

FOOD FOR THOUGHT 11 (PART FOUR-C):



OUR UNPARDONABLE ENEMIES, THE LEFT GATEKEEPERS



IN *THIS* EPISODE:

**ARIANNA HUFFINGTON
TELLS THE TRUTH! (AND *DOESN'T*
EVEN KNOW IT!!)**

ONE

“The Face of Evil”

A person wonders—or *I* do—what Nicholas Lemann might have been thinking as he worked on the article titled “Paranoid Style: How conspiracy theories become news” for the past October 16 issue of *The New Yorker*.

I wonder if he was thinking, smugly enough, that he'd dangle right in front of us the real nuts and bolts of how the gate-keeper media go about doing their lying, omitting, distorting, suppressing, ridiculing, and general covering up of 9/11 truth in ways most sneakily designed to make those media *look* as they're truth-telling, honest, normal, fair-minded, candid, thorough, and conscientious. I wonder, that is, whether he was thinking *so* highly of himself that here's what he was about to do: He was about to come right out and show us every last one of his magician's tricks—all the while knowing with absolute certainty that *his dumb readers would never "get" them anyway*.

It's inconceivable—isn't it? It *must* be. It *must* be inconceivable. Of course it's inconceivable.

Or not. Either way, the next question is the same: Which is worse, *knowing* or *not knowing* what it is you're actually *doing* when you make use of and demonstrate for your readers, right out in the open, every last trick and deception, every last item in the magician's razzle-dazzle book of flip-flopping, tricking, lying, conniving, slanting, omitting, suppressing, snipping, cutting, ignoring, distorting, making your audience look over *there* when what you're doing is *here*: In a word, the *fraud* in general that's attendant upon the pimping and whoring of what it means now to "write" for publications like *The New York Times* or *The New Yorker*.

To write for them, that is, on certain subjects of absolute and utmost importance that nevertheless, by *diktat* of a pernicious corporate ownership, *must not* be written about truthfully. Like—let's just say—the subject of 9/11 truth. What does it *mean* for once-honorable and once-professional people and publications when, in place of telling the *truth* about 9/11, they instead distort, suppress, or ignore it; or when, in place of telling the *truth* about those who are *part of* the 9/11 movement, they instead malign and calumniate them, cast aspersions on them, look down their noses at them, distort their aims, smear their character, or simply dismiss them, as we saw <http://www.ericlarsen.net/foodforthought8.html> Frank Rich himself do recently in the *Times*, "conspiracy nuts."

And what it *means* is this: *Either* that we are witnessing the most profound imaginable, the most unseeing and possibly even intentionally-maintained *ignorance* perhaps ever before known among those thought of as our guides, leaders, and public intellectuals; or *else* it means—there being no other possibility—that what we're seeing is the intentional committing of acts and deeds, by these same people, that are among the most iniquitous and heinous, the most perfidious, the most treacherous, the most shameful, the most dangerous, and the most unforgivable acts and deeds that may ever have been seen on such a scale as this in the entire history of our nation.

Those in the left gatekeeper media—from Frank Rich and the entirety of the *New York Times* to David Corn and the entirety of *The Nation*, from Amy Goodman and the entirety of National Public Radio to Nicholas Lemann in *The New Yorker* to Arianna

Huffington on the internet—every highly visible person among the left gatekeepers is either implausibly and quite totally *ignorant*, or each of them is in equal degree iniquitous and treacherous.

They are, I would say, quislings.

A powerful word, and so, now that it's appeared here, let's review it. An eponym, it derives, as everyone knows, from the name of Vidkun Quisling, the infamous pro-Nazi Norwegian. It therefore, refers to "a person who betrays his or her own country by aiding an invading enemy, often serving later in a puppet government; fifth columnist."¹ Another definition is "A traitor who serves as the puppet of the enemy occupying his or her country."²

And exactly which "invading enemy" is it that our present left gatekeepers have chosen to serve, committing the betrayal of *us*, of America, in order to do so? Those who have been following this series of "Food for Thought" pieces know at least in fairly clear outline, by this point, who or what that enemy is, the enemy of America to whom the left gatekeepers have turned. And such a person knows also that that enemy comes not from *outside* America, but from *inside* it. The enemy has invaded from within, and that's why metaphors of the *poisonous*, metaphors of *disease*, something destroying the body from *within*, are more accurate than any metaphors of invaders from elsewhere.

