

“Growing Evidence of Deception by Washington”...

You didn't read that headline in a U.S. newspaper!

No—it appeared in the British paper *The Independent* on April 20, 2003. Here are examples of the kind of “false information” the article referred to, collected from a variety of sources:

WHERE ARE THE “WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION”?

The threat posed by Iraq's supposed weapons program was the key rationale for the invasion—yet to date, *none* have been found.

- Documents said by President Bush and Secretary of State Powell to show that Iraq had tried to buy enriched uranium for making nuclear weapons turned out to be “a crude lie. All false,” chief UN weapons inspector Hans Blix told *El País*, a Spanish newspaper. (No U.S. media have interviewed Blix since the war began.)
- U.S. intelligence data said to reveal mobile Iraqi weapons laboratories led only to “some trucks dedicated to the processing and control of seeds for agriculture,” said Blix.
- The *New York Times* reported an anonymous Iraqi scientist's claim that weapons components were destroyed, buried in the sand, and sent to Syria before the war began. But the reporter made *no independent attempt to investigate the Pentagon's claim*. She was not allowed to interview the scientist—and the *Times* let the Pentagon censor her story.

WHAT ELSE HASN'T OUR MEDIA TOLD US?

The true extent of Iraqi casualties, for one thing.

- The media trumpeted the U.S. military's claim that precision bombing would minimize casualties. But so many people were killed and wounded that the Iraqis stopped trying to count them; Red Cross officials said the level of casualties was “incredible.” TV around the world showed images of these dead Iraqis, but our TV networks showed very few. Instead, we got extensive coverage of U.S. casualties and prisoners of war. “The lack of dead bodies on TV has been the biggest PR coup of the war,” notes Charlie Whelan in *PRWeek*, for it lets Americans avoid “the real horror of war.”
- The Pentagon's sanitized version of the killing of civilians by U.S. soldiers at a checkpoint outside Najaf was repeated without question by U.S. media. When the *Washington Post's* William Branigan reported in an eyewitness account that the deaths actually resulted from a failure to follow proper procedures, the Pentagon insisted its own story was correct—and many papers, including the *Times*, never mentioned Branigan's contradictory account.

Britain's *Independent* called for “a full parliamentary inquiry into the competence and accountability of the intelligence services, and into how our Government used them to sell a mistaken and reckless policy.”

WHY AREN'T THE U.S. MEDIA EQUALLY SKEPTICAL? WHY DON'T THEY ASK THE SAME HARD QUESTIONS AND MAKE THE SAME DEMANDS OF THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION?

Turn over to learn how you can help widen media coverage of Iraq and other issues ...

Want more information?

**Forum with Prof. Robert Jensen, Monday May 19, 7:30 pm
St. Francis College, 180 Remsen St, Brooklyn Heights**

Brooklyn Parents for Peace, www.brooklynpeace.org, 718-624-5921, bpfp@brooklynpeace.org