

**FOOD FOR THOUGHT**  
**Number 9, Part 4**  
**(NEW SERIES—2007)**

**TIME IS RUNNING OUT—**  
**PART FOUR**

•  
**THAT'S THE WAY IT IS IN**  
**THE EMPIRE OF LIES**

•  
**ALL IN POSITIONS OF POWER**  
**OR AUTHORITY**  
**BECOME SUSPECT**

•  
**TRUST IS DESTROYED**

•  
**RUIN GENERAL THROUGHOUT ARTS,**  
**LETTERS, PUBLISHING**

•  
But that's how it is in the Empire of Lies.

<http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/HL0703/S00184.htm>

—**Sherwood Ross**, “Bush’s Crimes in Baghdad Have Parallel  
in U.S., U.K.,” Sat, 10 Mar 2007

The sixty years that have brought us the new America have brought us  
also a virtually perfected socio-political culture of lies and lying, a  
culture built on a foundation of lying, framed by walls of lying, covered  
by a roof of lying.

—Eric Larsen,

<http://www.abebooks.com/servlet/SearchResults?sts=t&an=Eric+Larsen&y=9&tn=A+Nation+Gone+Blind&x=53> *A Nation  
Gone Blind: America in an Age of Simplification and Deceit*,  
p. 10

Indeed, I wonder when we'll face up to what has really been going on.

—National columnist in an email to Eric Larsen, Sept. 2006

Robert Bly to Eric Larsen, on hearing that an esteemed fellow poet was  
“in terrible shape,” was “all but crushed,” and had been “in despair” for  
the past three or four years: “Why is he in despair? He’s in despair  
because he doesn’t have *spirit!*”

—April 2007

## 1

## WHO GOT TO MATTHEW ROTHSCHILD?

In <http://informationclearinghouse.info/article17557.htm> “Bringing Down the House of Lies: The Final ‘Leg’ of the Journey,” Steve Bhaerman, the seriously comic writer, says he declared two years ago “that the illegitimate ‘legitimacy’ of the Cheney-Bush regime rested on a three-legged stool.” All three of those legs, not surprisingly, consisted of lies. Here’s Bhaerman:

The first leg was the belief they were fairly elected in 2000 and 2004. The second was the Iraq War and the reluctance of people to “change horse’s asses in the middle of an extreme.” The third was 9/11, and the official account of what happened that day.

Now, says Bhaerman in “Bringing Down the House of Lies,” that stool is ready to topple, with one leg gone, the second damaged, the third vulnerable:

So here we are. The “leg” called the Iraq War is gone. The “leg” called “these people were elected legitimately” is badly compromised. And yet, like the mad monk Rasputin, Bush and Cheney are still standing behind their stone wall. Subpoenas notwithstanding, they’ve entrenched and have no intention of giving in one iota. Because as soon as they do, the avalanche of revelations will cause their downfall. How long can this holding pattern go on? It can definitely go on indefinitely. Unless we as a nation allow the 9/11 story to break through the soundless barrier. When this leg gets chopped off, Bush and Cheney will be gone.

The Iraq War isn’t “gone,” but it’s true that *support* for it is. And I’m more than happy to concur with Bhaerman in the *hope* that the nation is waking up to the enormity of fraud in recent elections (2000 and 2004 especially), though I wish I were as certain of it as he is. (“As lame as you may think the Democrats are, this [the 2006 election] was the first important step of restoring the balance of power and the rule of law.”) But with his position on the third leg—the leg of 9/11 truth—I couldn’t agree more completely: “*When this leg gets chopped off, Bush and Cheney will be gone.*”

Too few people agree with me and Bhaerman, and so in these recent “Food for Thought” pieces I’ve taken it up as a job of my own to do whatever I possibly can to get more of them, first, to *come around* on the very fact of what the truth really is about 9/11, and, second, to agree that once sufficient numbers of people *do* accept and embrace the truth of that truth, then, “*When this leg gets chopped off, Bush and Cheney will be gone.*”<sup>1</sup>

If that’s true, how could *anyone*, how could *any* thinking person or how could *any* patriotic citizen desirous of saving and restoring the now-stolen and now-destroyed republic and of re-establishing the Constitution and its Bill of Rights—how could *any*

---

<sup>1</sup> Bhaerman’s next paragraph is this: “More importantly, the truth will be revealed so that we can collectively ‘face the music’ and set a new course. Never has any nation been in this position. Nazi Germany was forced to face their heart of darkness only by military defeat. Soviet Russia collapsed under the weight of its own unworkability. But now, for the ‘land of the free’ to finally earn that name and claim our true inheritance, we must face what is perhaps the most profound betrayal in our 200 year history.”

such person not work as hard and as deftly and as insistently as possible to establish and broadcast the truth about 9/11 once and for all?