And *this* basic fact, *this* essential truth, is what the left gatekeepers, at any and all costs, have chosen to suppress, falsify, ignore, or to keep a secret known only to them and to the enemy.

I say these things for the simple reason that, as I write these words now, five long years after the attacks of 2001, there is no longer *any persuasive evidence left* to show that the attacks were *not* in fact a "black flag op," or, more simply, an "inside job." And meanwhile, scholars have produced volume upon volume upon volume of overwhelming persuasive evidence *that they were*.

And indeed, they *were* an inside job. They were a self-inflicted wound, an attack *on America by America's* military, intelligence, and oligarchic leaders (with or without the help of a number of young, male, Muslim, patsies). These attacks, in the interest of the very rich and very powerful, and *only* of the very rich and very powerful, were repugnant, vile, opportunistic, cold-blooded, ruthless, murderous, unscrupulous, traitorous.

Many readers, I'm sure, will remember the name Steven C. Vincent. Some may even remember the *Times* news article from August 4, 2005, that ran on page B1 under the headline "Slain Reporter Recalled as Intrepid in War," byline Anthony Ramirez. Ramirez's lead paragraph goes like this:

¹ *Random House Unabridged Dictionary*, 2006.

² *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, Fourth Edition, 2002.

Steven C. Vincent, a New York City journalist who was kidnapped and killed in Iraq on Tuesday, was described by friends and colleagues yesterday as an intrepid newsman roused by the attacks on Sept. 11, 2001, and committed to shoe-leather reporting, whatever the consequences.

Ramirez later in the piece comments that “Lisa R. Ramaci, 49, Mr. Vincent’s wife, released a brief biographical sketch and a statement yesterday. She said her husband was ‘a brave, honorable, decent and moral person who was murdered doing what he loved and thought was necessary.’” In Iraq, Vincent “[worked] on a shoestring budget. . . [and] did not have the money for a bulletproof vest or a Kevlar helmet, let alone the bodyguards large news organizations routinely provide for their reporters. Mr. Vincent and his interpreters took taxis wherever they went, instead of armored vehicles.”

Vincent died in Basra, “shot three times in the chest,” after having been kidnapped by “insurgents.”

Of greatest importance to the correct memory of Steven C. Vincent and to the correct judgment of his death may be found in Ramirez’s second paragraph:

For much of his career, Mr. Vincent, 49, a freelance writer, had covered the art world, including museums, auction houses and the antiquities trade. But in September 2001, when he scrambled to the roof of his apartment building in the East Village and saw the second airliner strike the World Trade Center, “I saw the face of evil in that moment,” he later told a friend.

A “brave, honorable, decent and moral person,” wrote Vincent’s wife, “was murdered doing what he loved and thought what was necessary.”

Yes, but murdered by *whom*? Literally, of course, people will say murdered by the “insurgent,” or perhaps “insurgents,” who pulled a trigger three times. But, no, that or those insurgents are not, and that or those insurgents *cannot* be the real murderers.

On the morning of 9/11, Vincent said that when the second plane struck the south tower, he “saw the face of evil.” And he did, it’s true: That’s exactly what he did see, the face of evil, purest evil. But the face he *thought* he saw wasn’t the real one. The possessor or possessors of that one, the possessor or possessors of *that* face of evil, the *real* face of evil, the “face” that pulled off the job—some of them in the White House bunker, some in the Pentagon, some in the Booker Elementary School, some in NORAD, some in the FAA, others in various military sites, stations, and intelligence offices—*that* “face” went totally unseen by Vincent just as it went unseen by everyone else. *That’s* the face of those who, in cold blood, traitorously, in their own interests and *only* their own—murdered Steven C. Vincent.

He got murdered because he was a sucker. We were *all* suckers that morning—and many, many, many of us still are. Far worse than the real suckers, though, are those

despicable figures of true iniquity, the gatekeepers, those who know the truth and *still* keep it secret.

Poor Steven C. Vincent, the sucker. Poor Steven C. Vincent, murdered not just because, like so *many*, he *was* a sucker—but murdered because, as a sucker, he was also an “honorable, decent and moral person.”

For that’s what they do, absolutely. That’s what they do, not only our own quisling administration and quisling Congress but also our quisling left gatekeepers: *They*—all of them—*they* routinely and regularly and consistently murder off the *best* people while they busy their despicable minds with figuring out ways to keep the *worst*—that is, themselves—still alive.

