Stop the Murdoch (Flt 93) Memorial Blogburst: False AP report: Obama did NOT say that Iran must respect voters' choice"

Description

Obamaâ€™s comments were mushy, yes, but at least he said the most important thing, according to AP:

> He said itâ€™s up to Iran to determine its own leaders but that the country must respect votersâ€™ choice.

Why then have reputable people continued to pass harsh judgment? And why would AP paraphrase what would have been ObamaÃ¢â‚¬â„¢s key statement?

default watermark

Turns out Obama said no such thing. What he actually said is that the VOICES of the Iranian people should be heard and respected, not their votes:

> And particularly to the youth of Iran, I want them to know that we in the United States do not want to make any decisions for the Iranians, but we do believe that the Iranian people and their voices should be heard and respected.

This is consistent with the rest of Obamaâ€™s remarks. He never said a word about respecting votes. Obama did mention â€œthe democratic process,â€• but far from saying anything about this process having to meet any standards of integrity, he instead implied strongly that he will accept whatever result the â€œprocessâ€• followed by the Mullahs produces:

> I want to start off by being very clear that it is up to Iranians to make decisions about who IranÃ¢â‚¬â„¢s leaders will be; that we respect Iranian sovereignty and want to avoid the United States being the issue inside of Iran, which sometimes the United States can be a handy political footballâ€¦

Democracy means that Iranian sovereignty lies with the Iranian people and that a regime that rigs an election is NOT sovereign. Yet Obama is explicit that he will continue to treat the mullahs as the Iranian sovereign no matter how they judge the election. He even goes so far as to suggest that the only reason he is bothering to comment on the competing claim to sovereignty at all is because it would be unseemly for him not to:

> We will continue to pursue a tough, direct dialogue between our two countries, and weÃ¢â‚¬â„¢ll see where it takes us. But even as we do so, I think it would be wrong for me to be silent about what weÃ¢â‚¬â„¢ve seen on the television over the last few days.

The only operative concerns that he mentions are for: â€œfree speech, the ability of people to peacefully dissent.â€• When he talks about the â€œdemocratic processâ€• going forward, all he urges is that the process be peaceful and that dissent be allowed. He says nothing about the process being honest:

> â€¦there appears to be a sense on the part of people who were so hopeful and so engaged and so committed to democracy who now feel betrayed. And I think itÃ¢â‚¬â„¢s important that, moving forward, whatever investigations take place are done in a way that is not resulting in bloodshed and is not resulting in people being stifled in expressing their views.

It is no accident that Obama ended with the statement that AP paraphrased so egregiously (equating his call for bloodless suppression with a demand for legitimate elections). This was his theme throughout. He views the honesty of Iranâ€™s democratic process as something to be judged by the mullahs, who he clearly accepts to be the sovereign power, regardless of the merits of competing claims.

default watermark

AP covers its tracks, just like they did with the Flight 93 memorial

Blogburst logo, petition

APâ€™s fraudulent report about Obama demanding respect for votersâ€™ choice was the primary print report on Obamaâ€™s comments. Now that it has already misled millions of people, AP has covered its tracks by filing an update that overwrites the errant statement. This is what AP does when it gets caught putting out misinformation. To avoid issuing a correction, they flush the misleading story down the memory hole by using the same url for a completely different story. (Google only finds APâ€™s original article still posted at Fox News.)

AP did the same thing last year after it was taken to task for failing to check the most basic facts in a story about the controversy over possible Islamic symbolism in the Flight 93 memorial. Ramesh Santanam reported a number of conflicting factual assertions, like the 44 blocks:

> Opponents also claim there is a plan to have 44 glass blocks, for the 40 victims and four hijackers, in the design.

â€œThatâ€™s an absolute, unequivocal fabrication that is being portrayed as fact,â€• said Edward Feltâ€™s brother, Gordon Felt, president of Families of Flight 93. â€œItâ€™s misleading and helps drive the conspiracy theory.â€•

When it was pointed out that Santanam could have found the four extra blocks just by opening up the design drawings and counting, AP quickly filed a completely different story (about fundraising for the memorial), under the same url.

