

Baltimore Protests: “Why So Much Anger?”: If You Don’t Know, Washington Post Won’t Tell You

By [Jim Naureckas](#)

Global Research, April 29, 2015

[FAIR](#) 28 April 2015

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Media Disinformation](#), [Police State](#) & [Civil Rights](#)

“Why is there so much anger?” If you were wondering that before you read the **Washington Post’s** [“primer,”](#) you’re probably still wondering. (photo: Algerina Perna/**Baltimore Sun**)

The **Washington Post** ([4/28/15](#)) offers: **A Freddie Gray Primer: Who Was He, How Did He Die, Why Is There So Much Anger?**

The “who was he” part comes from the [“no angel”](#) school of journalism—stressing his the “frequent run-ins with the law,” sniffing that he “lived off” compensation for childhood lead-poisoning. It’s not all negative—friends recall him as “loyal and warm, humorous and happy.” But as in other pieces in [this genre](#), there’s a sense that the point is not to humanize the victim but to allow readers to judge whether he deserved to live or die.

In this section, **Post** writers Peter Hermann and John Woodrow Cox describe Gray as “at the moment...the nation’s most prominent symbol of distrust in police.” Does he really symbolize “distrust in police”—or police violence against black men?


But the **Post** can’t refer to him as a symbol of police violence, because as far as the paper is concerned, there’s no way to tell whether any police violence occurred at all; in the next section—“How did he die?”—his death is presented as a complete mystery. Which is not surprising when you look at the [sourcing](#) for this section:

The officers said.... Officials say.... police officials said.... Officials said....
Baltimore police have acknowledged.... Police have said.... Those involved in
the arrest.... City officials have promised.... Baltimore Mayor Stephanie
Rawlings-Blake said....

This is a good example of what Adam Johnson [calls](#) “a friendly local media whose default position is to simply repeat ‘official’ accounts, no matter how illogical they may be.” The only independent source of information offered on Gray’s death comes from “video shot by a civilian bystander,” which “shows officers dragging Gray, who appeared limp, after he was handcuffed.” But the **Post** follows this up with “officials say he was able to climb into the back of a police van.”

You can see the video [here](#). When you can watch a person being dragged into the back of a police van, apparently unable to walk, and you know that he later died of spinal cord injuries, is it reasonable to suggest, as the **Post** account does, that his death might be attributed to the fact he “was not seat-belted after being placed in a transport van”?

The **Post** offers that as one of the “significant errors” that are “acknowledged” by police—along with denial of medical attention and failure to call an ambulance—a phrasing that frames Gray’s death as a mistake and treats exculpatory claims by police as revealed fact. (You don’t “acknowledge” a deceptive claim.)



Freddie Gray: The Post doesn’t see his brutal death as sufficient to explain a community’s anger.

The final section is “Why is there so much anger?” The question implicitly plays down Gray’s importance as an individual—isn’t the fact that police killed someone in a particularly brutal fashion with no credible explanation reason enough for a community to be angry?—but the article does tie Gray’s death to “what activists say is a much larger national issue: police mistreatment of black men.” After listing some of the more infamous instances of black men or youths killed by police—[Michael Brown](#), [Tamir Rice](#), [Eric Garner](#), [Walter Scott](#)—the piece continues:

Those tensions were only heightened in West Baltimore, where relations between residents and police have long been strained.

First of all, a series of deaths are not “tensions”—they’re actual violence, with real lives lost. Nor is “strained” the appropriate word to use for relations between police and residents where police have repeatedly killed those residents.

An ACLU of Maryland [report](#) found 109 people killed in police encounters in the state in a five-year period from 2010-14. Sixty-nine percent of those killed were black. (Maryland is 29 percent black.) Forty-five were not armed in any way; 80 percent of these victims were black.

You get a good sense of the human lives—and the racism—behind these statistics in a **Baltimore Sun** article ([9/28/14](#)) about the city’s police brutality settlements, summarized by Conor Friedersdorf in the **Atlantic** ([4/22/15](#)).

But none of this information was included in a passage that purports to explain “why is

there so much anger”—though the section does find space to mention “violent rioters who set cars ablaze, looted businesses and injured more than a dozen officers.”

*Messages can be sent to the **Washington Post** at letters@washpost.com, or via **Twitter** [@washingtonpost](https://twitter.com/washingtonpost). Please remember that respectful communication is the most effective.*

The original source of this article is [FAIR](#)
Copyright © [Jim Naureckas](#), [FAIR](#), 2015

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Jim Naureckas](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca