

FOOD FOR THOUGHT
Number 13, Part 1.5
(NEW SERIES—2007)

THE PERNICIOUS HYPOCRISY OF FRANK RICH

Addendum 3

• • • • • • • • • •

From a Reader,
A Letter in Response to
“What [Would It Be Like to Be Amy Goodman?](#)”

TITLE:
Ridiculous condemnation

• • • • • • • • • •

Your attack on Amy Goodman seems to fall under the heading of “The Left eats its own.”

Her response to Kevin Barrett, who comes off in the video as a self-aggrandizing poop, seemed quite reasonable. **Amy Goodman:** “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.”

That, of course, did not satisfy Barrett because he wants his cause to be her cause and to use her show as his vehicle. If Amy Goodman decides to give play to voices other than Barrett’s, I cannot regard that as “hypocrisy.”

It appears that you think the events of 9/11 are the “key to everything”—that if you could just get everybody to believe what you believe, the world would be saved. You write that “it becomes apparent to those who agree with Webster Tarpley that the 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 [or] 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 insane and blood-curdling of the military and globally hegemonic plans and desires of the Bush-Cheney administration and of the ‘overworld power’ that controls it.”

My oh my. “Only this” can do it, huh?

I can think of any number of revelations that might upend this administration if they were broadly reported, broadly accepted by the public and seen as vital to the public. The 9/11 shenanigans are just one among many.

So it may be that you have a tactical disagreement with Amy Goodman as to what is necessary for bringing change. So be it. But I hardly see any justification in that for the name-calling in which you're indulging.

And if I may, let me give my own tactics for change: There are any number of questionable deeds in the history of this country about which we do not know all the details—and probably never will. If countering the Bush administration depends upon making such-and-such a revelation, having it reported and making it believable, I'm afraid the Republic is lost.

Even as reported by the mainstream media the news is rife with tales of the misfeasance and malfeasance of the Bush administration. A visitor from Mars might well assume that there is plenty of information available to bring down this administration. But then the visitor from Mars would not understand the dynamics of our politics—the sense of powerlessness on the one hand and indifference on the other that pervades the public mind.

Clearly Amy Goodman tries to bring on guests who will stir that public mind. Her selection may not comport with your judgments or preferences. But that does not make her a hypocrite. It makes you a one-note ideologue.

Use your browser's “Back” button to return to your place in [Food for Thought 13.1](#)