Paul Craig Roberts wrote just the other day, in a piece called <http://informationclearinghouse.info/article17562.htm> “The State or the People,” that “The foundation is in place for rule by the executive. Normally this is called dictatorship.”

Well, yes, and “normally” is *now*. How could *anyone* not resist dictatorship in America with every last bit of legitimate means at their disposal?



Yet that’s not the way it is in the empire of lies. In *this* empire, people right and left—left especially—are dedicated solidly and perversely to keeping the biggest lie of that dictatorship suppressed, and therefore are dedicated concomitantly to keeping the most heinous “government” in all U.S. history in place.

I don’t know how it can have come about that we’ve been betrayed by so many people like this—leftish people in the media who *are understood* to be dedicated to the truth, dedicated to balance, dedicated to the full range of subjects affecting the public in any significant way, and dedicated to objective analysis of them. I don’t know *how it can be* that so many people like this have perjured themselves, become consistent and hypocritical liars, and, in a word, turned traitor.

One thing I *do* know, however, is that this decision to turn traitor is capable of happening *fast*—in the very blink, as it were, of an eye.

I know this thanks to Bev Conover and Carla Binion, both of the indispensable <http://www.onlinejournal.com/> *Online Journal*. A long time ago, back on June 4, 2002, Conover wrote a piece called <http://www.oilempire.us/gatekeepers.html> “Has the Establishment Left become a handmaiden of the Republican Right?” In it, she not only asked very good questions but she named a lot of names. Better get out of the way, she said, “for the self-appointed gatekeepers of the left who are on a crusade to spin, smear, attack, and label as loony anyone who won’t accept the official line that the events leading up to and surrounding September 11 are nothing more than a series of coincidences and intelligence failures.” Conover went on:

This cabal of lily-livered leftists, ensconced in their ivory towers, have decreed we are bad kiddies for even suggesting that the Bush administration was complicit in or took advantage of the September 11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, and the baddest of all is Michael C. Ruppert, who publishes <http://www.fromthewilderness.com/> *From the Wilderness*.

Sadly, as all know, the verb “publishes” must be changed now into the past tense, with *From The Wilderness* no longer active and Michael Ruppert himself, at last word,

[http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/120206\\_mike\\_canada.shtml](http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/120206_mike_canada.shtml) “in the greater Toronto area and receiving medical care.”<sup>2</sup>

Nevertheless, having said *what* the gatekeepers were doing, Conover *named* a fair number of “this cabal of lily-livered leftists”:

Among the others lobbing missiles at us from the battlements are Norman Solomon, executive director of the Institute for Public Accuracy; David Corn, *The Nation*’s Washington editor; Michael Albert, co-founder of *Z Magazine* and system operator of the magazine’s Znet.org; Steve Rendall, FAIR’s senior analyst; Chip Berlet, senior research analyst for Political Research Associates; Larry Bensky of Pacifica Radio’s flagship station, KPFA; and Noam Chomsky, writer, philosopher, and professor of linguistics at MIT.

Quite a lineup, eh? And there are others.

Ask yourselves why, if we are so loony—and Mike Ruppert is the looniest of all—why these gentlemen are expending so much energy in writing reams of copy denouncing us, with what has become the new epithet, “conspiracy theorists?” Why not simply ignore us? Pretend we don’t exist?

What worse punishment can they mete out for our ignominious behavior than ignoring us? *Or is there more to their motives?* [emphasis added]



Consider: All of that was written *almost five years ago!* And every single one in Conover’s entire cabal of “lily-livered leftists” is *still* “lobbing missiles” and *still* sticking firmly to their anti-empirical, anti-evidential, absolutely adamant wall of cover-up, suppression, innuendo, and smear (for pure falsehood, innuendo, smear, and *really* crappy logic see <http://www.thenation.com/blogs/capitalgames?pid=66> this particularly purulent and shameless David Corn diatribe from 2002). So what if it’s been five years, someone asks? Well, so this: Doesn’t *anyone* with more than a molecule of brains *have* to agree that, yes, otherwise intelligent thinking people who stick to falsehood, cover-up, smear, innuendo, and evasion of facts *for five long unbroken years* must have more for motive than simply the frivolous or embarrassing discrediting of their colleagues in the media?

Let me just ask, for example: Is there anyone else who—like me—would very, very much love to know precisely what it was that must have happened to Matthew Rothschild of *The Progressive* magazine between October of 2001 and May of 2002?