Itâ€™s not that there is anything inherently wrong with AP using subject feeds that automatically update with their latest offering. It is that AP is systematically using this system to dodge corrections. This is actually their official policy:

> For corrections on live, online stories, we overwrite the previous version. We send separate corrective stories online as warranted.

Except AP virtually never issue corrective stories, for the simple reason that AP has no established correction procedure. They just do the overwrite thing and say â€œtoo bad.â€•

Well this time the overwrite thing is not good enough.

Demand a corrective story about APâ€™s false paraphrase of Obamaâ€™s words

Associated Press obviously understands the importance of Obama saying that Iran must respect votersâ€™ choice or they wouldnâ€™t have bothered to pretend that he said it when he didnâ€™t. They donâ€™t just fail to mention Obamaâ€™s glaring omission on this crucial point, but actually tell the public via false paraphrase that he did say what he glaringly omitted. This cannot stand. Faced with our new presidentâ€™s key statement on a historic crisis, AP reports a photo negative of what Obama actually said.

default watermark

There may be no established procedure for AP corrections, but anyone can still send a pre-written email to AP CEO Tom Curley, Chairman Burl Osborne, Editor Kathleen Carroll, the reporters who worked on the story (the egregious Jennifer Loven, along with Anne Gearan and Robert Burns), plus a smattering of other AP editors and bureaucrats. Who knows. There may even be a limit to how disingenuous some of these people are willing to be.

Error Theory extra: Obama implies that he will let the mullahs get nuclear weapons

Obama is king of the weasel words. At first blush, his statement about Iranian nukes seems to suggest that he will try to stop Ahmadinijad from getting nukes:

> â€¦tough, hard-headed diplomacy Ã¢â‚¬â€• diplomacy with no illusions about Iran and the nature of the differences between our two countries Ã¢â‚¬â€• is critical when it comes to pursuing a core set of our national security interests, specifically, making sure that we are not seeing a nuclear arms race in the Middle East triggered by Iran obtaining a nuclear weaponâ€¦

But wait a minute. If he meant to say that we need to make sure Iran doesnâ€™t get a nuclear weapon, how come he said this other thing? How come he said we need to make sure that there is not an arms race triggered by Iran getting a nuclear weapon? Is he actually saying that what we need to insure is that when Iran *does* get nukes, it does not trigger and arms race?

Yes. Absolutely. With 100% certainty. Otherwise he would not have used weasel words. The only reason to use weasel words was to find a way NOT to commit to stopping Iran from getting nukes.

Seeing Obama use weasel words for the simple objective of stopping Iran from acquiring the most powerful weapons is like seeing AP use paraphrase for what would have been Obamaâ€™s key remark. There has to be a reason for going the long way around, so you look at the actual words and

you see the actual meaning.

Obama evades the simple goal of stopping Iran from acquiring the most powerful weapons because *he does not share that goal*. He either positively *wants* Iran to have nukes, or he is determined to accept it. Since these views shared by very few of his countrymen, Obama uses weasel words.

This nixes any possibility that Obama accomodation of Islamofascist election-stealing is because he thinks he can negotiate Ahmadinijad and the mullahs out of their nuclear ambitions. He has *no intention* of keeping the Islamofascists from acquiring nuclear weapons. If there is any interplay between Obamaâ€™s tolerance for election-stealing and his tolerance for Islamofascist nukes it can only be that one reason he wants the mullahs in power is so that his plan to accommodate their nuclear ambitions will not go unfulfilled.

To join our blogbursts, just send your blogâ€™s url.

default watermark

Category

1. Public Service

Tags

1. Flt 93
2. flt 93 memorial
3. iran
4. iran election
5. iran revolt
6. islam
7. Obama
8. president obama
9. revolt
10. revolution

Date Created
June 17, 2009
Author
admin