of national mobilization. When societies face existential security threats, media institutions may voluntarily align with national defense efforts, prioritizing public solidarity and resistance narratives.

In such situations, journalists themselves may adopt editorial approaches that emphasize national resilience and unity. While these dynamics can strengthen social cohesion during crises, they may also reduce the level of critical debate within the media environment.

Scholars studying wartime communication have therefore noted that restrictions on press freedom during conflict do not always arise solely from government regulation. In some cases, they also reflect broader social dynamics within media communities operating under conditions of national emergency.

5.4 Balancing Security and Democratic Principles

The central challenge facing democratic societies during wartime is therefore not simply whether to regulate information, but **how to balance legitimate security concerns with the preservation of media pluralism and journalistic autonomy.**

International standards generally emphasize that wartime restrictions on press freedom should meet several criteria:

- they should be clearly defined in law
- they should be proportionate to security risks
- they should remain temporary in nature
- they should not eliminate independent journalism

Maintaining this balance is often difficult in practice, particularly in conflicts characterized by high levels of information warfare and rapid digital communication.

Nevertheless, the ability of democratic societies to preserve space for independent journalism even during periods of conflict remains an important indicator of institutional resilience.

6. Conclusion

The analysis presented in this article demonstrates that armed conflicts significantly reshape the institutional environment in which journalism operates. Wartime governments frequently introduce regulatory mechanisms designed to manage information flows, protect operational security, and counter hostile propaganda. These mechanisms often include restrictions on military reporting, journalist accreditation systems, centralized information coordination, and measures aimed at countering disinformation in digital environments.

The case of Ukraine illustrates how these mechanisms can emerge within a democratic society confronted with large-scale military aggression and intensive information warfare. Ukrainian authorities introduced several policies intended to coordinate national communication and

regulate sensitive military information, while journalists and media organizations adapted their professional practices to the realities of reporting during an active conflict.

At the same time, the study highlights the structural tension between national security considerations and the preservation of press freedom. Wartime information governance inevitably involves limitations on the dissemination of certain types of information, yet excessive or prolonged restrictions may affect media pluralism and journalistic independence.

The analysis suggests that the key challenge for democratic societies during armed conflict is not simply whether to regulate information, but how to ensure that such regulation remains proportionate, transparent, and compatible with the fundamental principles of freedom of expression.

Maintaining this balance becomes particularly complex in modern conflicts characterized by digital communication networks, rapid information circulation, and the strategic use of media narratives by multiple actors.

Future research may further explore how wartime information policies evolve over the course of prolonged conflicts and how different institutional arrangements affect the resilience of media systems. Comparative studies of media governance in various conflict environments may also provide valuable insights into the broader relationship between security policy, democratic institutions, and press freedom.

Understanding these dynamics is essential for developing institutional frameworks capable of protecting both national security and the integrity of independent journalism during periods of armed conflict.

References

Reporters Without Borders. (2023). *World Press Freedom Index 2023*.

Committee to Protect Journalists. (2022). *Journalists at risk in conflict zones*.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2021). *Journalism, press freedom and conflict situations*.

Hoskins, A., & O'Loughlin, B. (2015). *War and media: The emergence of diffused war*. Polity Press.

Carruthers, S. L. (2011). *The media at war: Communication and conflict in the twentieth century*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Howard, P. N. (2020). *Lie machines: How to save democracy from troll armies, deceitful robots, junk news operations, and political operatives*. Yale University Press.