

The Gwadar Terrorist Attack Exposed the International Media's Double Standards

By [Andrew Korybko](#)

Global Research, May 12, 2019

Region: [Asia](#)

Theme: [Media Disinformation](#)

In-depth Report: [PAKISTAN](#)

Most of the international media is referring to Saturday's attack on the Pearl Continental hotel in Gwadar as being committed by either "gunmen" or "militants" instead of the actual terrorists that the perpetrators are after the BBC reported that they chose their target in order to kill Chinese and other foreign investors, therefore exposing a common double standard whereby "politically convenient" terrorist attacks are simply reframed as "shootings" or "militancy" while "politically inconvenient" acts of resistance are smeared as "terrorism".

Several terrorists tried storming into the Pearl Continental hotel in CPEC's terminal port of Gwadar Saturday afternoon, but a large-scale tragedy was thankfully averted after the security services managed to evacuate most of the guests. The [BBC](#) reported that the "Balochistan Liberation Army" (BLA) claimed responsibility for the attack and quoted the terrorist organization as "saying it had targeted Chinese and other foreign investors". This incident is a blatant act of terrorism just like the much more devastating ones that were carried out against several hotels and churches [in Sri Lanka](#) last month, but the international media is resorting to its tried-and-tested double standards after most of them described the perpetrators as "gunmen" or "militants" instead of the actual terrorists that they are.

This is because the terrorist attacks are "politically convenient" for the US and India, with these two allies collectively commanding impressive influence across the world's media space, because it targeted Chinese civilians and infrastructure as part of the ongoing [Hybrid War on CPEC](#). The evident purpose was to deter further investments and visits by foreign businessmen to this strategically significant port in the [global pivot state](#) of Pakistan, as well as to trigger an overreaction by the security services against local Baloch which could then be basis upon upon which a [Xinjiang-like fake news campaign](#) alleging "concentration camps" and "cultural cleansing" can be carried out prior to the possible imposition of sanctions for "humanitarian reasons". Of course, this would also be executed in parallel with the [Hybrid War on Hybrid War in Pakistan](#) pretending that the country has no terrorist threats whatsoever and that all forms of opposition to the state — including taking up arms and targeting civilians — are "legitimate", especially if they're being led by minority Pashtuns or Baloch.

On the opposite side of the coin, "politically inconvenient" acts of resistance such as what the [Kashmiris](#) and Palestinians are doing against their Indian and "[Israeli](#)" occupiers (who not coincidentally have recently become military-strategic partners and are both allied with the US) are smeared as "terrorism" even if they only target soldiers and paramilitary units. Another double standard is that international media is usually pleading for the world's

leading economies to invest in underdeveloped “Global South” regions, yet these same information outlets are now lending “legitimacy” to the BLA’s terrorist crusade against China’s [Belt & Road Initiative](#) (BRI) investments in Pakistani Balochistan because it serves the US’ grand strategic purposes. Having said that, even the most casual information consumer must sense that they’re being manipulated after the world condemned last month’s terrorist attacks on Sri Lankan hotels but is now silent about the latest one Pakistan’s PC Gwadar.

*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

This article was originally published on [Eurasia Future](#).

Andrew Korybko is an American Moscow-based political analyst specializing in the relationship between the US strategy in Afro-Eurasia, China’s One Belt One Road global vision of New Silk Road connectivity, and Hybrid Warfare. He is a frequent contributor to Global Research.

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Andrew Korybko](#), Global Research, 2019

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Andrew Korybko](#)

About the author:

Andrew Korybko is an American Moscow-based political analyst specializing in the relationship between the US strategy in Afro-Eurasia, China’s One Belt One Road global vision of New Silk Road connectivity, and Hybrid Warfare. He is a frequent contributor to Global Research.

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