

FOOD FOR THOUGHT 11 (PART FOUR-A):

OUR ENEMIES, THE LEFT GATEKEEPERS

ONE

A person hardly knows where to begin, so many and so grotesque are the available examples of “left gate-keeping.” In a sense, however, I already *did* pick a starting point, and that was back in <http://www.ericlarsen.net/foodforthought8.html> “Food for Thought 8.” Number eight was the essay about the *New York Times* as a suppressor of 9/11 Truth *and*, more specifically, about Frank Rich in the role of 9/11 Truth gatekeeper, holding the truth back by slandering it. Or *maybe* holding it back, but slandering it for sure. The upshot in Rich’s case was that part of his Sunday op ed piece of September 17—the smearing and name-calling of 9/11 truth advocates—“shows one of two things, and maybe both.” Here were the two possibilities:

First, that Rich is lying through his teeth, and/or second, that he is quite, quite, quite utterly ignorant of what he’s talking about. I don’t know which is or would be worse. Both are iniquitous and shameful.

Anyone who’d like to can go <http://www.ericlarsen.net/foodforthought8.html> back and read the essay again. I hope some will. Its importance here and now, as a starting point for this last segment of “Food for Thought 11,” is that it raises the distinction between iniquity on the one hand, and sheer, pure, unadulterated ignorance on the other.

Let’s talk first about sheer, pure ignorance.

Genuine ignorance of 9/11 truth (however obvious this may seem, it needs saying) can result from stupidity, jingoism, and dogmatism—the “my country right or wrong” kind of ignorance, for example. This kind of ignorance—as *A Nation Gone Blind* argues at length—is created, coveted, and cared for by the corporate-military state’s ever-vigilant effort to de-educate, condition, and anti-educate its citizens in order to transform them into pliant, passive, and obedient “consumers.”

But you don’t have to be an Archie Bunker or less in order to have that kind of perfect but *aggressive* 9/11 ignorance. Masses of others—throughout every socio-

economic level—have 9/11 ignorance in that same *degree* of perfection, even though in these myriad other cases it fits in smoothly indeed with all the virtues of decorum, politeness, and civility. Or it *can* fit in, and, mostly, it does.

Just one more distinction between “genuine” 9/11 ignorance and other kinds has to be made before we leave it behind. That is to say, we’ve got to talk about “denial.” Some will argue that the word “genuine” can’t logically be used if what we’re saying is that people, out of denial, *will* themselves into a “perfect” or “genuine” 9/11 ignorance. It’s a point well taken: You can’t go into denial of something unless, somehow, you *know* it’s there.

In any case, the important thing about this kind of 9/11 ignorance—setting aside the word “genuine” for now—is that it arises, precisely as the original perpetrators intended, from *fear*. For people with this kind of 9/11 ignorance, not only the *actual* facts and events of 9/11 *themselves* are too frightening and horrifying to think about, remember, analyze, or explore, but the ongoing *results* of those facts and events, fascism among them, are even *more* horrifying and frightening. So who can possibly blame that kind of people—the ones who are in this kind of “denial-ignorance”?

Well, that depends. I suppose you can’t really blame them *personally*, if only because that would be insensitive and ill-mannered, if not caddish or plain villainous. And, after all, it’s a free country, and you can’t bring blame upon others just for exercising their own individual and Constitutionally guaranteed *rights*—those, for example, to “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” These people, the frightened and in-denial people, are simply pursuing the happiness, or the *relative* happiness, that’s achievable for them by maintaining, through psychological self-trickery, a state of 9/11 ignorance.

But now, dear readers, a game, albeit a deadly serious one. To wit: Who among you will be the first to spot the blunder in that preceding paragraph, in the paragraph just written? Who among you will be the first who can see, seize, and denounce that blunder—and *possibly* even consider how it would or wouldn’t apply to the argument that a policy of *tolerance* toward those in 9/11-denial is a policy both humane and right, a policy in no need of defense? On the other hand, forget about the argument if you’d rather and just find the blunder—since applying the blunder *to* the argument is what *I’m* going to do next anyway. You can leave the work to me, if you choose.

So, here’s the offer: If you’re the first to spot the blunder (I mean, the on-purpose blunder) in the paragraph now twice before this one, *and* if you can also summon up the good luck of being the first reader to <mailto:ericlarsen@ericlarsen.net> tell me what that blunder is (assuming, of course, that you’re right!), I’ll in return cite your name as the winner (unless you don’t want me to) in this essay and also send you a free copy of <http://www.fetchbook.info/compare.do?search=1593760981> *A Nation Gone Blind*, inscribed by me to you.

I’ll now upload this first chunk of “Food for Thought Eleven, Part Four,” and, while I’m waiting <mailto:ericlarsen@ericlarsen.net> to hear from you, I’ll be hard at work finishing the rest of Part Four.