

# US-Led Airstrikes Kill as Many Civilians as Nice Attack-but Get No Front-Page Headlines in Major US Media

By [Adam Johnson](#)

Global Research, July 24, 2016  
[FAIR](#) 20 July 2016

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

*A coalition airstrike reported on Tuesday that killed at least 85 Syrian civilians—one more than died in the Nice attack in France last week—wasn’t featured at all on the front pages of two of the top US national newspapers, the [New York Times](#) and [LA Times](#), and only merited brief blurbs on the front pages of the [Wall Street Journal](#) and [Washington Post](#), with the actual stories buried on pages A-16 and A-15, respectively.*

According to the London Telegraph ([7/19/16](#)), the airstrike killed “more than 85 civilians” after the “coalition mistook them for Islamic State fighters.” Eight families were represented among the dead, with victims “as young as three.” The Intercept ([7/19/16](#)) reported the death toll could end up being well over 100.

The Pentagon has not denied the reports, saying an investigation is underway, according to Stars and Stripes ([7/19/16](#)), a media outlet that operates inside the Department of Defense.

As many on Twitter pointed out, the number of dead was roughly equal to that of the recent Nice attack, yet the airstrike did not garner nearly as much media coverage, nor did news outlets convey an outpouring of grief:

US “accidentally” obliterated 85 civilians. Same number as killed in Nice but you won’t see wall-to-wall coverage <https://t.co/eS8wEa14pQ>

— Rania Khalek (@RaniaKhalek) [20 July 2016](#)

By contrast, the Nice attack garnered multiple front-page stories in the [New York Times](#) and [LA Times](#), as well as significantly more than 20-word blurbs in the [Wall Street Journal](#) and [Washington Post](#).

For those who see a “false equivalency,” there are two mitigating reasons for this glaring discrepancy: 1) The airstrike deaths were an “accident” and 2) Syria’s a war zone, where civilian deaths are to be expected. Neither of these retorts are satisfactory, and certainly not enough to justify a virtual front-page blackout.

On the issue of accidental deaths having less import than purposeful ones, this doesn’t explain why unintentional natural disaster deaths [routinely receive splashing front-page coverage](#). Intent rarely affects coverage of these events; only death counts do. And this is

granting the deaths were actually accidental, which we don't know for sure at this time, or whether the US military was using tactics, like so-called "[signature strikes](#)," that are known to greatly increase the chances of killing noncombatants.

As for the "war zone" factor, [according to Airwars](#), a Western group that monitors civilian deaths at the hands of the US-led coalition, the total number of civilians deaths since the beginning of airstrikes in September 2014 has been 190. To increase this number by almost 50 percent in a matter of days would indeed be a radical departure from the normal course of events—rendering it more than newsworthy.

Indeed, all of the publications in question ran a story on the "dozens of deaths" at the hands of US-led airstrikes, so we know they deemed it notable. Just not notable enough, for whatever reason, to put in a prominent position for US audiences.

*Adam Johnson is a contributing analyst for FAIR.org. Follow him on Twitter at [@AdamJohnsonNYC](#).*

The original source of this article is [FAIR](#)  
Copyright © [Adam Johnson](#), [FAIR](#), 2016

---

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Adam Johnson](#)

**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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)