

Abysmal War Propaganda. Falsehoods in the New York Times: “Mr. Putin Tests the West in Ukraine”

By [Eric Zuesse](#)

Global Research, September 05, 2014

Region: [Russia and FSU](#), [USA](#)

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

In-depth Report: [UKRAINE REPORT](#)

The only way to expose lies is within context; so, this will be somewhat lengthy:

The *Times* [editorial](#) opens with a falsehood:

“There is no longer any doubt: Russian troops are in Ukraine, not as volunteers, as the rebel commander in Donetsk would have the world believe, but in units equipped with mobile artillery and heavy military equipment.”

Their only cited source for that statement is “a senior NATO officer.” But should anyone take as a source, on that type of matter, either an anonymous U.S.-NATO official, or an anonymous Russian official? That’s hardly an unprejudiced “source,” in either case — and it’s their only source on this.

The context here has to be understood: During the run-up to our 19 March 2003 invasion of Iraq, the *Times* was similarly taking, as sources, anonymous U.S. officials, who lied about the evidence, saying that aluminum tubes were definitely being used for making weapons of mass destruction, when they weren’t at all, and that [“uranium from Niger”](#) was being snuck into Iraq for nuclear bombs that were also a fabrication — outright [forged ‘evidence,’](#) selectively accepted, while the *Times* selectively rejected, and avoided even to mention, far more-solid evidence to the exact contrary. They wanted us to invade, and we did. The *Times* apologized for their “errors” years later, after the damage had already been done — damage (many thousands of corpses, and several trillions of dollars in costs) that the *Times* greatly assisted George W. Bush to produce, by helping to sell the country on doing it.

The *Times* is today trying to repeat their catastrophic success, in Ukraine and elsewhere, simply because their readership continue to subscribe, notwithstanding the paper’s proven abysmal journalistic quality — which wins top awards, even after having been demonstrated by that catastrophic experience to be actually dismally, even catastrophically, poor.

The *Times* has not improved since then. There has been no accountability for those thousands of corpses, and trillions of dollars, wasted in Iraq. Readers still buy the paper. And, so, this type of ‘journalism’ (actually mere stenography to the existing U.S. regime — Bush then, Obama now) (transparently just that, and nothing more), continues on, uninterrupted.

Anyway, the *Times* allegation here is *certainly false*. There is plenty of doubt, though the *Times* says, “There is no longer any doubt.” Their citing only one — an entirely untrustworthy — source for their allegation is like calling their readers fools to their very faces, but their readers buy it: they still buy the paper, as if it were reliable; and so they are what the *Times* management think they are, and the *Times* merely takes advantage of that, and of them, history-be-damned.

However, one needn’t necessarily go as far as Paul Craig Roberts on this matter, when he headlined on August 17th, “In The West, Respect for Truth No Longer Exists,” and when he said there, “Now we have the media story of the armored Russian column that allegedly crossed into Ukraine and was destroyed by Ukraine’s rag-tag forces,” and that, “British reporters fabricated this story or were handed it by a CIA operative working to build a war narrative. The disreputable BBC hyped the story without investigating.” He’s probably right on all of that except “The disreputable BBC,” because the BBC is reputable just like the *Times* is; and bad too, like the *Times* is; but the *Times* allegation here is certainly false, regardless of whether the paper (or the BBC, or etc.) is “reputable.”

The point here, in any case, is that despite the *Times* allegation, there still hasn’t been any reliable evidence published *anywhere*, that Russia’s troops are fighting in Ukraine (as the opening of the *Times* editorial alleges), nor even evidence on this issue that’s based on trustworthy sources. None at all.

So: the *Times* editorial opens with this blatant and even glaring falsehood.

Next, their editorial states, “new, tougher Western economic sanctions are obviously needed to make clear to President Vladimir Putin of Russia that the West views his lies and escalating aggression as a major threat.” But, actually, the existing sanctions hurt “the West,” and might even be helping Russia, by tying Russia more to China and other non-Western countries; so, the *Times*’s “obviously” is likewise (and also quite obviously) false. European Union commerce with Russia is ten times what America’s is; and the EU is definitely hurting from these sanctions. Russia’s [top-four sources for imports are](#) China (15%), Germany (14%), Ukraine (5.5%), and Belarus (4.6%); and Russia’s [top-four export markets are](#) Netherlands (9.2%), China (8.1%), Germany (6.5%), and Ukraine (5.7%). In the future, on account of the sanctions (that the *Times* says are “obviously needed” and must be made “tougher”), we’ll probably see more of China, Brazil, and India, and less of Europe and Ukraine, there. Furthermore, the likely resulting separation of the world, into these two trading-blocs — one that includes Europe, the U.S., Canada, Australia and New Zealand; and the other that includes Russia and most of the rest of the world — could hurt “the West,” far more than it will the rest.

Consequently, it is ridiculously false to assert, as the *Times* does (without documentation or support), that “new, tougher Western economic sanctions are obviously needed.”

Sanctions are economic measures; and the sanctions thus far have also driven Russia, along with China and several other countries, to increase their move to abandon the dollar and to establish new alternative international economic institutions so that the end of the dollar as the international reserve currency is now seriously on the horizon, whereas previously it was just talk.