---

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/120206\\_mike\\_canada.shtml](http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/120206_mike_canada.shtml) Nov. 26, 2006 - Thanks to contributions and assistance from so many of you, Mike Ruppert was successfully moved from Venezuela to Canada on November 18th. He is currently in the greater Toronto area and receiving medical care and rest thanks to dedicated Peak Oil activists. In addition to his previously described symptoms it has been learned that his adrenal system is severely damaged and there may be toxicity of the liver. He has lost more than 20 pounds in the last ten weeks. Many of you have written suggesting possible poisoning as cause for his known symptoms. We are not pursuing that at the moment because the treatment for the symptoms would not change in either case.

Whatever it was, I'll bet it would make a real doozie of a one-act play or a short story in the manner of someone like, say, the late Graham Greene.

The reason I'm so desirous of knowing just what happened to Rothschild between those dates is that I've read Bev Conover and Carla Binion. Binion, in a piece written shortly after Conover's and called [http://www.onlinejournal.com/archive/06-17-02\\_Binion.pdf](http://www.onlinejournal.com/archive/06-17-02_Binion.pdf) "Conspiracy Theories and Real Reporters", reminded us that in October of 2001, Rothschild wrote the following in *The Progressive*:

The United States does not have clean hands in the world. The history of the last fifty years is the history of U. S. war and repression in one Third World country after another. It is not an exaggeration to say that the United States has acted as a terrorist from Guatemala to Iran, from El Salvador to Vietnam, from Chili to Indonesia . . . [sic] To heighten the level of terror by waging all-out war against Afghanistan or any other country Bush is aiming his bombers at will serve no useful purpose.

Good enough: Nothing there that one mightn't expect or hope for from the editor of a significant and historically progressive publication when he's talking about a reactionary, unelected, and militarist administration. In short, Matthew Rothschild in those words was both speaking and telling the *truth*. I find myself wanting to say, "How refreshing!" But why in non-god's name should one be refreshed by the *truth*, when it's the *truth* that should be standard, everyday fare?

Well, the answer is that Rothschild's truth of October 2001 quickly turned—by May of 2002—to the long and unbroken parade of lies, stupidity, fallacy, cover-up, smear, innuendo, and inanely perseverant attacks on 9/11 investigators, writers, and scholars as being simple-minded and contemptible "conspiracy theorists."

Why the change? And why so *sudden* a change? Who or what *got* to Rothschild between October and May? And what did it or they get to him *with*? What kind of threat, what kind of malice, what kind of fear, what kind of terror—yes, as in the word "terrorism"—could it have been that it or they confronted Rothschild *with*?

Or was it nothing of the sort, nothing like any of that? Is it just that Rothschild *really is* as dim, non-logical, and perfectly hollow-headed a fellow as he *seems* to be in his anti-9/11 Truth diatribes?

If you're a reader of my "Food for Thought" pieces, you may remember that Rothschild wrote a stupendously juvenile, tortured, and inane cover-up piece called [http://www.progressive.org/mag\\_wx091106](http://www.progressive.org/mag_wx091106) "Enough of the 9/11 Conspiracies, Already," a piece that appeared in *The Progressive* and was dated September 11, 2006, the five-year "anniversary" of the 9/11 attacks. So abysmal was that piece of work that I was obliged, in my professional capacity as a professor emeritus of "English," to award it a grade of F. Here's the paragraph where that award was given, in this year's <http://www.ericlarsen.net/foodforthought1.2.2007.html> Food for Thought One, part two:

You not only reveal, Mr. Rothschild, that you have never read *Mother Goose*, that you have never read the *Fables* of Aesop, that you have never read *The Canterbury Tales* of Chaucer; you not only, Mr. Rothschild, show *either* your own ignorance *or* your criminal complicity in the crimes of murder and treason that were committed on 9/11 (by deceitfully obscuring evidence relating directly to them); but, Mr. Rothschild, you

gravely and unforgivably insult our intelligence over and over again in—whether it be criminal or not—your eminently juvenile, childish, infantile, baby-talking piece of writing. Throughout my study and analysis of the piece, it has become increasingly clear to me that *all* of my professional training to become a Ph.D., and that *all* of my ethical responsibilities as I honored and undertook them over forty years as an instructor—requiring even now that I evaluate not just student writing but *any* writing by absolutely the same measures and by absolutely the same rules—all of these, Mr. Rothschild, bring me to the unavoidable recognition that I can do no other than award your essay with a grade of F, it being *so* abysmal, *so* wholly incompetent, and *so* entirely and thoroughly fraudulent.

Not only is Rothschild's piece distinguished as a failure so total as to deserve only pity or contempt, this by merit of its being an ignorant, bottom-feeding, propagandistic, closed-minded, fallacy-filled, tendentious, ungrounded piece of work—but it's further distinguished by the fact that it provides an example of the kind of non-thinking and non-writing on 9/11 that Rothschild *has stuck with for no fewer than five long years!*

Now, to stick *that* long with a project *that* self-demeaning and *that* shameful to anyone in the profession of *writing*—the threats or forces at work to corrupt a professional journalist *so* quickly and *so* entirely and *so* demeaningly and for *so long a time* must be some forces indeed.

