

The Independent (UK) Analyses the New Media Distraction Method

by Leah Tuesday, Jun 11 2019, 9:45pm

international / prose / post

For some time various journalists, mostly independent, that is, not part of the mass media stable of compliant slaves suffering acute job anxiety, have attempted to draw the public's attention to how the mass media distracts from the REAL issues that affect us (and the planet.)

While this is not a new trick it has never been utilised to the extent it is today, ALL 'news' today is SELECTIVE. In other words stories that are not compatible with the status quo, though important to us, are either backgrounded or omitted from coverage completely. This is of course a sinister strategy to manage and control public awareness and create a tailored mainstream dominant discourse, which is not necessarily based on facts. We thank Robert Fisk of the UK Independent for joining other independent journalists with professional INTEGRITY, for his efforts.

We are fed saturation 'news' on the persons of Donald Trump and Julian Assange, for instance, the persons NOT what they represent; for example, Assange publishes dirty little secrets that governments and high ranking personages wish to hide, and as is known from these publications, they primarily reveal CRIMINAL ACTIVITY.

However, by shifting FOCUS to Assange, one person of no consequence, as Wikileaks could easily function without him, the public is DISTRACTED from the real issue, crime in high places; this focus shifts attention away from the crimes and criminals involved in crime, which Wikileaks EXPOSED, to a man of no consequence -- THE REAL ISSUE IS STATE CRIME, and the criminals in high places that have hijacked our nations, NOT Assange the person.

Therefore the public should, in order to neutralise this media trick, pursue these EXPOSED criminals with all the vigour necessary to maintain social JUSTICE and LAW, which these criminals delight in flouting. From the Clinton, Bush, Obama puppet presidencies to Trump the biggest puppet of them all, these crimes should be the central focus of public attention NOT the distractions presented to us (DAILY) by the sinister mass media, which works to protect these criminals; indeed, we must ask why, and then investigate the plutocrats that own the mass media, and disassemble/de-centralise their evil media empires that intentionally and constantly mislead the public as clearly their involvement (supporting criminals) also becomes a criminal act. However, if we the public, remain distracted these exposed and KNOWN criminals are never held accountable, so continue to pursue their clearly criminal/evil mass murdering and international thieving agendas, notwithstanding their crimes become more brazen by the day. The rest I leave to Robert Fisk of the Independent:

While the world watches Donald Trump, it's missing what's really going on with US foreign policy

Our leaders know how to bang the war drums and, by and large, we go along with them. The US threatens Iran with war - so will Iran close the Strait of Hormuz and attack American warships in the Gulf? Israel strikes Iranian targets in Syria after rockets fall on Golan - so does an Arab-Israeli conflict loom closer than at any time since the 1973

conflict? Jared Kushner plans to reveal Trump's "deal of the century" for peace in the Middle East - but is it dead in the water?

Meanwhile the real stories get pushed down the page - or "to the back of the book", as we journalists used to say.

Take Donald Trump's desire to furnish Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates with billions of dollars of extra weapons so that they can increase the ferocity of their war in Yemen against the Houthis - whose support from Iran, such as it is, prompts much of the international abuse against the Islamic Republic. French intelligence officers in Washington have apparently discovered that this is no routine request from Riyadh but a desperate appeal to Washington, because so promiscuous has been the Saudis' use of US munitions against Houthi rebels (and civilians, hospitals, aid centres, schools and wedding parties) that they are running out of bombs, guided and unguided missiles, drone parts and other "precision" arms to be used on one of the poorest countries in the world.

Thus when Trump found himself confronted by congress, which wanted to halt the supplies - not least because its members are still very angry about the murder of journalist Jamal Khashoggi - the destination of the weapons supplies was broadened to include America's plucky little ally, King Abdullah II of Jordan. Yes, we all missed that bit, didn't we? We added the words "and Jordan" to the headline, but didn't ask why. And the munitions will come not from direct sales to the Gulf, with a possible congressional cap of \$25m (£19.7m), but from US government military stocks and - so the French suggest - a very large part of these weapons will go to Jordan.

Which is very odd, because Jordan is not at war with anyone right now, and is certainly not part of the Saudi "coalition" forces bombing Yemen.