And so it is that Steven C. Vincent joined the company of others dead by murder, beginning with those made dead by murder on 9/11 itself, a company altogether whose number reaches now, late in 2006, toward a million.

TWO

The “Pathological Refusal”

“Pathology” is another strong word, almost as strong as “quisling.” It has to do, as everyone knows, with the study of disease and infection, and, as everyone also knows, it can conveniently be made into an adjective, “pathological,” and in *that* form put toward the simple meaning of “crazy,” <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/pathological> as in phrases, for example, like “pathological liar.”

When Frank Rich, therefore, in the *New York Times* calls me or you or anyone else who studies 9/11 in order to find out the truth about it—when he says that you, I, or we are <http://www.ericlarsen.net/foodforthought8.html> “conspiracy nuts,” what he basically means is that we’re “crazy people.” He’s saying we’re “pathological.”

Considering all this—the meanings and uses of strong words like these, along with the innuendo, calumny, smear, and gutter-level name-calling that so often pop up when words like “pathological” are being thrown around—considering all this, it was particularly interesting to come upon a piece by Arianna Huffington in <http://www.populist.com/index.html> *The Progressive Populist* for December 1, 2006.

Huffington’s piece is entitled “Living in Denial” and her subject is the Bushiscti’s “refusal to accept reality.” Here’s *her* lead paragraph:

Let’s face it: the Bush administration is sick. The fall of Ted Haggard is just the latest manifestation of the central disease of President Bush and his cohorts: the

pathological refusal to accept reality, and the delusion that reality can be changed by rhetoric.

A couple of sentences later, Huffington adds, as if with a nod to Sophocles and *Oedipus the King*, that “while it’s the administration that’s sick, it’s the whole country that’s suffering.” And here’s a list of some of the “denials of reality” that make the Bushiscti so “sick”:

How many more examples of this disease do we need? The insurgency is in its “last throes,” we’ve “turned the corner” in Iraq, gutting Social Security would “save” it, global warming doesn’t exist, evolution is just “a theory,” Rumsfeld and Cheney are “doing a fantastic job,” etc., etc., etc.



Some clarification has to be made before we get to the matter of *real* importance and interest here. First, we all know that people in the Bush administration lie like rugs, and *have* lied like rugs even long *before* the 2000 election. And *lying* is a different matter indeed from “refusing to accept reality.” A liar *can* be in perfectly reasonable and good contact with reality and just be, well, a liar.

All right. That was pretty easy. But now we’ve got to figure out not only *why* there are so many lies but also why they’ve been going on *so* consistently and *so* plentifully and for *so* long. And the answer this time is: The lying is pervasive, necessary, *very* ineptly delivered and yet cornucopian in its abundance for the simple but overwhelmingly important reason that the government that we *see* and are *aware* of is not in any way the government that’s actually governing. Anyone who reacts to what I just said by thinking that I should be smeared and calumniated, a la Frank Rich, by being called a “conspiracy nut,” is cordially invited to <http://www.waronfreedom.org/> pick up a copy of Webster Griffin Tarpley’s http://www.amazon.com/9-11-Synthetic-Terror-Third/dp/0930852370/sr=1-1/qid=1165070741/ref=pd_bbs_1/104-4231058-3189532?ie=UTF8&s=books *9/11 Synthetic Terror: Made in USA* and sit down for a good long read.

This “government,” which Tarpley names our “rogue” or “invisible” government, is the composite power that pulls the strings. Some who are actually *in* the central parts of the Bush administration may be among the string-pullers; these are the “moles” Tarpley speaks of, identifying and describing some for us, among them, for example, Cheney, Wolfowitz, and Tony Blair. Among the moles, however, is very definitely *not* George W. Bush.

Most pathetic among all American presidents is George W. Bush—for the very good reason that he is the biggest ninny of all presidents and the most left out. Badly educated, not smart, certainly not deep, he is *the most obviously of all presidents since LBJ* the string-jerked puppet of forces he himself can scarcely begin even to comprehend, let alone control.

Bush, therefore, is insignificant in regard to Huffington's inquiry. Bush lies *when* he's told to, and he lies *as* he's told to. What *else* can he do? And every single lie without exception is nothing more than a brief diversion, the tugging of a tattered veil over the mass American eye, a temporary buying of time as the invisible government goes about the business of deciding its own next steps. A string is pulled—the hand rises. A string is loosened, the jaw drops. A button is pushed, out come certain words. Another button—other words.

