

FOOD FOR THOUGHT
Number 12, Part 1
(NEW SERIES—2007)

WHAT WOULD IT
BE *LIKE*
TO BE AMY GOODMAN?



Dear Eric,
Please unsubscribe me from your newsletter. I am surprised to find you chastising Amy Goodman . . . apparently because she has steered clear of the 9-11 story. (I am assuming this is the case since you don't go into great detail about her prostituted mind.) Anyway, she is the least of our problems and, basically, is helpful in covering news stories that are completely omitted from mainstream journalism. Best of luck in your investigative and other works.
X. Y.



1

That letter (the one above) is typical of the kind of response I got after posting my “Food for Thought” back in April 2007 called <http://www.ericlarsen.net/foodforthought9.2.1.2007.html> “Amy Goodman: A Mind Prostituted.” Just about all the arguments I got went this way: 1) Amy Goodman does *lots* of good things, and therefore 2) it's unfair and illogical to criticize her for doing *one* thing bad.

Actually, as you can see in the letter above, the person defending Goodman often didn't even consider ignoring the subject of 9/11 to *be* a bad thing. The letter-writer above, for example, pretty clearly doesn't really know much of anything about 9/11, certainly hasn't read any of <http://www.ericlarsen.net/ideas.books.9.11.html> the essential books on it, and so for him or her 9/11 remains just *a* story, and that *I* happen to want it covered is no reason to blame Goodman for *not* covering it.

The Amy Goodman affair is all very old news, but there's a recent development, thanks to <http://www.mujca.com/> Kevin Barrett, that's worth looking at and knowing about.

I actually posted two pieces on Amy Goodman. In the first, “A Mind Prostituted,” I took up a piece of hers called “It’s Bigotry that Should Be Silenced.” In it, Goodman alludes to the “White Rose collective of World War II” and to “[a] brother and sister named Hans and Sophie Scholl, [who] with other students and professors, decided the best way to resist the Nazis was to disseminate information, so that the Germans would never be able to say, ‘We did not know.’”

Then Goodman wrote:

The collective distributed a series of pamphlets. On the bottom of one was printed the phrase ‘We will not be silent.’ The Nazis arrested Hans and Sophie as well as other collective members, tried them, found them guilty and beheaded them. But that motto should be the Hippocratic oath of the media today: ‘We will not be silent.’”

My response <http://www.ericlarsen.net/foodforthought9.2.1.2007.html> was to suggest that “Anyone who’s done their 9/11 homework will—or will be able to—feel little other at this point than repugnance and disgust.” And why is that?

Look closely, after all, at what’s happening. Amy Goodman, who won’t speak or allow to be spoken in her presence, on air or off, the least hint of what the actual causes of 9/11 were or where the real culpability for the *crimes* of 9/11 lie—how can it be that *this* media person who hides *those* truths now blithely declares that this “motto should be the Hippocratic oath of the media today: ‘We will not be silent.’”

The well known view of Goodman as silent on 9/11 was powerfully substantiated by <http://carolynbaker.net/site/> Carolyn Baker’s 2006 landmark essay http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/011306_empress_clothes.shtml “The Empress Has No Clothes: Amy Goodman’s Reality Blackout.” Here’s an excerpt from it that I quoted in my second piece on Goodman, <http://www.ericlarsen.net/foodforthought9.5.1.2007.html> “Does the CIA Own Amy Goodman” (a title borrowed directly from Carolyn Baker, who asked that question):

. . . <http://www.oilempire.us/democracynow.html> Amy will not, absolutely will not, deal with 9/11. Surrounding herself with “conspiracy-theory” phobics, such as <http://www.oilempire.us/chomsky.html> Noam Chomsky and <http://www.oilempire.us/solomon.html> Norman Solomon, she has occasionally danced around the issue, but never firmly planted her feet in the reality of the pre-meditated mass murder by the United States government that September 11 was. Any journalist as articulate, informed, and on the cutting edge as she purports to be would not be evading the issue five years after the event. What was the point of inviting Sibel Edmonds to *Democracy Now* and asking obligatory questions of a guest who has been silenced by a colossal gag order from the Justice Department? Why invite one of the most astute researchers of 9-

11, David Ray Griffin, to her program, and instead of actually interviewing him, pit him against Supreme Conspiracy Phobe <http://www.oilempire.us/berlet.html> Chip Berlet, whose only rebuttal to Griffin's impeccable evidence was, "It's not good for people to believe in conspiracy theories." Why only pathetically brief, patchy, so-called interviews with http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cynthia_McKinney Cynthia McKinney who is the only Congressperson who has delved deeply into 9-11 and called for and carried out public hearings?

