

How Mainstream U.S. ‘News’ Media Pump Their Government’s Lies to Deceive the Public

By [Eric Zuesse](#)

Global Research, August 05, 2017

Region: [Middle East & North Africa](#), [Russia and FSU](#), [USA](#)

Theme: [Intelligence](#), [Media Disinformation](#), [Police State & Civil Rights](#), [US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [FAKE INTELLIGENCE, SYRIA](#)

Now that finally the U.S. government has [officially terminated its arming and training of the jihadist gangs that are fighting to overthrow and replace Syria’s government](#), the neoconservative mainstream U.S. ‘news’ media are disagreeing with each other over how to communicate this fact to the American people without contradicting, or otherwise violating, the false ‘history’ they’ve all been presenting and preserving, throughout the past five years, which has described the U.S. government as being opposed to the jihadists in Syria, instead of as the U.S. government’s arming and training jihadists to overthrow and replace Syria’s government.

That’s a pretty blatant ‘historical’ lie, which they’ve all been maintaining, now, for five years; and, they’re at loggerheads over whether or how they’ll deal with it, now that the program (whose very existence they’ve helped the government to hide from the public) has been so publicly and suddenly ordered to end.

On July 19th, a neoconservative Democratic Party newspaper, the *Washington Post*, headlined one of their many anti-Trump news-articles, [“Trump ends covert CIA program to arm anti-Assad rebels in Syria, a move sought by Moscow.”](#) Their angle on this (actually momentous and constructive) action by Trump to abandon ‘the rebels’ (almost all of whom are, in fact, jihadists), was that this Republican President had done that in order to please Russia’s President Vladimir Putin (who defends Syria’s government, which secular government is knee-jerk-vilified in this and all American newspapers), and the *WP* article quoted neoconservatives who criticized the move by Trump to end the program.

The August 7th issue of a neoconservative Republican Party magazine, *The Weekly Standard*, headlines [“Trump Got This One Right: Shutting down the CIA’s ghost war in Syria,”](#) and doesn’t attack the previous, Democratic, President, for having initiated and run that “ghost war,” and doesn’t make clear what it was, or why it was being waged, but does say hostile things against the leaders both of Russia and of Syria, such as that [“Putin ... has the blood of many Syrian civilians on his hands,”](#) and allegations also against the Syrian government, such as:

Russian and Syrian jets have indiscriminately and repeatedly bombed civilian targets. The Assad regime has used chemical weapons, which Trump himself objected to, bombing a Syrian airfield in response. The United States cannot

endorse these war crimes by allying itself with the perpetrators of mass murder in Syria.

Besides the fact that at least some of those assertions are [demonstrably false](#), the United States government has actually (and often) done [such things](#) as [that](#) propaganda-article *alleges* Russia and Syria to have done, but nothing is said in this far-right magazine about that; readers of *The Weekly Standard* don't get to see even a mention of this reality. The publication fools its readers, instead of informs them.

What's even more important to take note of here, however, is that the article does **not** so much as even just *mention* the *key* fact: that Russia's forces were invited into Syria by Syria's secular government, in order to *defend* it against the jihadist gangs America was assisting, and that America's forces **weren't** invited by Syria's government, but are instead invaders there, trying to overthrow that government, and are not *only* trying to help to defeat the ISIS jihadists who have also invaded Syria in order to overthrow Syria's secular government.

The crucial fact, that [the Obama Administration was insistent that Russia in Syria not bomb Al Qaeda forces in Syria and that that insistence upon protecting Al Qaeda there was the key reason why Secretary of State John Kerry's efforts to reach an agreement with Russia about Syria had failed \(they were actually sabotaged by his own boss, President Obama\)](#), is ignored by *The Weekly Standard*. (Also ignored by this far-right magazine is that the U.S. government has [the blood](#) of [at least as many](#) "Syrian civilians on its hands" there, as does the Russian government or any other participant in the war. That magazine's playing to this false 'us'-against-'them' prejudice, insults the intelligence of its readers, but is done in order to divert their duped reader's attention away from the reader's *real* enemies, which include the owners of that magazine, who want to manipulate, instead of to inform, their readership, for the benefit of Republican aristocrats. Those aristocrats need these dupes to remain duped.)

This shows that even when Republican 'news' media defend a Republican President who is reversing an imperialistic policy of his Democratic predecessor, it's done in such a way, so it's designed to keep the American public still *deceived* about the actual ugly history, which indicts both of America's political Parties — indicts the U.S. government itself, at its highest levels, where both Parties are united together, in order to conquer the entire planet (including Syria, including Russia), for the benefit of America's aristocrats.

Instead of reporting this crucial truth, *The Weekly Standard* says:

Russia intervened in Syria in September 2015, and the timing was not accidental. Just months earlier, in March, the "Army of Conquest" took over the northwestern province of Idlib. This rebel coalition was no band of moderates. It was led by Nusra and included its closest Islamist and jihadist partners. The Army of Conquest was on the march, threatening the Assad family's stronghold of Latakia on the coast.

