



Hiding America's Role in Yemen Slaughter: US Bombing of Civilians Portrayed as « Self-Defense »

Par [Adam Johnson](#)

Mondialisation.ca, 17 octobre 2016

[Common Dreams](#) 16 octobre 2016

Région : [Middle East & North Africa, USA](#)

Thème: [Crimes against Humanity](#), [Media Disinformation](#)

To hear US corporate media tell it, the US was dragged into a brand new war on Wednesday.

US destroyers in the Gulf of Aden [launched airstrikes](#) against Houthi rebels, a Shia insurgent group currently withstanding a massive bombing campaign from a Saudi-led coalition in a year-and-half conflict between largely Shia rebels and the Saudi-backed Sunni government in Yemen. The Pentagon insisted that cruise missiles had been fired onto the USS Mason on Sunday and Wednesday from Houthi-controlled territory, and called the airstrikes a “limited self-defense” response.

Needless to say, US media followed the Pentagon's lead. The fact that the United States has been literally fueling Saudi warplanes for 18 months while selling weapons and providing intelligence support to the Gulf monarchy—acts which even the US State Department [believes could expose](#) the US to war crimes prosecution—was either downplayed or ignored. Nor did media recall the US's long history of [drone warfare in Yemen](#), where the military and CIA have been carrying out long-range assassinations since 2002, killing more than 500 people, including at least 65 civilians.

So far, most print media reporting has at least bothered to briefly put the attack and counterattack in broader context, noting the US role in the brutal bombing campaign that has left over 4,000 dead, including over 140 [bombed at a funeral](#) in Sana'a last week—even as the stories' framing downplayed the US's history in the conflict. The New York Times ([10/12/16](#)), for example, said in the second paragraph of its report on the airstrikes (emphasis added):

The strikes against the Houthi rebels marked the first time the United States has become involved militarily in the civil war between the Houthis, an indigenous Shiite group with loose connections to Iran, and the Yemeni government, which is backed by Saudi Arabia and other Sunni nations.

But the Times story went on to acknowledge, somewhat contradictorily, that the US had been “quietly providing military support to a Saudi Arabia-led bombing campaign against the rebels since last year.” The story noted that the US had been

providing intelligence and Air Force tankers to refuel the coalition's jets and bombers. The American military has refueled more than 5,700 aircraft involved in the bombing campaign.... More than 4,000 civilians have been killed since the bombing began, according to [the United Nations' top human rights official](#).

TV news reports, on the other hand, kept the spin and left out the context. They mostly failed to mention that the US has been assisting the Saudi assault on the Houthi rebels for a year and a half, and framed the incident as a US warship being attacked while simply minding its own business in international waters.

CBS's David Martin, fresh off his [14-minute Pentagon commercial](#) last month, didn't mention the Saudi bombing campaign or explain the US's role in the war for his segment for CBS This Morning ([10/13/16](#)). In fact, Martin never uttered the word "Saudi" or named any of the other countries involved in Yemen, only noting that the rebels are "trying to overthrow the government." The average viewer would come away thinking the US Navy ship just happened to be in the neighborhood when it was randomly fired upon.

ABC's Martha Raddatz (Good Morning America, [10/13/16](#)) likewise didn't inform the viewer that the US has been a party to the civil war for 18 months. She also never used the word "Saudi" or referred to the brutal bombing campaign; she barely even alluded to there being a conflict at all.

CNN's Barbara Starr (CNN, [10/13/16](#)) joined the club, omitting the US and Saudi roles in the conflict entirely. She went one step further and repeatedly speculated about "direct" Iranian involvement in the *Mason* attack and what that would entail, despite there being zero evidence and no suggestion from the Pentagon of Iranian participation. Starr even conflated Al Qaeda and Iran, despite their being on opposite sides of the conflict:

The Yemeni missiles were fairly old but had been outfitted with highly lethal warheads, the kind Al Qaeda and Iran know how to make.

The implication was that Al Qaeda might have somehow provided Houthi rebels with missiles, but this, of course, is absurd: The Houthis and Al Qaeda are sectarian enemies and have been fighting each other throughout the civil war. Never mind; Starr needed to raise the stakes and throw out as many boogymen as she could.