2

In my own second piece, I quoted from Goodman's inaugural column in her new capacity as print-journalist. Here's what I quoted:

My goal as a journalist is to break the sound barrier. To cut through the static and bring forth voices that are not usually heard. I am not talking about a fringe minority, or the Silent Majority, but a silenced majority, increasingly restless, of people who are looking for alternative sources of information in a complex world.

And what hooley and hogwash that paragraph is—if, that is, you understand the fact that among those "voices that are not usually heard" are, most saliently of all, the voices of 9/11 truth, which Amy Goodman, hypocrite to the end on that one particular, will do all she can to *keep* unheard.

Goodman's hypocrisy, that is, becomes apparent only to those who *do* know the truth about 9/11, having read, say, <http://www.ericlarsen.net/ideas.books.9.11.html> the essential books about it; her hypocrisy becomes apparent only to those who *do* agree with Paul Craig Roberts that <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article18020.htm> "Unless Congress immediately impeaches Bush and Cheney, a year from now [July 16, 2007] the US could be a dictatorial police state at war with Iran"; it becomes apparent to those who agree with <http://www.waronfreedom.org/newrels.html> Webster Tarpley that the <http://www.ericlarsen.net/foodforthought12.1.2.2007.html> "only. . . way to erode Bush's hard core base. . . is by attacking the 9/11 myth"; to those who *do* agree with Paul Craig Roberts that "Today the US media serves as propaganda ministry for the government's wars and police state"; to those who *do* believe, therefore, that telling the truth about 9/11 and holding the Bushists accountable for the crimes they clearly and demonstrably committed—that *only this* can save restore stolen Constitutional rights and freedoms, restore the republic itself, and very possibly safeguard the stability of the entire world by preventing the fulfillment of the most <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article17863.htm> insane and blood-curdling of the military and globally hegemonic plans and desires of the Bush-Cheney administration and of the http://www.gnn.tv/articles/3242/Exclusive_excerpt_The_Road_to_9_11_Wealth_Empire_and_the_Future_of_America "overworld power" that controls it.

In her inaugural column, Goodman wrote this:

With this column, I join you in the important ritual of reading the paper, of examining the news, to discern for yourself the state of the world and your place in it. I invite you to join me in going to where the silence is, as we seek out the news and newsmakers who are ignored. This column will include voices so often excluded, people whose views the media mostly ignore, issues they distort and even ridicule.

If we, indeed, are going to join her “in going to where the silence is,” then that’s precisely and exactly where she *ought* to take us. But no. She doesn’t mean *there*. For reasons that can only be imagined—threats of death, of dismissal, of demotion—must be keeping her from “going” into the one silence that right now, this minute, and today, can diminish the ever-increasing likelihood that the current regime and the http://www.gnn.tv/articles/3242/Exclusive_excerpt_The_Road_to_9_11_Wealth_Empire_and_the_Future_of_America “overworld power” that controls it will make their move by staging another variant of their ever so successful 9/11, then on the basis of that “national emergency” will declare martial law, suspend elections, and—well, I leave it to you—and *do whatever they want to do*.

What *must it feel like* to be Amy Goodman and to know that you’re aiding *that* enemy, that you’re empowering *that* monstrosity, that you’re posing as a truth-teller while simultaneously covering up what may be the greatest lie ever told—what would make you *do* such a thing, and what would it *feel* like?

3

Thanks to Kevin Barrett, we can now have *some* hint of what it might be like. Or at least Kevin—in his usual shrewd, amusing, and eagle-eyed way—has recorded Amy Goodman in action (recorded her in his own words, that is) in such a way as to give us a glimpse—possibly—into the person.

I’m on the e-list (as everybody should be) of <http://mujca.com/default.htm> MUJCA, the website founded by Kevin (MUJCA stands for Muslim-Jewish-Christian Alliance for 9/11 Truth), so I get news and updates from the site more or less regularly.