We know from both Binion and Conover that Rothschild's <http://www.commondreams.org/views02/0530-08.htm> "The Crude Politics of Scandal" appeared in *The Progressive* and was dated May 29, 2002, and that in it Rothschild hypothesized what would have happened "if Al Gore had been President on September 11." From what we know now, it's unlikely that 9/11 itself would have *happened* if Gore had been in the White House, and we know now that that's *one* of the reasons it was imperative to the Bushiscti that he never *be* in that place or position—hence the stolen, or fraudulent, or *non-elective* election.

Of course, back in May 2002, a lot less of that sort of thing was known—five years of intense scholarship have provided a very great abundance of information as to what was going on when and what plans were afoot as of what dates. Even so, go ahead and forgive Rothschild for having a degree of 9/11 ignorance commensurate with the date of May 2002. And give him credit for saying that "We need an Independent Commission to get to the bottom of this fiasco." Fat chance of *that* ever happening, as we now know so well. Still, give Rothschild a May 2002's worth of credit just for saying that such a commission *was* needed.

But even giving him *those* two credits, there's no way in the world that he can be pardoned for turning straight at his fellow progressives and baring his fangs in the contemptuous way he does. "But what we don't need," snarls he,

is crazy conspiracy theorists coming from the left. Almost every time I've spoken in public since September 11, I've heard variations of the following theme: Bush not only knew about the attacks, but wanted the United States to be attacked so that he could (and here you can take your pick):

- a) Increase his popularity by waging war
- b) Justify an increase in Pentagon spending

c) Boost the profits of the Carlyle Group, a private military investment group that includes Bush's father, among other heavyweights.

In short, Rothschild has *already*, way back in May 2002, switched over to his since-then standard mode of smear and innuendo and whitewash and snide condescension toward the naiveté, gullibility, and childish stupidity of his own fellow progressives.

Following a quick knife-slash at the courageous and great truth-seeker [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cynthia\\_McKinney](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cynthia_McKinney) Cynthia McKinney (to Rothschild she's an "arch-conspiracist"), he concludes his piece as follows, with the result that a person like me understands quite, quite clearly that from here on in Rothschild is one whom "I will trust as I will adders fang'd":

The claim that Bush knew the U.S. would be attacked and intentionally let it happen for his own nefarious purposes is well beyond my significant skeptical powers. It assumes a callousness at the loss of innocent American lives that I wouldn't want to impute to any President. And it greatly underestimates the likelihood of bureaucratic incompetence. (A hedge fund against such incompetence would be a sure profit-maker.)

When lefties go off half-cocked with conspiracy theories, it does our cause no good. We instantly lose credibility with our fellow citizens, and it distracts us from the main problem: Not that a few corrupt individuals are taking the country over a cliff, but that a system of militarism and corporatism distorts our values, inverts our priorities, and helps to sow the seeds of hatred overseas.

Let's focus on that, and not the Carlyle Group.

Skillfully and nefariously done. He's still "one of us," as he makes clear by using "we," by the phrases "our cause" and "our fellow citizens," and by clarifying that he, too, opposes a "system of militarism and corporatism [that] distorts our values, inverts our priorities, and helps to sow the seeds of hatred overseas."

*But.* But the Carlyle Group is just hunky dory, an institution perfectly fine and nice, and it's a big, big mistake to mess around with it. And also, dear children, there's no way that the post-9/11 situation can be so simple as "a few corrupt individuals. . .taking the country over a cliff." So, happy lefties, if you know what's good for you you'd better back off, you'd better declare the red herring of "incompetence" to be the full cause and true source of 9/11 and of all its attendant and subsequent ills, and, above all, you'd better give due respect to the fact of Matthew Rothschild's inability to *believe* that the Bushiscti could *possibly* be so bad as you foolish and half-cocked lefties might think.

Yes, there it is. Right there is a line worthy of Iago himself; a line *stupendous* in its faux-naiveté; in its *utter* inanity; its total and deliberate simple-mindedness; a line *desperate* to please the powerful; a line that could be written *only* by one who is so deeply naïve as not to be fully adult; or by one who knows *no* shame; or by one who is terrified to death: a line representative of the most adamantly determined of those once-free, progressive, inquiring minds now committed intractably to the covering up of 9/11 truth and therefore to the more and more certain bringing forth of the first dictatorship of America:

*It assumes a callousness at the loss of innocent American lives that I wouldn't want to impute to any President.*

## 2

### DOES THE CIA OWN AMY GOODMAN? Part One

Amy Goodman presents us with a slightly different but equally pervasive and certainly just as poisonous a destruction of trust as does Matthew Rothschild.

