

# AMAZING DEVELOPMENTS!!!

1)  
**THE BBC LIES  
THROUGH ITS TEETH!!!**

2)  
**AN ACTUAL SLIVER OF  
9/11 TRUTH IN—YES!!—  
THE *NEW YORK TIMES*!!!**

• • • • • • • • • •  
Enemies List:

- 1) The Left Gatekeepers
- 2) Frank Rich, Amy Goodman, Matthew Rothschild, the *New York Times*, *The Nation*, etc., etc.
- 3) The “Democratic Party”
- 4) The Neo-Conservatives
- 5) The Blinded Nation

• • • • • • • • • •  
TO: READERS OF *ANGB* AND OTHER RECIPIENTS

FROM: EL

DATE: MARCH 5, 2007

RE: TWO NEWS BREAKS ON 9/11 TRUTH!!

• • • • • • • • • •

1)

George Lakoff recently wrote this sentence in a piece called “The Words None Dare Say: Nuclear War” that ran on

<http://informationclearinghouse.info/article17220.htm> Information Clearing House: “...silence and euphemism are forms of complicity both in propaganda and in the denial of reality.”

Lakoff used those words in the context of discussing the fact that “an attack on Iran” is being portrayed “in the major media” as “a real possibility.” Further, the media are suggesting that it’s also an apparent possibility that in such an attack on Iran, “a ‘low yield’ ‘tactical’ nuclear weapon, say, the B61-111, *might* be needed.” [Lakoff’s emphasis]

In the likelihood—even the distant likelihood—of such a development, “silence and euphemism are a form of complicity” if they constitute one’s response to the massive and continuous propaganda now being broadcast across our land, each day’s worth of it making people *less* horrified at the prospect of the U.S. actually initiating a nuclear war. That is to say, people become more and more accustomed—with each day’s worth of propaganda that goes unnamed and unlabeled as a pack of lies—they become more and more accustomed to a “denial of reality” *being* reality itself.

If you want to read a good book on this very phenomenon and the many horrors it produces and has already produced, grab a copy of <http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/1593760981/ref=nosim/104-1974668-7081548?n=283155> *A Nation Gone Blind: America in an Age of Simplification and Deceit* and give it a read. After that, and after looking at <http://informationclearinghouse.info/article17220.htm> Lakoff’s piece, it may be even more clear to you why I keep saying, repeatedly, that “We must, every one of us, see the truth, name the truth, and write, speak, or shout the truth.”

The truth in this case is very simple. It’s reality.

And now, thanks to the BBC’s complicity and deceit, everybody can take a “test” of the “reality” regarding 9/11 Truth. As you know, on September 11, 2001, the BBC declared that liar and hypocrite Larry Silverstein’s special little baby, World Trade Center 7, <http://www.ericlarsen.net/foodforthought7.0.2007.html> had collapsed—all fine, except that the BBC announcement came more than twenty minutes *before* the building actually fell.

What interesting questions this premature announcement raises—and what interesting *problems* it raises for the onscreen BBC people who realize early on that they’ve made a big blunder in reading their lines before they’d been given their cue! Take the test, watch the TV Brits squirm, repeat themselves, fill dead time, try like the very devil to keep the truth—which is right there before the viewers’ eyes, the unarguable truth that the building is still standing—very, very well hidden indeed.

Take the test—and afterward keep your eyes open to monitor just how thoroughly this piece of 9/11 truth ends up being suppressed, denied, or simply disappeared by our own vile and corrupt mainstream media as that media does all it can to lie, be complicit,

and fawn at the will of its corporo-fascisto-politico owners. To take this important and revealing test, click

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q3BuHjydg1s>

HERE.

2)

And, speaking of our own vile and corrupt mainstream media as it does all it can to lie, be complicit, hide the truth of 9/11, and fawn before its traitorous and criminal masters—speaking of such things, how can a person *not* think of the *New York Times*? It's certainly impossible for *me*, but then <http://www.ericlarsen.net/foodforthought8.html> I'm guilty of having accused the *Times* of being a “lying machine,” and therefore, clearly, I'm hardly one to be trusted.

Still, be that as it may, it's grandly heartening to find in the actual pages of the *Times* something that has every appearance of being either 1) a really bad screw-up that some rather lowly person's head is going to roll for, or 2) nothing less than the work of a 9/11 truth-teller who has managed not *only* to infiltrate the fasco-mendacious *Times* staff in the first place but who has *also* managed to pull a true, real, authentic swifty on them.

