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[http://www.salon.com/2014/08/04/the\_medias\_big\_torture\_lie\_enhanced\_interrogation\_and\_the\_politics\_of\_false\_equivalence/](https://mail.maristc.act.edu.au/owa/redir.aspx?C=0d61165f96eb4f45b179f6769626f9c6&URL=http%3a%2f%2fwww.salon.com%2f2014%2f08%2f04%2fthe_medias_big_torture_lie_enhanced_interrogation_and_the_politics_of_false_equivalence%2f)

“And yet journalists (Hosenball is by no means the only one) still use the Bush administration’s euphemism, “enhanced interrogation,” as if using the language of propaganda somehow marks them as objective reporters. They still introduce torture by insinuating that only human rights advocates or CIA (or Bush) critics would consider all this torture. They still wield scare quotes to separate such nasty issues from their own journalistic voice. Many journalists and news outlets continue to use a euphemism to describe torture long after independent arbiters have deemed it as such.”

[http://www.montrealgazette.com/life/Please+spare+euphemisms/9964556/story.html](https://mail.maristc.act.edu.au/owa/redir.aspx?C=0d61165f96eb4f45b179f6769626f9c6&URL=http%3a%2f%2fwww.montrealgazette.com%2flife%2fPlease%2bspare%2beuphemisms%2f9964556%2fstory.html)

A Canadian perspective.

[http://www.eurekastreet.com.au/article.aspx?aeid=479#.VBe8dE04rIU](https://mail.maristc.act.edu.au/owa/redir.aspx?C=0d61165f96eb4f45b179f6769626f9c6&URL=http%3a%2f%2fwww.eurekastreet.com.au%2farticle.aspx%3faeid%3d479%23.VBe8dE04rIU)

Old article but touches on the moral issues inherent in not telling the truth.

“In our time, political speech and writing are largely the defence of the indefensible. Things like … the dropping of atomic bombs on Japan can indeed be defended, but only by arguments which are too brutal for most people to face, and which do not square with the professed aim of political parties. Thus, political language has to consist largely of euphemism, question-begging and sheer cloudy vagueness.”

[http://davinasquirrel.wordpress.com/2014/09/12/no-need-to-panic-its-just-schrodingers-family-annihilator/](https://mail.maristc.act.edu.au/owa/redir.aspx?C=0d61165f96eb4f45b179f6769626f9c6&URL=http%3a%2f%2fdavinasquirrel.wordpress.com%2f2014%2f09%2f12%2fno-need-to-panic-its-just-schrodingers-family-annihilator%2f)

This one relates specifically to the Hunt case.

“Throughout this post I have deliberately used the words ‘slaughtered’ and ‘murdered’. The former is never used in mainstream press, the latter sometimes used—but often times, the sanitised words of ‘dead’ or ‘killed’ suffice for the mainstream media, to hide the true horror of what is really going on for women and children living under patriarchy.”