

FOOD FOR THOUGHT 11 (PART FOUR-F-TEMP.):



OUR ENEMIES, THE LEFT GATEKEEPERS



IN *THIS* EPISODE:

**MAJOR ROADBLOCKS
KEEP US FROM OUR RETURN TO
NICHOLAS LEMANN:**

AND JUST *WHO'S* STANDING IN THE ROAD??

**WELL, HOW ABOUT:
AMY GOODMAN, FRANK RICH (YES, *AGAIN*),
CHRISTOPHER HAYES, ALEXANDER
COCKBURN,
MATTHEW ROTHSCHILD, AND EVEN,
FROM WAY BACK,
THE SNAKY AND VILE CHRISTOPHER
HITCHENS**

ONE

Uh, oh. It can't be good news, this hint that no one among my many valued recipients (deflating thought for any writer) actually got to the end of what's listed as Number 28 on my "Ideas" <http://www.ericlarsen.net/ideas.html> Index Page, the piece

otherwise known as “Food for Thought 11 (Part Four-E)” of “Our Enemies, the Left Gatekeepers.”

For your recollection, the piece is <http://www.ericlarsen.net/foodforthought11.4.E.html> here, and this is its subtitle:

ON OUR WAY TO CONCLUDE
OUR VISIT WITH
NICHOLAS LEMANN,
LET’S STOP OFF
AT
JACOB WEISBERG’S
PLACE

Now do you remember? Weisberg was the one who actually thought it was an admirable accomplishment of George W. Bush and his administration to have gotten us through five entire years with no repeat of a 9/11-style attack. For anyone who’s read even *one* of the best of the many powerfully researched and eloquently presented books exposing 9/11 as an inside job (I’ll make a formal list of them as soon as I get time), Weisberg’s thinking is either 1) as ignorant as a Yahoo’s, or 2) a pack of lies spat out right into your face.

And—as of now, December 28, 2006—in the twelve days since I posted *that* FFT, I’ve gathered up or run across *at least seven* more examples, *all* of them from public figures and putatively estimable journalists, and *all* of them examples of either 1) the sheerest Yahoo-level stupidity and ignorance or 2) the most patent and bald-faced lies being thrown right in my face.

I don’t see—really, I simply *don’t see*—how I can conceivably let any of them or any of their utterances or any of their hypocrisies go unexamined, unchallenged, or unexposed—at least not how I can let them go unchallenged *and* go on living with myself, or at the very least go on living with a conscience that’s unprostituted, undemeaned, uncompromised, undefiled.

In short, if I let these liars, if I let these collaborators, off the hook, the result will be that *I*, too, as opposed to *them alone*, will be responsible also for covering up—or abetting—the Bush administrations abominable and on-going string of treasonous behavior and crimes against humanity.

That, dear readers, I *will not do*. That, dear readers, I *can not do*.

TWO

But, for the moment, back to the question of whether anyone read *all* of the Weisberg FFT. The reason I wonder is that not a soul has responded to the *contest* I

proposed. That contest has to do with the title of “Part One” of the Weisberg FFT, a title that contained a hint as to the contest and that went like this:

We’ve Got Plenty
of Trouble
AND
We’ve Got **More** than Plenty of
You-Know-What

Now, the contest. I’m going to post it again right here and send it out once more to you all. Read it if you will, consider it, and—why not?—respond to it. Of course, the prize is only another copy of *A Nation Gone Blind*, albeit an inscribed one. Maybe if I offered a thousand bucks—*then* I bet the contest would go like lightning!

But, alas, that’s out of the question. I’ve got too little cash on hand for such ostentation or flamboyance—less cash, I’ll bet you a nickel, than the prominent, prestigious, nationally known Mendacious Ones listed near the top of this page.

And, anyway, the best gift is the gift that means to you the most. That makes it an honest gift.

Enough said. Herewith, the repeated close of “FFT Eleven Part 4-E,” originally posted on December 16th, 2006:

AFTERWORD:

Clearly, we have work left to do, having not yet even returned to Nicholas Lemann in order to finish up with him, nor having said what really needs to be said about the as-yet-unmentioned Christopher Hitchens and others as well.

And there’s also our CONTEST to straighten out. You remember the situation as we left it [at the opening of this post], I’m sure, and you remember that, at that point, Gulliver had made a point of “disburthening” himself early each morning and “in open air, at the full extent of my chain. . .” You’ll also remember, I trust, Gulliver’s having told us that “due care was taken every morning before company came, that the offensive matter should be carried off in wheelbarrows. . .”

The CONTEST QUESTION is a dual one, thus: **First part:** How *many* Lilliputians were assigned the detail of carting off Gulliver’s “disburthenment” each morning? **Second part:** In what exact way does that correct answer reveal a parallel between those Lilliputians and me, writing here about the Gatekeepers, in this extended series of pieces?

Now, the rules: The *first reader* to <mailto:ericlarsen@ericlarsen.net> send me the correct answers will receive a free copy of <http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/1593760981/ref=nosim/104-1974668->

[7081548?n=283155](#) *A Nation Gone Blind*, inscribed by me to that person. Previous winners, I'm afraid, must, in fairness, be excluded from the competition. Good luck. God knows, *every one* of us needs it.

—EL