Here's how it goes. On page A10 of the *Times* for today—March 5, 2007—is a news item written by Raymond Bonner headlined “Terror Case Prosecutor Assails Defense Lawyer.” In the development of this seemingly conventional *Times*-ian piece, there suddenly pops out a truth-passage about the Bushiscti that's there because—well, I don't know if we'll ever be absolutely sure *why* it's there.

The story has to do with the Australian prisoner at Guantanamo, David Hicks, who has been held uncharged in the Cuban gulag for the awful span of five years. More specifically, the story has to do with the person who is *defending* Hicks, that being a Marine Corps major by the name of Michael Mori. And, more specifically still, it has to do with the “chief prosecutor for the American military commissions that will try suspected terrorists being held at Guantanamo Bay”—*that* august figure being Col. Morris D. Davis, an Air Force lawyer.

The issue? Davis is really mad at Mori, and Mori is *really* mad at the Bushiscti.

Over three years, Mori has traveled no fewer than seven times to Australia for purposes presumably having to do with strengthening his ability to defend Hicks. Be that as it may. What's popped Col. Davis's cork is the detestable fact that Mori *has been saying things* in Australia. What things? Hold on a minute. First, they're things such that Col. Davis says that

it would be up to the Marine Corps whether to charge Major Mori with violation of Article 88 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, which makes it a crime for a military

officer to use “contemptuous words” about the president, vice president, secretary of defense and other high public officials.

Well. Sacred is sacred, I guess, even in the land of the free, once a person is in uniform. Col. Davis is cited as saying that “Most of the defense counsel say the [military] commissions are unfair and criticize the process[,] as they are entitled to do.” So they’re “entitled” to “criticize the process.” But the kicker, says Davis, is “that Major Mori ‘goes further than any defense counsel I’ve ever known.’”

The plot is thickening like gumbo, and I hope you’re ready for this next historic and climactic paragraph. It is, one might say, a doozie:

Colonel Davis said that it was improper for Major Mori to have made statements alleging that the president, the secretary of defense and Congress “intentionally created a rigged system that guarantees convictions in order to cover up wrong-doing” and that “everyone involved is potentially guilty of war crimes greater than the charge against” Mr. Hicks.

And there it is at last: **TRUTH!!** And truth delivered with such subtlety and dramatic irony that one—well, that one can’t really identify its source. Is this Col. Davis’s quote? If so, doesn’t it explode in his face like a trick cigar—for the very reason that it expresses, even if *he* would never wish to, the *truth*? Or is it Col. Davis’s quote that’s slyly inserted by Raymond Bonner, who himself is dying to tell the truth but can do it only by “quoting” Mori as “quoted” by Davis? Or—let’s just assume this possibility—maybe Bonner is a good *Times*man (something like a good German) who’d *never* intentionally compromise the great cover-up that the *Times* and the owners of the *Times* have sworn to uphold to the death—along with patsies like Frank Rich, who say what the master says to say, no more, no less; maybe Bonner is a Richian *Times*man who’d *never* tell the truth about 9/11 itself *or* the truth about the administration’s ruinous and republic-destroying, freedom-destroying, Constitution-destroying policies *since* 9/11.

Who knows? Certainly it’s not Col. Davis “speaking.” Maybe it’s Raymond Bonner “speaking,” but then again maybe not: he’s just the *reporter*, after all. Maybe it’s Mori himself “speaking,” except that *he would never be allowed to speak openly in the Times!* And so, *who is it?* Davis? Bonner? Mori? Maybe even *Hicks?*

What I like to think is this: That it’s some copy-editor pretty far down on the totem pole, a guy who, realizing that Bonner had slipped up and accidentally let in the real actual truth, could have snipped, or muted, or downplayed—or cut out altogether—the Mori “quote” that as it is comes to us via Davis via Bonner via Mori himself somewhere far down the line. That’s what I like to think: That there’s sabotage at the *Times* from guys pretty low down—and that *they’re* the ones who will slip in the truth under the very eyes of the complicit and traitorous big shots every single chance they get.

If I’m right, there may even be some hope for truth, for us, for the republic. The little guys are the ones we’ve got to depend on. Who else, for the sake of all that’s divine,

would have allowed these words into the pages of the *New York Times*, that compromised and complicit Gatekeeper, that traitor, that criminal against humanity:

Colonel Davis said that it was improper for Major Mori to have made statements alleging that the president, the secretary of defense and Congress “intentionally created a rigged system that guarantees convictions in order to cover up wrong-doing” and that “everyone involved is potentially guilty of war crimes greater than the charge against” Mr. Hicks.

Improper? Let it go. As to the content, amen.

Eric Larsen  
March 5, 2007