I don't know whether Goodman did a flip-flop in the quick, blink-of-an-eye manner of Rothschild or not, but I do know that on the radio she has consistently ignored, skirted, or at the very least touched only most delicately and tangentially on the issues of greatest importance—as causes or contributors—to the gradual yoking of our necks together under the <http://informationclearinghouse.info/article17562.htm> dictatorship that we now, somehow, must rid ourselves of or else see the republic die.

The best place to turn in an evaluation of Goodman as an enemy of progressivism and truth-seeking is to the ever-dedicated and extraordinarily alert <http://carolynbaker.org/> Carolyn Baker, in particular her article from 2006 entitled [http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/011306\\_empress\\_clothes.shtml](http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/011306_empress_clothes.shtml) “The Empress Has No Clothes: Amy Goodman’s Reality Blackout.”

Baker divides her abundantly annotated essay into three parts, “Blackout Number One,” etc. I’m going to touch on these in reverse order, for reasons of focus and emphasis, as you’ll see. So, Baker’s introduction to her third section:

Blackout Number Three: While *Democracy Now* is currently giving ample air-time to the Abramoff scandal, its grasp of the depth and scope of U.S. government corruption and economic warfare on its own citizens is abysmal. Much is made of the military industrial complex, indisputably a monstrous cavern of theft and taxpayer bilking, but has Amy Goodman ever interviewed experts on the \$59 billion dollars missing from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, or the \$2.3 trillion missing from the Pentagon? Has she ever invited the foremost expert on U.S. government economic warfare on its own citizens, Catherine Austin Fitts, to be interviewed on *Democracy Now*? Or what about former Washington Times reporter, Kelly O’Meara, who has reported extensively on the missing money? What about Stephen Roach, Morgan Stanley’s chief economist who in 2004 made mainstream financial headlines by stating unequivocally that the U.S. economy is heading for <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/business/4209709.stm> economic Armageddon?

Instead, Democracy Now has conducted numerous interviews with John Perkins, author of *Confessions Of An Economic Hit Man*. In her article specifically addressing Perkins' book, [http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/010705\\_economic\\_hitmen.shtml](http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/010705_economic_hitmen.shtml) Catherine Austin Fitts writes:

A “limited hangout” is a partial confession, a mea culpa, if you will, that leaves the essence of a crime or covert reality hidden. Because it includes some small part of the truth, the limited hangout is irresistibly attractive to dissidents and political critics whose thirst for such truth makes them jump at the dangled scraps. . .

Readers who have been following these “Food for Thought” pieces may remember this material about Catherine Austin Fitts' analysis of the Perkins book as a diversionary sop—“limited hangout”—from December 2006 and my piece called <http://www.ericlarsen.net/foodforthought11.4.D.html> “Our Enemies, the Left Gatekeepers: The Limited Hangout of Nicholas Lemann—in, Yes, *The New Yorker!*”

Between Carolyn Baker's remarks so far and my own piece for you to look back at if you like, let's consider enough to have been said on “Blackout Number Three.” On, then, to “Blackout Number Two.” Baker writes that

[day] after day, in a world where oil production worldwide has peaked, and where we are now plummeting toward an energy Armageddon, Amy Goodman says almost nothing about the issue. In terms of foreign policy and the Iraq War, her guests incessantly proclaim world domination by the diabolical United States as the sole motivation for the U.S. invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq. Whenever the energy issue is alluded to, it is presented as a feigned crisis construed by bloodsucking oil companies who would do anything to justify spiking gas prices. Unquestionably, oil company profits are at an all-time high, but that does not diminish the reality of Peak Oil. Again, Amy has not done her homework, and it doesn't appear that she's interested in doing it anytime soon.

While she has interviewed Michael Klare, a Peak Oil expert and author of “Blood and Oil,” it has little effect when counterbalanced by numerous appearances of progressive guru, Noam Chomsky, who insists that oil is not the primary motivation for the dissection of the globe by the American military. *Democracy Now* is virtually silent on issues of oil and natural gas depletion, and the absence of interviews with the most outspoken experts on Peak Oil—such as Richard Heinberg, author of “The Party's Over” and “Powerdown”; Matt Simmons, one of the world's most distinguished energy experts; British Peak Oil authority, Colin Campbell; or Princeton's famed petroleum geologist, Ken Deffeyes—is nothing less than mind-boggling. Failure to address what may be the most devastating global survival issue in the history of the human race is not only irresponsible but unconscionable.