But back to “reality” and being in touch with it. Very, very clearly, the true “Bush administration,” which is really just a way of referring to the “rogue” or “invisible” government, is as firmly and clearly “in touch with reality” as may be humanly possible. Many a quibble might justifiably arise at this point, not to mention some potentially very good counter-arguments—along *Dr. Strangelove* lines, suggesting that the invisible government itself can't be in touch with “reality” because its members are “pathological,” their *salient* pathology being megalomania. Interesting as these arguments may be, even convincing as they may prove, they've still got to be set aside for the moment, since they'll take us away from our present subject.

Which is to say the subject of “lying” and “reality,” doing the former and being out of touch with the latter. Now, the “reality” that the invisible government is firmly in touch with is what we'll call its *agenda*. For this invisible government does indeed have an agenda—and *has had* an agenda <http://www.newamericancentury.org/aboutpnac.htm> since long before November of 2000. And this agenda, in the invisible government's view (*and* in the invisible government's own interest), *is not an agenda that's ours to know*. Like all other elements of the invisible government's agenda, it is *secret*, precisely in the way it was made a *secret* that the attacks of 9/11 were *self-inflicted*, that they were in fact the plan, product, and crime of the invisible government.

It's all perfectly logical, after all. The invisible government's agenda *must* remain a secret one because it's an evil one and if it becomes known ahead of time—known, that is, to brave, good, decent people, people like, say, Steven C. Vincent—those who have learned of it will resist, fight, rebel against it, expose it, derail it.

The left gatekeepers, therefore, by definition *cannot* be brave, good, decent people but *must* be the opposite of all of these.

The invisible government, after all, can make suckers of us, very easily, but only by keeping us in the dark.

And we aren't in the in the dark any longer. The truths of 9/11—and therefore the truths of the entire invisible government's agenda—are known, are available, have been widely, deeply, responsibly, and plentifully researched, studied, and written about—albeit never, ever reviewed by an enemy gatekeeper media. But these works, even so, have become widely known, made widely available, and remained widely respected. And so if any one of them—if Arianna Huffington; if Frank Rich; if Nicholas Lemann; if Amy

Goodman; if David Corn—if *any* such people who are professional journalists and therefore intellectual leaders *don't* know about this massive literature on 9/11 truth—well, then they've done no homework and they're bloody ignorant fools, and that's that.

But on the other hand, if any one of these or others like them—if Arianna Huffington; if Frank Rich; if Nicholas Lemann; if Amy Goodman; if David Corn—if *any* such people who are professional journalists and therefore intellectual leaders *know* those widely-available and immeasurably important truths *and yet sit on them and keep them dark*: Then such people as these aren't just crappy at their profession, and aren't just poor decent suckers like Steven C. Vincent, but they are instead, *every one of them*, iniquitous, criminal, traitorous, monstrous quislings who should rot in hell and who are far, far, far beyond any *conceivable* pardon, ever.



Let's see what Arianna Huffington has to say about them—and perhaps about herself, albeit in both cases inadvertently.

“Was Ted Haggard's absurd claim,” asks Huffington, “that, yes, he saw Mike Jones, but only for massages and that, yes, he bought meth from Jones but never used it, really that different from Bush and Cheney and Rumsfeld continuing to claim we're winning in Iraq?”

We're back here to the thin subject of simple, old-fashioned hypocrisy and lies—in the case of the good reverend Haggard, certainly—while *possibly*, though not *surely*, “denial of reality” is involved in the Bush-Cheney-Rumsfeld (*requiescat in pace*) reference. Either way, here's what's important, as Huffington—while adding Mark Foley into the soup—blurs out the real, honest-to-god truth, as anyone who's *seriously* read *Hamlet* or *Lear* or *Oedipus the King* or *The Oresteia* very, very well knows:

Mark Foley and Ted Haggard are textbook examples of how the relentless denial of reality perverts judgment and rots the soul. Same with the Bushies.

Now, just possibly, we may really be getting somewhere, though I doubt that Huffington knows it. The mishmash, the mix-up between simple lying versus actual denial of reality is still at work and still unclarified. But Huffington, knowingly or not (and probably not) keeps pushing toward our real subject:

That both the reverend's and the administration's claims were made with the expectation that the public would buy them shows what the chronic refusal to acknowledge reality does to one's judgment.