The message the magazine is trying to convey to its conservative American readership, is that Russia there was defending "the Assad family," and not defending Syria's sovereignty over Syria's own territory — not defending the independence of the Syrian government, from the demands of the U.S. aristocracy (which are [mainly concerned with building oil and](#)

[gas pipelines through Syria in order to replace Russia as the main energy-supplier to the world's biggest energy-market, the EU, by the U.S. and its royal Arab allies as the main energy-suppliers there\).](#)

This is an imperialistic war, and the only way for the U.S. aristocracy to win it, is militarily (and/or via coups [such as it did in Ukraine](#)) to break apart Russia's foreign alliances, in order to grab control of Russia's assets (including that oil and gas) — but the U.S. oligarchs are also going after China's assets, and Iran's assets, and the assets of any well-armed government that's not yet a vassal-nation to the U.S. aristocracy (vassals such as Europe, Japan, and all other U.S. allies).

America (with the assistance of the Saudis, and of the U.S. aristocracy's other fundamentalist-Sunni business-partners in the Middle East) uses jihadists to serve as those "boots on the ground," against secular governments such as Syria and Russia, because that's a lot cheaper to do than to re-institute the U.S. military draft and to send tens of thousands of American soldiers out to overthrow, or at least to weaken, the 'enemy' government. It's much cheaper "boots on the ground," to grab new territory via these proxies, than via U.S. troops.

The supreme international issue in our time is sovereignty — the independence, or freedom, of nations. It's international democracy, which is really at stake, in all of this. The alternative (which the U.S. government leads) is international fascism. It's [a vast program](#), not composed merely of invasions (the 'Defense' Department) and of coups (the [State Department](#), etc.).

Now that ([after 24 February 1990](#)) [the United States has been committed to world-conquest](#), there is, regarding international news-reporting in the United States, nothing that is fundamentally true that's reported in the U.S. 'news' media, regarding international relations — it's all based upon a shared lie by both wings of the U.S. aristocracy, Republican and Democratic, saying that the U.S. government supports freedom and democracy around the world, and that the nations which the U.S. government is trying to conquer, do not favor international freedom and democracy. The standard American account (that it supports, instead of opposes, democracy around the world) is the exact *opposite* of the truth.

For example: How much publicity did the U.S. 'news' media provide when [twice in one day](#) the Secretary General of the United Nations said that the U.S. President's insistence upon having a veto-power regarding whom would, and whom would not, be allowed to become Syria's next President, was "totally unfair and unreasonable" and that instead "The future of Assad must be determined by the Syrian people." No publicity for those statements. None at all. The fact (that the U.S. President refused to *accept* that "The future of Assad must be determined by the Syrian people") was shocking. But it *wasn't* reported to the American people. Americans never knew about it.

How much publicity did the U.S. 'news' media provide when [the U.S. government was one of only three governments in the entire world to vote in the U.N. General Assembly against a resolution to condemn racism, fascism, and denial of the Holocaust?](#) None. None at all. The fact was shocking. But it, too, wasn't reported.

And: How many Americans know that on the night of 24 February 1990, the U.S. President secretly told the Chancellor of West Germany, that all of their statements to Soviet President (soon to become only Russia's President) Mikhail Gorbachev, saying to him that

the U.S. and its alliances would end the Cold War on their side if the Soviet Union and its alliances did on theirs, [had been mere lies and that the Cold War would henceforth continue to be waged on the Western side until Russia itself would be conquered?](#)

How can a nation *be* a 'democracy', while its government (and its 'news' media) hides the most important parts of history, and pumps instead lies, to its people, regarding international relations? Who is the *actual* sovereign in the United States — its public, or its [aristocracy](#)?

And how many U.S. news-media will carry this article, which is submitted to all of them, to publish free-of-charge? For any of them that has a large audience, to publish it, could precipitate an unprecedented revolution within the U.S. aristocracy itself (a revolution against their lies), because it would, in effect, officially acknowledge that the existing 'history' is *founded* upon lies. But, if this fact is not publicly recognized in the U.S. now, then when will the truth about these matters be allowed to be published here? Or, will it ever? Or will it never.

The *Washington Post's* article said that "a current official, who spoke on the condition of anonymity" said: "Putin won in Syria." The anonymous source didn't say: "The Syrian people won in Syria."

Western-sponsored polls in Syria showed that [55% of Syrians wanted Assad to remain as President, and 82% of Syrians blamed America for the presence of jihadists in Syria trying to overthrow Assad.](#)

Are the U.S. 'news' media hopeless — beyond salvaging? Is [democracy](#) in America beyond salvaging? Is 1984 here locked-in? What would that mean for the future of the world?

'News' media in the countries that are allied with the U.S. are just as trashy. For example, [here's an article](#) from a brilliant blogger ripping to shreds an August 1st article from Britain's Reuters 'news' agency, about the war in Yemen. That Reuters 'news'-report could just as well have been published by the *New York Times* or *Washington Post*.

Maybe 'news' media now are that rotten all over the world. But any mainstream 'news' medium in the U.S., or its allied countries, has no realistic basis for criticizing 'news' media in other nations. Yet they do criticize the press in those nations, constantly. That's just another lie, from 'news' media that might as well be pure lies.

The presumption when reading the 'news' should therefore be: What are they really trying to sell, and to whom? In a world dominated by lies, the thing that's actually more important than anything else, is the motives. And nothing should then be believed on the basis of trust. In international relations, everything now is war, and the first victim of war is truth. And that is the reality today.

Investigative historian Eric Zuesse is the author, most recently, of [They're Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010](#), and of [CHRIST'S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity](#).

This article was originally published by [Strategic Culture Foundation](#).

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Eric Zuesse](#)

About the author:

Investigative historian Eric Zuesse is the author, most recently, of *They're Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010*, and of *CHRIST'S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity*.

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