

Washington Post Iran deal bias exposed between Washington and Beirut

Contributed by Written by Tom Harb
Sunday, 17 April 2016

In a report on the Christians of Iraq, including on the Assyrian claim for an autonomous region in Nineveh, Iraq, The Washington Post correspondent in Beirut Hugh Naylor interviews Habib Afram, the head of the "Syriac League" of Lebanon and uses his quotes in the article.

But few weeks ago *IshaanTharoor , writes a smear piece in the Washington Post trashing Donald J. Trump's advisor Professor Walid Phares DC for having alleged "ties with a Christian militia in Lebanon, known as the Lebanese Forces LF." The Washington Post bias is abysmal as Walid Phares and Habib Afram -the latter interviewed by the Post in Lebanon- were colleagues, both representing their political groups in the LF political council. Both men had identical portfolios. They chaired their own political organizations, were not in the military, and represented diverse policies within a representative council. Why did the Washington Post smear Phares and elevated Afram?

On the other hand, Tharoor of WaPo criticized Phares for his intellectual work, which was exactly about what the Post have been giving visibility to: the fate of minorities in the Middle East. Phares led NGOs to the UN and Brussels to call for protected zones. The Washington Post attacks Phares for doing so and praises Afram and other NGOs for calling for it, from Beirut. Why the extreme and so obvious bias?

It is simple, the Washington Post is a backer of the Iran deal. It praises those who are calling for anything as long as they are backers of Iran's regime. And it slanders those who calls for the same goal, but are opposed to the Iran Deal. Unfortunately Washington's media sounds more like Tehran's regime press...

Full Washington Post Article [[HERE](#)]