Well, maybe so. *Whatever* we're really talking about—be it plain lying or authentic reality-denial—at least a new spice has been added to the mix, and that spice is the subject of *judgment* being warped. And, *voilà*, things begin suddenly to sound very, very familiar indeed to anyone who has been closely involved in the 9/11 truth movement, *or*

to anyone who has been closely involved in observing the work of the *gatekeepers* of 9/11 truth.

Let's read on, and, as we do, please pay *special* attention to the word "but," where the emphasis added will be not Huffington's, but mine:

I have little doubt that Haggard's homophobia was real and that his desire to not be gay was real too. *But facts are stubborn things*. Instead of accepting those facts, Haggard chose to deny them, suppress them and attack those who exposed them.

And so, here at last, though unbeknownst to the very person who has brought and guided us here, we've finally reached home. For what Huffington has done, and done most perfectly indeed, is to provide us with a spot-on, absolutely accurate, bull's-eye descriptive definition of precisely what it is the left gatekeepers do, have done, and doubtless—unless they're exposed, punished, purged—will "choose" to go on doing without end: namely, denying and suppressing the "facts," and, as we've seen, "[attacking] those who exposed" those facts.



Arianna Huffington, then, in condemning *others*, has with absolute perfection and perfect ignorance put the finger on herself; she has put the finger on Frank Rich; put the finger on David Corn; on Amy Goodman; on Nicholas Lemann—and on all the editors of all those people and on all the managers and directors in charge of those editors.

Huffington has, in other words, put the finger on *all* the left gatekeepers. She has put the finger on that *kind* of people who ruthlessly and relentlessly and cruelly continue to make it impossible that "brave, honorable, decent and moral" figures like the late Steven C. Vincent—and the three-quarters of a million others, or more, who, like him, are dead—will *ever* be allowed the dignity *of* the truth, will *ever* be allowed to be dignified *by* the truth.

He was a sucker. He took the bait, and because of it he died. People may think he was a martyr, but, no, he, like *millions* of others, was a sucker. He fell for it. He didn't see through the con. He was a sucker.

But he was hardly alone, and this, too, is certain: Vincent *deserves* the greater truth, and *deserves* the vindication that that truth alone can bring him. And so, *only* when his iniquitous, execrable, vile, quisling murderers are finally exposed, named, prosecuted, and punished, *only then* can it be said either *honestly* or *truly* that he, and the many like him, was not a sucker, but a martyr, and a true one.

Until that happens, all is lies. Until that happens, all is deceit. Until that happens, all is poison, disease, and death.

THREE

The Truth

It shouldn't take much more space to bring an end to this section of our long look at the left gatekeepers—although it's clear, yet again, that another section will be needed before we pounce upon the iniquitous Nicholas Lemann as an exemplary quisling left gatekeeper actually at the details of his repugnant and vile work.

“Part Four-D,” then, will have to be brought into existence. Before that happens, though, let's follow Arianna Huffington as she—again unknowingly—shows us not the truth that she's already led us to, but as she shows us in her own way the *enormous importance* of that truth to the life or death of the nation.

Both for accuracy and emphasis, I'll cite the whole of a longish paragraph:

The refusal by the Bush administration, its supporters in Congress and its “spiritual advisers” to acknowledge reality is sick—and potentially lethal to the well-being of our country. But it's clear they're not going to get better, because to do so would require they acknowledge reality enough to know they're sick in the first place. And they're not going to do that. They actually believe there's an alternative to the <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/10/17/magazine/17BUSH.html?ex=1255665600en=890a96189e162076ei=5090> “reality-based world,” and that they live in it.

The allusion to Ron Suskind's famous essay, “Faith, Certainty and the Presidency of George W. Bush,” in the *New York Times Magazine* of October 17, 2004, is aptly made, and Huffington deserves credit for making it. It's in that essay, readers will remember,³ that a strong case in fact really *is* at least strongly suggested that the Bushiscti actually should diagnosed as pathological, megalomaniacal, and deniers of empirically based reality.