We can allow Carolyn Baker's concluding sentence at this point—“Failure to address what may be the most devastating global survival issue in the history of the human race is not only irresponsible but unconscionable”—to lead not only to her *and* our obvious next question (*How can and why does Amy Goodman fail in this egregious and extraordinary way?*), but we can allow it to lead us also to Blackout Number One.

Thus:

Blackout Number One: <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](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?

Baker goes on to document “the enormous misstatements” made “by *Democracy Now*’s producer, Jeremy Scahill as he was interviewed by Amy Goodman on November 10, 2005.” It turns out that Scahill “repeatedly praised Jerome Hauer,” “a close friend of the Bush Administration” and a man whose “connections with some of the most despicable corporations on earth are indisputable”—corporations including “Bio Port, one manufacturer of a particularly atrocious anthrax vaccine.” Further, according to a *From the Wilderness* story cited by Baker (one that I can’t any longer access ([http://www.fromthewilderness.com/members/121505\\_jerome\\_hauer.shtml](http://www.fromthewilderness.com/members/121505_jerome_hauer.shtml) ), this “Bio-Warfare expert” Hauer is also

well known in New York City for having created former mayor Rudolph Giuliani’s Office of Emergency Management (OEM) in World Trade Center 7—the building that inexplicably imploded in a freefall on September 11, 2001, without having been hit by an airplane.

Those at all well versed in 9/11 research will smell maybe a dozen rats here already, but there are more to come:

On the eve of 9/11, in NYC, Hauer was having drinks with his close friend, the recently retired FBI Agent and “Osama-Chaser,” John O’Neil. At that time O’Neil was the head of security at the World Trade Center complex, a position Hauer had helped him to get. O’Neil died in the World Trade Center on 9/11, and it was Hauer who identified his body.

If you’re not familiar with the name of John O’Neill, and with the implications of some of the things that happened in his life preceding 9/11, you can [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John\\_P.\\_O'Neill](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_P._O'Neill) catch up a little bit about him here, and <http://www.rense.com/general18/neil.htm> find out a little bit about his death here. After that, look in the index of Mike Ruppert’s seminal <http://www.abebooks.com/servlet/SearchResults?sts=t&an=Ruppert&y=7&tn=Crossing+the+Rubicon&x=44> *Crossing the Rubicon*.

It's fair to say that Jerome Hauer is not a guy one would want to trust very far, if at all—unless, of course, one were, akin to him, also a Bushiscti.

Well, so it goes. “Scahill’s misstatements [on the air about Jerome Hauer],” Carolyn Baker continues,

not only herald the virtues of a notorious “bad guy” and ally of the Administration, but fail, once again, to explore links to 9-11. I hasten to add, however, that Scahill’s shabby reporting was also carried by *The Nation Magazine* the day before the *Democracy Now* interview in an article, <http://www.thenation.com/doc/20051128/scahill> “Germ Boys and Yes Men.” The same article was published concurrently by the websites <http://www.alternet.org/> *Alternet* and <http://www.commondreams.org/> *Common Dreams*.

And then she concludes, and concludes on no happy note:

It appears that the left has been astonishingly misled by a failure to check facts and connect dots. Is it any wonder it has so profoundly lost its vitality and credibility in the twenty-first century? When so-called progressive journalists fail to do the most fundamental homework, all of the “Don’t Think Of An Elephant” linguistic research of the likes of George Lakoff about how to communicate with the rest of the world becomes meaningless.



Or worse than meaningless. Let’s go back to *The Progressive Populist* for January 1-15, 2007, the same issue of that magazine in which Amy Goodman’s “It’s Bigotry That Should Be Silenced” appeared, the piece that I discussed in considerable detail in my own analysis, <http://www.ericlarsen.net/foodforthought9.2.1.2007.html> “Amy Goodman: A Mind Prostituted.”

That piece lost me a reader or two—people who weren’t willing to tolerate any whit of ill being said of Amy Goodman. It’s probably a good thing they’re not here now to read what’s coming up—since the prostituted mind on display in Goodman’s anti-bigotry piece is *nothing* compared to the near-indescribable, the towering, the vast, oceanic, gargantuan, absolute, sheer hypocrisy that’s on display in what *The Progressive Populist* ran as a companion piece to the essay on bigotry. That’s how it was laid out on *The Progressive’s* page, though I take it now (as I suspected then) as being in actuality Goodman’s inaugural statement as a print columnist. Entitled “Beyond the Nine-Second Sound Bite,” it ran in [http://seattlepi.nwsourc.com/opinion/291047\\_amy05.html](http://seattlepi.nwsourc.com/opinion/291047_amy05.html) *The Seattle Post-Intelligencer* for November 5, 2006, and then appeared also <http://www.commondreams.org/views06/1105-26.htm> at *Common Dreams*.

And here we go with paragraph one:

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.