So, on Friday, September 28, I got an email full of worthy and interesting announcements, numbered 1 through 5:

- 1) Please help publicize the William Rodriguez Heartland Tour that begins next week Wednesday, 10/3/2007 <http://www.mujca.com/heartland.htm>
- 2) 9/11 Political Prisoner Mike Cook is Finally Out of Jail!
<http://www.mujca.com/cookfree.htm>
- 3) What's It Like to Spend Ramadan In Guantanamo? Ask Moazzam Begg
<http://www.mujca.com/begg.htm>
- 4) William Rivers Pitt Goes Insane! <http://www.mujca.com/pitt.htm>

Open Letter to William Rivers Pitt: <http://www.mujca.com/pitt.htm>

5) Seven CIA Veterans Challenge the 9/11 Commission Report:
<http://www.mujca.com/ciavets.htm>

It went on (and why shouldn't it—nobody has energy like Kevin Barrett, *and* he's on the radio three times a week):

Barrett's near-future radio guests include Guantanamo vet Moazzam Begg, world's leading academic expert on the neocons Shadia Drury, bestselling 9/11 truth author Ian Henshall, 9/11 truth newbie and <http://www.ericlarsen.net/foodforthought9.8.1.2007.html> celebrated artist Rob Shetterly, Muslim pro-tolerance activist Ahmed Rashid of <http://www.ahmedrashid.com> and other fascinating folks. Schedule: <http://www.mujca.com/airwaves.htm>

But then came the more unusual part, with its own big headline, which I'll leave a little bit big here. I'll leave everything else exactly the way I got it from Kevin as he described in his own words his personal—well, sort of—meeting with Amy Goodman.

So here:

Kevin Barrett Questions Amy Goodman On Building 7

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v2yC4xgeVMM>

(Watch it all on Youtube)

by Kevin Barrett, <http://mujca.com>

Thanks to Matt Naus of <http://ts911t.org> for his stellar camerawork. Please, write Amy and ask her to invite me on her show to continue the conversation! mail@democracynow.org

I attended Amy Goodman's speech at the University of Wisconsin-Madison last night, Thursday, 9/27/2007. She talked about doing "ground zero reporting" and said "our job as journalists is to go to where the silence is." I wanted to confront Amy over her reprehensible silence about the 9/11 truth debates in general, and her refusal to cover the demolition of Building 7 in particular. After all, she was present at the pre-announced demolition of Building 7:

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-4094539209684370800&pr=goog-sl>

If I were confronting a hopelessly evil 9/11-complicit creep like Guiliani or McCain I'd be a lot more confrontational. But, as Col. Bob Bowman pointed out on my radio show, which will be rebroadcast next Friday, 10/5/07 4-6 pm CT on <http://gcnlive.com> network 2, Amy is a potential ally, albeit a maddeningly silent one so far. And her audience, who are also potential allies, loves her. So I wanted to get in her face, but with a 'tough love' approach spiced with humor, rather than venting the anger we all feel about Amy's betrayal of the truth.

Amy began the question period by announcing that nobody would be tasered for asking questions.

Kevin: “Well, if anyone were going to be tasered here, it probably would be me. Hi Amy. Kevin Barrett here. I appreciate your great work on so many issues, and I agree with your quote that ‘our job as journalists is to go to where the silence is.’ Now there’s a very popular youtube video that’s especially popular among the 100 million Americans who know that 9/11 was an inside job, according to a New York Times poll. It shows you present at the controlled demolition of Building 7.”

Amy: “I did not demolish Building 7.”

Kevin: “Well, okay, I’m glad we got that straight. My question would be, if your job is to go to where the silence is, Building 7 is a great place of silence, as I’m sure you know. Its a 47 story building that came down into its own footprint for no apparent reason at about 5:30 p.m. on September 11th. A countdown to the demolition of Building 7 went out on New York police radio. I was in New York for the sixth anniversary, and every cop I talked to knows that that went out on police radio. The BBC reported that Building 7 had collapsed twenty minutes before it happened, with Building 7 standing in the background behind the reporter. And we have eyewitnesses—I can give you their contact information—who were inside Building 7 at [around] 9 o’clock in the morning who witnessed massive explosions that killed large numbers of people and devastated the lobby. There were pre-demolition explosions. You’re right there in New York, you’re right next to Ground Zero, and you talked about doing ‘ground zero reporting’—so when are you going to get around to doing some ‘ground zero reporting’ on Building 7?”

Heckler: “Why don’t you shut up, this is not your night.”

Amy: “Overall, I would say that everything that happened on September 11th should be fully investigated. Of course I don’t think that the 9/11 Commission was an adequate investigation. And I agree that there are a lot of questions that have to be answered.”