And yet, whatever that case may be, it doesn't change *our* subject here and how. And that's because the great point for us *here*, for us *now*, isn't whether the Bushiscti and Cheneyiscti are fruitcakes or not fruitcakes, but the question is whether they are treasonous and criminal or not treasonous and criminal. No, the point for us *here, now*, is that whatever the Bushiscti may or may not be *clinically*, the unalterable fact remains that

³ “The aide said that guys like me were ‘in what we call the reality-based community,’ which he defined as people who ‘believe that solutions emerge from your judicious study of discernible reality.’ I nodded and murmured something about enlightenment principles and empiricism. He cut me off. ‘That's not the way the world really works anymore,’ he continued. ‘We're an empire now, and when we act, we create our own reality. And while you're studying that reality—judiciously, as you will—we'll act again, creating other new realities, which you can study too, and that's how things will sort out. We're history's actors . . . and you, all of you, will be left to just study what we do.’”

the left gatekeepers—which now include the Democratic party—in their aid and abetment, *are exactly the same as the Bushiscti.*

If *one* side lies, *so* does the other. If *one* side “denies reality,” *so* does the other. If *one* side ignores “facts,” even though “facts are stubborn things,” *so* does the other.

And the significance? Well, the significance, according, implicitly, to Arianna Huffington, is that *both* sides are “sick.” I tend to agree with her—even though she doesn’t know that she’s even *said* it. And the additional significance? The additional significance of this “sickness”—and the guilt falls every bit as heavily on the left gatekeepers as it does or ever could on the Bushiscti—the additional significance of the sickness is that it’s “*potentially lethal to the well-being of our country.*” [my emphasis]

And, good nongod above, can you ever bet safely on *that*.
<http://www.ericlarsen.net/foodforthought8.html> “This is the imposthume of much wealth and peace,” we remember Hamlet saying, “that inward breaks and shows no cause without why the man died.” The membranous sac of poison that *is* the crime of 9/11—that membranous sac of vile toxins *has got to be removed from its hidden place deep inside the body politic or it will burst, poison the blood itself, and the entire being necessarily and consequently die.*

And haste, great, great haste, is essential, because that ugly sac of lies, fraud, purulence, hypocrisy, and sheer diabolic fascistic-style grabbing for hegemony is *already leaking out its poisons*, and the body has *already* lost one arm (habeas corpus), a lower leg (torture), one eye and half its hearing (FISA spying), and the coherence of its central nervous system (arrest without cause, incarceration without limit).

The country is dying. The cause is known, the cure available, the surgeons standing by. Impeach. Prosecute for the crimes of 9/11. Punish those guilty. And then begin the long hard work of recuperation: Start the nation all over again; set it once more on a foundation of laws, not of the sheerest treason, thievery, and deceit; restore its Constitution, all but stolen already by the hideous disease that may yet kill us all (see http://www.amazon.com/9-11-Synthetic-Terror-Third/dp/0930852370/sr=1-1/qid=1165070741/ref=pd_bbs_1/104-4231058-3189532?ie=UTF8&s=books Tarpley on this subject).

Consider the Democrats, who, less than a heartbeat after the recent elections, declared impeachment “not on the table.” What *conceivable* moral authority can such a political party as that one *ever* have or *ever* gain or *ever* hope to achieve if it chooses to remain collaborator to the greatest criminal establishment in the world; rather than justice or truth, chooses complicity in criminal and treasonous attacks *on* the nation and *on* its people; chooses the sheerest and most corrupting complicity in murder, robbery, mendacity, treason, power-grabbing, fraudulent wars, defense not of the nation but of the oligarchy alone, all accompanied by the most obscenely cavalier waste of lives by the hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of thousands?

What kind of political party, covering up and thereby making itself complicit in crimes of those dimensions, could such a party *conceivably* be? Still, that's what the Democrats have already announced with the utmost clarity—through the voice of Nancy Pelosi herself and the *instant* capitulation of John Conyers—that they have already chosen to be. That is to say, a party of fraud, thuggery, and the deepest, most treasonous criminality—identical to the party of fraud, thuggery, and the deepest, most treasonous criminality that, until this past seventh of November, held the majority.

Big difference.

And in this way you can see the extraordinary importance of exposing the culpability of the left gatekeepers, those who alone in the media who *could* have chosen otherwise but instead have taken it upon themselves *not* to rebel against their Pelosian owners, *not* to do their *real* work of reporting upon and exposing the *truth*, but, instead, to submit to the malevolent enemy itself, to work instead to *silence* the fact of that enemy's greatest of crimes, to labor as journalists, reporters, writers, editors, managers *on behalf of the criminals themselves*—in short, to be quislings.

Next time, we'll take a look at a few of them at work.

—Eric Larsen
—December 2, 2006