

The BBC: A Criminal Instrument in the War on Syria

By [William Bowles](#)

Global Research, August 24, 2013
williambowles.info

Region: [Europe](#)

Theme: [Media Disinformation](#), [US NATO](#)
[War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [SYRIA](#)

Evidently, the BBC was not satisfied with the propaganda pieces I referred to in yesterday's [article](#), so it's come out with another, equally audacious piece of fiction that reiterates, again without any proof, the same drivel it peddled to us yesterday (and the day before). But what '[UN's Angela Kane in Syria urges chemical weapons probe](#)' (24/8/13) does is communicate a sense that it (the BBC's) wishes might yet come true; that the Empire would once again unleash the dogs of war this time on poor, destroyed Syria.

The BBC really is a war junkie. What is really galling is that aside from a single reference to the Russian assertion (and itself a qualified reference), "[Russia, Syria's main ally, said earlier there was evidence rebels were behind Wednesday's attack](#)", the views of scientists and experts assembled on *WashingtonsBlog* ('[Experts Doubt Syrian Chemical Weapons Claims](#)') for example, are nowhere to be found. It's one, big cry for war.

Yet assembling and deferring to informed and reliable opinion and analysis, instead of 'belief', is journalism one-o-one; talk to the experts, the media analysts, use some common sense for Christ's sake! The BBC is always using 'experts' but can't seem to find a single one when it comes to adding any fact to Hague's 'belief'.

Why would the Syrian government, on the very day the UN inspection team arrived, gas hundreds of people just a stone's throw away from the location of the UN inspectors? Why doesn't the BBC piece even entertain, in the words of William Hague, the "vanishingly small" chance that it would be 'an own goal' for the Syrian government to do something so stupid?

Instead the BBC again quoted Hague that the Assad regime was so brutal, and hence of course stupid-everyone knows that brutal and stupid go together-that it would do something like invite the Empire to finish off the job started by its proxies, by murdering hundreds of its own citizens and thus signing its own death sentence. It's the [Reichstag Fire](#) all over again!

Again, I keep coming back to the point that the BBC's 'news' coverage of events in Syria is in reality war propaganda for the government, a government that seems hellbent on killing some more 'rag heads', do a little more of the Western version of 'civilising' Syria, the cradle of civilisation. It really is disgusting. And to think we are all paying for it.

The US, meanwhile, is facing rising pressure to intervene.

Where is this 'pressure to intervene' coming from, aside from the BBC, that is? Well there's France, just as gung ho to kill some more people of colour as the Brits are and of course, the usual assemblage of right-wing psychos and so-called liberals, and then there's the BBC.

France's Foreign Minister Laurent Fabius said on Saturday that "all the information at our disposal converge to indicate that there was a chemical massacre near Damascus and that the [regime of Bashar al-Assad] is responsible".

Back in Mark Mardell's piece of the 22 August, '[Obama's thick red line on Syria](#)', Mardell lets the reader know that with his and his master's help, he'll get his way; war, war, war, not jaw, jaw, jaw:

There may be a tipping point when moral outrage grows too strong.

Whose 'moral outrage' is Mardell referring to? His own? The BBC's? It's outrageous but there's worse. In the same piece, we get the 'insider dope' on the war to come (salivating, but spiked with a dollop of moral outrage):

I am certain there are plans for the discreet use of special forces to secure chemical weapons - but it is not clear what the trigger would be.

Ever so discreet is Mardell. Mardell writes as though it's him that's involved in planning the invasion (which in a perverted kind of way, he is) but he just hasn't assembled all his resources yet. And once more, Obama is a dithering fool, who wants to go through the

tedious and time-consuming process of making the destruction to come, 'legal' (he pants breathlessly):

In either case, Mr Obama is likely to insist on going the full UN route to gather the maximum possible support for any action – and that means waiting for the inspector's report on earlier incidents at the very least.

Then, at almost the very end of today's article on Kane's UN visit, reluctantly included as it were, we read the following:

Russia's foreign ministry said Moscow had urged President Assad to co-operate with UN inspectors, but questioned the opposition's willingness to provide "secure, safe access of the [UN] mission to the location of the incident".

It also said there was evidence that "this criminal act was clearly provocative", referring to unsubstantiated internet reports that allegations were being made hours before the attack was supposed to have happened.

It's interesting how the Internet reports are "unsubstantiated" as opposed the BBC's elevation of "belief" to that of fact. But be sure, the BBC, with its billions, will not be investigating any such 'unsubstantiated reports' anytime soon.

Are we really going to let them get away with yet another war on the innocents made possible by the likes of Mark Mardell and his bloodthirsty crew? The fate of millions is effectively played out in the editorial rooms of the major media, and if they say yay, we wage war on the defenceless once again.

The original source of this article is williambowles.info
Copyright © William Bowles, williambowles.info, 2013

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [William Bowles](#)

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