One of the passages I used as an epigraph in <http://www.abebooks.com/servlet/SearchResults?sts=t&an=Eric+Larsen&y=12&tn=A+Nation+Gone+Blind&x=43> *A Nation Gone Blind* came from <http://www.abebooks.com/servlet/SearchResults?sts=t&an=William+Strunk+and+E.+B.+White&y=12&tn=Elements+of+Style&x=38> Strunk and White, to the effect that “All writing is communication; creative writing is communication through revelation—it is the Self escaping into the open. No writer long remains incognito.”

Now, I don’t know, in our day, what Strunk *or* White would think about that old distinction between “writing” and “creative writing,” though I do know that I for one got rid of it entirely, long ago, as essentially useless and misleading. Certainly, on the other hand, the remaining two Strunkian tenets in this little passage are as true and intact and solid today as they were back in 1918, when William Strunk first put them into print: Namely, first, that “All writing is communication” and, second, that “No writer long remains incognito.”

In my own forty years of teaching, I tried to keep those two truths as much as possible in the forefront of things at all times—letting my students know from the start, in regard to the second tenet, that once they themselves became good analysts of writing, they’d be able to peer right into the very essence of their fellow writers. Because it really is quite, quite true that writing—like not many other things—does reveal huge amounts about the person who does the writing: “No writer long remains incognito.”

All right, then—and I’m sure you saw this coming. Another quiz.

**Question:** So what do you see in Amy Goodman by peering into her head through the first paragraph of her writing—as opposed, I might add, to what people usually do, which is listen to her on the radio?

**Answer:** Clichés, clichés, clichés. Hollowness, emptiness, dreariness. Dust gathered in long-undisturbed corners.

Too harsh? Well, it’s up to you. You can stop reading right here if you want to, even though I think that would be a mistake. And I don’t think but I know that every one of the following phrases would lose important points in any piece of work submitted by a student of my own—the long, long ago exhausted “my goal,” for openers (add a double demerit *because* it’s used as an opener). And “as a journalist” for another—little does Goodman know how widely she’s opening the door to attack by using that old and inane “as a this or that” phrase. After all, it *immediately* raises the question not only of *logic* (as a journalist but not as a thinker?) but of *honesty*: “As your preacher, I advise that you find a way to forgive your wife,” but “As a predator, I must say I find her sexually most fulfilling and enjoyable.”

False analogy? You don’t see the faulty logic? Well, it’s up to you. You can stop reading right here if you want to, though I do think, again, that would be a mistake, and also that if you do quit you’ll miss out on a lot of fun and also on a lot of really, really, really, really important stuff. After all, what is it we’re talking about here? Shall I remind us all?

All right. We're talking about *this*:

Paul Craig Roberts wrote just the other day, in a piece called <http://informationclearinghouse.info/article17562.htm> "The State or the People," that "The foundation is in place for rule by the executive. Normally this is called dictatorship."

We're talking, that is, about *nothing less than the United States becoming a dictatorship*. And, on top of that, we're talking about why it conceivably could be that Amy Goodman, a media person in a position of very, very great power, has chosen to behave for the past five years *in a way that has helped and that still helps the bringing of that dictatorship about*.

Too strong? Amy Goodman as a traitor? Up to you. Quit reading right now if you want to. But if you do quit, you won't get to hear me point out not only the clichéd and grievous vacuity of phrases like "looking for alternative sources of information in a complex world," and you won't get to hear me point out also the deceit, the falsehood, the sheer *evil* here, worthy of Lady Macbeth herself, the demonstrated *hypocrisy* of the famous Amy Goodman, she who

[http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/011306\\_empress\\_clothes.shtml](http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/011306_empress_clothes.shtml) "will not, absolutely will *not*, deal with 9/11," she who "[surrounds] herself with "conspiracy-theory" phobics, such as Noam Chomsky and Norman Solomon," she who "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"—the sheer, utter, unspeakable, vile, disgusting hypocrisy of such a person as that daring to say—*daring*—that "as a journalist" she has the following as her "goal." Herewith, her second paragraph:

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.

To say such things as these and at the same time to sit *for five years* on 9/11 truth? To say such things as these *while aiding and abetting*—if in no other way than by failing, by *refusing* ("as a journalist") to go "where the silence is"—while *aiding and abetting* those same industrious criminals who are this very moment busy as bees ushering in our American dictatorship?

One of the people who insisted on being removed from my list wrote this:

Please unsubscribe me from your newsletter. I am surprised to find you chastising Amy Goodman. . . just because she has steered clear of the 9/11 story. She is the least of our problems and, basically, is helpful in covering news stories that are completely omitted from mainstream journalism.