Next, the *Times* editorial praises the assertion by Obama’s U.N. Ambassador in which she

had said that Russian troops “fight alongside illegal separatists” in Ukraine. No evidence was presented by the *Times* on that. (Merely our Government’s saying it is enough for them and their gullible readership.) Nor is mention being made by the *Times* that the Obama Administration illegally perpetrated a [coup d’etat in February that overthrew Ukraine’s last democratically elected President, who had won in his 2010 election a truly nationwide election, that had near 70% turnout in all parts of the country](#). In Ukraine’s subsequent May 25th ‘election,’ which has been the only one held since our February coup there, only the areas in Ukraine that favored our coup were allowed to vote, and the other areas didn’t even want to vote in that election, because the government that was holding it was [bombing](#) them. See the election’s turnout map at wikipedia, which is here

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ukrainian_presidential_election,_2014#mediaviewer/File:Явка_в_виборців_на_позачергових_виборах_Президента_України_2014_по_округах.PNG

and this turnout contrasts sharply with the turnout in the election that chose the President, Viktor Yanukovich, whom Obama overthrew in February

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elections_in_Ukraine#mediaviewer/File:Активність_избирателя_й.svg](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elections_in_Ukraine#mediaviewer/File:Активність_избирателя.svg), in which, as shown there, the turnout was approximately the same throughout the country.

So, what today’s Ukrainian Government insists was a ‘democratic’ election that included the regions they’re bombing, is in fact not that at all. It didn’t include those regions, but the Kiev regime insists on ruling those regions, regardless of that. Basically, the [extermination-program in the southeastern half of Ukraine](#) antagonized the residents there toward the regime that was choosing the candidates and that was holding the 2014 election; and, yet, this new Ukrainian Government claims that the regions that are breaking away from this U.S.-coup-imposed ‘democracy’ have no right to break away from it, at all, even despite this new government’s [ethnic cleansing program to get rid of the residents there](#). According to the U.S. regime, the residents there don’t have a right to life — just bomb them some more, until they accept our regime. That’s our ‘democracy,’ which Obama’s people are offering the people there.

Then, the *Times* says, “Mr. Putin has played his dangerous game in Ukraine with cunning and deceit since the ouster in February of the corrupt Viktor Yanukovich lost him a Ukrainian president he could manipulate.” But that (clumsily written) statement is loaded with multiple deceptions: All of Ukraine’s post-Soviet leaders have been profoundly corrupt; this “ouster” was a U.S. coup not against a corrupt one but against one who declined the U.S.-EU offer; and the deal that Yanukovich had rejected from the (then U.S.-dominated) EU wasn’t nearly as good for Ukraine as was the one on offer from Russia: Yanukovich was doing the right thing for his people, all Ukrainians, by choosing Russia’s offer instead. None of this essential background has ever been so much as mentioned in the *Times*.

Then, the *Times* continues in their condemnation and lies about Putin: “He annexed Crimea outright.” That is meant to give the false impression that Putin used force in Crimea, rather than the true impression, which is that Obama used force in Kiev, and that it backfired and failed totally in Crimea. A [Gallup poll in Ukraine in April](#) of this year found that, while Obama’s coup-regime in Kiev was viewed favorably in Ukraine’s northwest, it was despised and feared in Ukraine’s southeast, which is where Crimea is located. Moreover, in Crimea, “only 2.8% of the public there view the U.S. favorably; more than 97% of Crimeans do not.” And this poll was taken right before our campaign to slaughter our regime’s opponents in

Ukraine's southeast, which started on [May 2nd](#), and which was initiated by [the U.S. White House](#) and has been part of Obama's plan — to eliminate the people in the areas of Ukraine that had overwhelmingly voted for the man whom Obama overthrew in February. Obama doesn't want Ukraine ever again to have at the top a President who isn't controlled from the White House, so he's getting rid of those voters. Crimeans having voted overwhelmingly on March 16th to break away from Ukraine and to come under the protection of Russia is what, in fact, saved the Crimeans from being bombed to smithereens like the rest of the people in Ukraine's southeast are. Furthermore, Crimea had been a part of Russia from 1783 until 1954 when Khrushchev tried to appease the people in Kiev by handing Crimea over to them. Furthermore, ["Gallup surveyed Crimeans just a few months before Obama's coup in Ukraine,"](#) and headlined "Public Opinion Survey: Residents of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, May 16-30, 2013." They found that when asked "Regardless of your passport, what do you consider yourself?" 40% said "Russian," 25% said "Crimean," and only 15% said "Ukrainian." So: when the Autonomous Republic voted after Obama's coup, when even fewer Crimeans self-identified with the now-fascist-run Ukraine, it had to have been a foregone conclusion that they'd choose Russia (on March 16th), because even prior to that, there was nearly a three-to-one preference of Russia over Ukraine. That same (and this was *pre-plebiscite*) poll showed 68% favorability for "Russia" and 6% favorability for "USA." 53% wanted to be part of the Customs Union with Russia, Belarus and Kazakhstan, while only 17% wanted to be part of the EU.

Then, the *Times* says, without even pretending to cite a credible (or any) source on it, "The rebels shot down a Malaysian jetliner with a Russian missile," though [the credible evidence is unanimous to the contrary](#): The Ukrainian Government itself shot it down — and [intentionally](#). However, even if that weren't the case, [it was Obama who actually caused that airliner to be downed](#). And the *Times* hides all of that essential background and evidence from its readers, just like they did in 2002 and 2003 regarding "Saddam's WMD," etc.

A country where a 'news' organization such as that can repeatedly win highly touted prizes for 'journalism' cannot possibly be a democracy, because the voters are being deceived so much, and so thoroughly, on such basic issues, even of war and peace, and of what the country itself is doing, so that to call such a country "democratic" would be to insult democracy itself.

The problem is not democracy; it is instead the lack of that, which has been and is the problem in America today.

No problem can be solved unless it is first identified and understood. We cannot rely upon 'news' media such as *The New York Times* to help us do that, because they are a crucial part of the problem. It's that deep.

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](#).

[**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