MSNBC's Rachel Maddow ([10/13/16](#)) delivered the worst of the batch. Not only did she too omit the Saudi bombing campaign and the US's role in it (again, leaving the viewer to believe the attack was a total non sequitur), she spun the issue in tedious partisan terms, recalling Trump's statement he would attack Iranian warships that threatened the US:

You might remember Republican candidate Donald Trump said in an off-handed remark during the campaign that if Iranian ships got too close to American ships and if Iranian sailors made rude gestures towards our American sailors under President Trump, we'd blow those Iranian ships out of the water. Well, Iranian ships and American ships are now in the same waters, off the coast of Yemen in the middle of war, with Tomahawk missiles and cruise missiles already flying. Steady on.

Why are American ships in those waters? Why are Tomahawk missiles "flying"? The conflict is never explained; it's only brought up so that Maddow can warn that the GOP nominee could make things worse. Of course, it isn't Trump who backed the Saudis in an air campaign that's left thousands dead, but Obama—and it's Hillary Clinton who as secretary of State enthusiastically pushed to sell warplanes to Riyadh ([The Intercept, 2/22/16](#)). But such facts would mess up the election-season narrative.

Maddow, like the other reports, used the loaded modifier "Iran-backed" to describe the

Houthis (even though experts and Pentagon officials think Iran's support is [overblown](#)). This is a stark asymmetry, considering that none of the reports referred to the Yemeni government as "US-backed" or "Saudi-backed." She also said that the Navy blamed the attacks on the Houthis, when the Pentagon only claims the missiles came from rebel territory, and could very well be from other allied groups (New York Times, [10/13/16](#)).

Not only is the US's backing of Saudi Arabia omitted from all these reports, the word "Saudi" isn't uttered in any of them. The viewer is given the impression that the war, aside from Iranian meddling, is an entirely internal affair—when it actually involves over 15 different countries, mostly Sunni monarchies propping up the Yemeni government—and that the rebels just randomly decided to pick a fight with the largest military in the history of the world.

The Houthis, for their part, [vehemently deny](#) having carried out the attack on the *Mason*, and there is no publicly available evidence it was them or allied forces. It should be noted, however, that Houthi forces [took credit](#) for sinking a United Arab Emirates supply ship two weeks earlier.

As is often the case with war, the issue of "first blood"—or who started the fighting—gets muddied. Governments naturally want global audiences and their own citizens to view their actions as defensive—a necessary *response* to aggression, not aggression itself. US corporate media are aiding this official spin in their reporting on the US bombing of Yemen.

[Adam Johnson](#) is an associate editor at AlterNet and writes frequently for FAIR.org. Follow him on Twitter at [@adamjohnsonnyc](#).

La source originale de cet article est [Common Dreams](#)
Copyright © [Adam Johnson](#), [Common Dreams](#), 2016

Articles Par : [Adam Johnson](#)

Avis de non-responsabilité : Les opinions exprimées dans cet article n'engagent que le ou les auteurs. Le Centre de recherche sur la mondialisation se dégage de toute responsabilité concernant le contenu de cet article et ne sera pas tenu responsable pour des erreurs ou informations incorrectes ou inexactes.

Le Centre de recherche sur la mondialisation (CRM) accorde la permission de reproduire la version intégrale ou des extraits d'articles du site [Mondialisation.ca](#) sur des sites de médias alternatifs. La source de l'article, l'adresse url ainsi qu'un hyperlien vers l'article original du CRM doivent être indiqués. Une note de droit d'auteur (copyright) doit également être indiquée.

Pour publier des articles de [Mondialisation.ca](#) en format papier ou autre, y compris les sites Internet commerciaux, contactez: media@globalresearch.ca

[Mondialisation.ca](#) contient du matériel protégé par le droit d'auteur, dont le détenteur n'a pas toujours autorisé l'utilisation. Nous mettons ce matériel à la disposition de nos lecteurs en vertu du principe "d'utilisation équitable", dans le but d'améliorer la compréhension des enjeux politiques, économiques et sociaux. Tout le matériel mis en ligne sur ce site est à but non lucratif. Il est mis à la disposition de tous ceux qui s'y intéressent dans le but de faire de la recherche ainsi qu'à des fins éducatives. Si vous désirez utiliser du matériel protégé par le droit d'auteur pour des raisons autres que "l'utilisation équitable", vous devez demander la permission au détenteur du droit d'auteur.

Contact média: media@globalresearch.ca