Am I alone? Does no one else see the extent and grievousness of the lie, the hypocrisy of it, and the unmitigated disaster it's leading to? "Just because" she has

“steered clear” of 9/11? Were Amy Goodman a doctor—then she’d work “as a doctor”—what equivalent thing could such an omission, a “steering clear” *possibly* consist of? Well, I’ll tell you what it could be. In fact I’ll tell you not what it *could* be but what it *would* be. If Amy Goodman were a doctor and she received a patient, she *would* treat the patient—but first *she would cut off the patient’s head*.

No? Don’t like the analogy? Won’t buy it?

Just think for a moment: Not counting global warming, what percentage of current political suffering and political ills worldwide exist *because* the Bushiscti got away with committing 9/11 and used it as a huge lever of opportunity to push their foreign war *and* their domestic police-state agendas ever further and ever faster? Don’t consider whether those agendas are “succeeding” or “failing,” but consider only *that* they exist *and* that they *do* cause human suffering and loss, *have* caused human suffering and loss, and *may* very well cause a great deal more human suffering and loss. (A glance at Tom Engelhardt’s [http://www.tompaine.com/articles/2007/04/10/bushs\\_arc\\_of\\_instability.php](http://www.tompaine.com/articles/2007/04/10/bushs_arc_of_instability.php) “Bush’s Arc of Instability” might be useful as you consider your percentages.)

So, what do you come up with? Forty percent? Fifty percent? Maybe *sixty percent* of the world’s current political ills and suffering have arisen directly as a result of the Bushiscti having gotten away with the crime of 9/11? You can’t blame North Korea on 9/11’s “success,” or, say, Northern Ireland, or the hideous weather in Europe, or mad cow disease, etc., etc. But you *can* blame the Iraq “war” on it; and the “war” in Afghanistan; and the Israeli-Lebanon fighting last summer; you *can* blame the nuclear threats toward Iran, with their possible catastrophic potential; you *can* blame the Ethiopia-Somalia killing, and you *can* blame the 7/7 bombings in London; you can blame arrests all over the world, and you can blame extreme rendition, and secret CIA torture-prisons, and Guantanamo, and water-boarding, and all other forms of torture, and you *can* blame Abu Ghraib, and you *can* blame the loss of habeas corpus and Posse Comitatus and the tremendously dangerous (for us) changes in The Insurrection Act, and you can blame the on-going construction, by Halliburton, of domestic concentration camps (just in case they might come in handy), and you *can* blame the ugly, vile, disgusting, repugnant offering of no-bid contract after no-bid contract to huge war-profiteering corporations again and again and again, and you *can* blame the looting of the U.S. treasury, and you *can* blame the miserable and pitifully uncaring “treatment” given wounded U.S. soldiers—and so on, and so on, and so on.

And so here’s why I think of the crime of 9/11 as the equivalent of the head of, say, a person: it’s the thing that makes all the other things possible. Without a *head*, not even Hitler could any longer going around being Hitler.

And now, having cleared up the true significance of 9/11 as the source of so very, very many evils, ills, disasters, murders, tortures, and human *and* other spoliations worldwide, I have one last thing to say about Amy Goodman.

If Amy Goodman were a doctor—if she performed “as a doctor”—she wouldn’t just treat patients who came to her, though doing so only *after first cutting off the head of*

*each*. No, *here's* what Amy Goodman would do. Amy Goodman would treat the patients who came to her, but only after first cutting off the head of each. And *then* she would go all over the world to all the medical conferences held everywhere, bragging about what a good, fine, thorough, observant, dedicated, and detail-oriented doctor she was.

She would go around the world saying

I join you in the important work of studying and practicing medicine, of examining new research, so that you can discern for yourselves the state of the medical profession and your place in it—and mine. I invite you to join me in my own medical work, going to where the silence is, seeking out patients of every kind who may be ill or suffering in any way whatsoever. But I invite you especially to join me in finding and treating those patients who are usually ignored. I for one will go on treating patients often excluded, patients whose illnesses the medical establishment mostly ignores, patients whose needs are commonly distorted and even ridiculed.

Bring 'em to me, says Dr. Goodman. Just let *me* get my hands on *them!* *I'll* take them *where the silence is!*

And now I hope you will pardon me, but it simply is no longer possible for me, just now, to continue further, even though much, much work remains to be done. But from what I have read, analyzed, and observed so far of fraud, lies, falsehood, and hypocrisy, I am quite, quite incapacitated, quite, quite down. I retch. I gag. I must take a restorative break. *How can it be*, I ask and I ask and I ask, that people don't see through such wrongness as this, such wretched and ruinous deceit, such *malignity* as this—particularly at a time of such overwhelming *emergency* as ours?

So great are these questions, and so much do they weigh on me, that I will have to find respite, and take them up again next time.

—Eric Larsen  
—April 25, 2007