[well jeez Amy, you’re a journalist, you’re based right next to Ground Zero. . . why don’t YOU try to get some answers??!!]

While I stood in line to get my Amy Goodman book autographed, I autographed Amy a copy of my own book : <http://www.amazon.com/Truth-Jihad-Epic-Struggle-Against/dp/0930852990> *Truth Jihad: My Epic Struggle Against the 9/11 Big Lie.*

I also carried a copy of the best photo book on 9/11, Eric Huffschmid’s http://www.amazon.com/s/ref=nb_ss_gw/105-4791811-3350040?initialSearch=1&url=search-alias%3Dstripbooks&field-keywords=painful+questions&Go.x=0&Go.y=0 *Painful Questions*, open to the page showing the demolition of Building 7. When I arrived in Amy’s exalted presence, the following dialogue transpired:

Amy: “I guess you’re famous here.”

Kevin: “Not as famous as you, Amy. Here’s my book, with my phone number, in case you want to invite me on your show, or appear on one of my three radio shows. Also, I was wondering if you could autograph this book (Eric Huffs Schmidt’s http://www.amazon.com/s/ref=nb_ss_gw/105-4791811-3350040?initialSearch=1&url=search-alias%3Dstripbooks&field-keywords=painful+questions&Go.x=0&Go.y=0 *Painful Questions*) here on the Building 7 page (page 65, featuring still shots from the demolition of WTC-7) so when you break this story. . . “

Amy: “I don’t want to mess up your page.”

Kevin: “I think when you break this story it’ll be valuable. . .”

Matt Naus (off camera): “You were there, Amy! I saw the video of you. You were there!”

Amy: (smiling) “I work right there.”

Kevin: “I mean, if you break this story. . . if anybody does, it might be you. . .and if you sign this, this will be a very valuable book.”

Still smiling, she declines to sign.

Please write to Amy and ask her to invite Kevin Barrett on her show either (A) for a friendly chat about the 9/11 truth movement, or (B) to debate any bunker who dares to try to take me on. Her address:

mail@democracynow.org

4

I wrote to Kevin Barrett telling him how much I liked his Amy Goodman material. “What a job you did,” I wrote, and all *with* humor and *with* composure. I couldn’t have done it.”

I told him the truth. I was thinking of using his words in a piece of my own: “Your humanity and personableness are huge assets and have stood you in good stead and continue to. I don’t have those. But your report on your evening. . . might help as a foil for my more snide and nasty ways that would follow.”

And I asked him the questions that won’t go away and that just keep on burning at me:

I don’t know what to do. What *is* it that has people like her in its grip? Fear? Money? Threats? Just the “corporate” machinery-mentality of Pacifica? Here the very future of the republic—of more—is at stake and she won’t budge,

won't acknowledge even the merest shred of truth even when videotape makes her prior knowledge of WT7's collapse all but indisputable. I didn't know the detail about the NYC police radio counting down to the [making of the <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-1340351950774479027&q=larry+silverstein+pbs+interview&total=27&start=0&num=10&so=0&type=search&plindex=1> Larry] Silverstein fortune. Isn't that proof of pre-knowledge of the collapse? What kind of evidence does it *take* to break down the big huge high thick wall of Amy Goodman-esque silence and denial? *Where* is the power of that resistance coming from? I mean, are all the patsy-coward democrats in Congress actually afraid for their lives? That's what <http://www.politicalcortex.com/user/Sheila%20Samples> Sheila Samples thinks. I mentioned her on your show. In <http://www.politicalcortex.com/story/2007/8/22/20124/1820> "Ah Democracy, We Hardly Knew Ye," she conjectures that even the senators and reps are afraid of being named "enemy combatants" if they cross Boss Dubya. That's fear of detention and death, isn't it. Even in the United States Congress.

So there you are. What *would* it be like to be Amy Goodman? Well, what would it be like to be *anyone* who's doing nothing more than telling the truth? Why more frightening for those—Amy Goodman, Nancy Pelosi, Frank Rich, John Conyers—who, given their positions and stature, could really make the truth sing?

Aren't they just caving in with servility to the threats of a treasonous and vile mob? Is *that* what you gain prominence and professional visibility and high position in your life for—to cower and tremble and lick at the boots of the Capo?

I think we could all use a little bit of leadership here. And it's not in Amy Goodman or those I named a minute ago. At least not yet.

Six years have already gone by. They'd better get courageous fast, don't you think?

—Eric Larsen
—September 30, 2007