So how much of the \$8.1 billion worth of missiles, bombs and so on will be sent to Amman? And how much of that will be unloaded from US military aircraft and reloaded onto Saudi military aircraft once the stocks arrive in Jordan? Only one small but traditionally brave little publication, the unputdownable French weekly *Le Canard enchaîné* picked up this story. Its Washington sources have always proved correct in the past, and the whole wretched arms transfer was summed up by the paper as: "Very smart, if not moral, [just] a few trifles for new massacres."

And now let's take a New York Times investigation of the Mubarez family's destruction by a US air attack in Afghanistan on 23 September last year. The US-led mission in Afghanistan at first denied the attack. Then it narrowed down the target to the coordinates of the Mubarez family home in Wardak province, where Masih Mubarez's wife and seven children had been spending the morning at the moment of the bombing. Her husband was in Iran. Yet now the Americans claimed that its soldiers had received "sniper fire" from the building and after the bombing, "it is our assessment that only combatants were killed".

But, after what were obviously weeks of reporting work alongside The Bureau of Investigative Journalism, The New York Times revealed this week, in a story with four reporters' bylines, that an American-made precision GPS-guided bomb had indeed killed Mubarez's wife Amina; his four daughters Anisa, aged 14, Safia, 12, Samina, seven and Fahima, five; his three sons Mohammad Wiqad, 10, Mohammad Ilyas, eight and

Mohammad Fayaz, four; and four of their teenage cousins.

Mubarez, who last spoke from Iran on his mobile phone to his wife an hour and a half before she died, said of the Americans: "They can kill the enemy, but they only destroy my home." And one last thought: in his last call home, Mubarez heard his wife say that American and Afghan soldiers were inside their house. What did this mean?

In days gone by, this would have been a front-page story in *The New York Times*. There would have been follow-up reports, perhaps an editorial. But this week it was confined to the "World/Asia" section of the paper. In the international edition, it was at the bottom of page three. Like *Le Canard enchaîné's* report - also at the bottom of page three, although in a paper of only eight pages - the story appears to have fallen into a ditch. Like so much else these days.

Take, for example, the death in an Algerian hospital of Berber activist and lawyer Kamel Eddine Fekhar, who had embarked on a prolonged hunger strike after arrest. The *pouvoir* ("power") - the same corrupt Algerian government which clung on to the comatose Abdelaziz Bouteflika as president until the crowds forced his removal and which now says elections for a successor must be postponed - had jailed Fekhar as a "threat to state security" who had "incited racial hatred". These were the usual fake claims the same *pouvoir* often uttered whenever it locked up or killed political activists during the 1990-98 civil war (total dead somewhere around 250,000).

The story which would never otherwise have reached us, however, came from Tunisian journalist-lawyer Nessim Ben Gharbia. He pointed out that Fekhar, rather than being routinely locked up to await trial or imprisoned with other supposed suspects, was kept in "provisional detention" where harsh interrogations - and in the Algerian context, we should know what that means - are conducted against those who have committed, according to the law books, "the gravest crimes", an imprisonment which is, says Article 59 of the Algerian constitution, an "exceptional" measure. But Ben Gharbia reveals in a tiny French-language magazine that this same law is now being applied to men and women accused of fake money transfers, "demoralisation" of the army and "plotting" against the state. A state, one should add, which only ended its civil war with a law forbidding any punishment of state employees for what we would call war crimes.

Routine reports of Fekhar's death did not mention this extraordinary development in the prisons of the country, which is now regarded by the West as a bastion against Isis and other Islamist killers. Nor has there been any follow-up, as we say, to Ben Gharbia's report.

Nor is there likely to be in a world where we all take a rhetoric bath several times a week from the Trumps, the Bolttons and the Pompeos - yes, and the Khameneis, the Netanyahus and the Mohammed bin Salmans.

And, I suppose, the Farages, the Goves and the Johnsons.

Maybe it's time we ended the right of these people to set our agenda and pushed real people to the top of the page, now that the Assanges and the Mannings can't do that job for us.

Refer to link below for important additional embedded information:

<https://www.independent.co.uk/voices/trump-saudi-arabia-us-air-strikes-jordan-yemen-afghanistan-bolton-a8946726.html>

Inverse Times Open Publishing. <http://inversetimes.lingama.net/news/story-665.html>