

Why I don't read the Mainstream Press: today's example—*Rolling Stone*

The last piece of real reporting at *Rolling Stone* was October 1977, a piece by Carl Bernstein called ["The CIA and the Media."](#) In it he quotes Frank Wisner, head of the OPC at the CIA, as saying that he played the media "like a mighty Wurlitzer organ." We must suppose that soon afterwards *Rolling Stone* got a visit from the mighty Wurlitzer and was told to stop the music. Which it dutifully did. Ironic, because the subject of Bernstein's piece was the influence of the CIA on the media. Bernstein hasn't been the same since and neither has *Rolling Stone*. Remember that this was one year after the Church Committee hearings (1975-76) in the Senate which also exposed the extent to which the CIA had taken over the media. Like Bernstein, Frank Church got played by the Mighty Wurlitzer, losing his re-election bid to vote fraud in 1980. By 1984, Church was dead.

I will be told that Matt Taibbi is doing a bang-up job of skewering Wall Street, but that's all misdirection. Matt Taibbi and *Rolling Stone* are like Julian Assange and Wikileaks or Marshall Berman and *Dissent*. The CIA creates its own opposition in order to control it. Through Taibbi, we watch the banks attack themselves in seemingly vicious ways, but of course nothing ever comes of it. The banks know that *Rolling Stone* readers aren't revolutionaries. There is zero chance of ignition. The articles are just a way to allow the readers to let off a bit of steam as they drink their lattes at Starbucks or eat a tiny tub of Ben&Jerry's at the Whole Foods Deli.

These plants "on the left" are also in place when it comes time for serious damage control. They are then called into action, protecting their masters. We saw this damage control after 911 Truth began to make serious inroads into the mainstream around 2005. Taibbi, along with Matthew Rothschild at *the Progressive* and Alexander Cockburn at *Counterpunch* and many others, was called to try to defuse this bomb, and to seem to do it from the left. Unfortunately, none of these guys has been at all successful in doing that. In classic intelligence agency style, the CIA has only mobilized 911 Truth even more, while exposing their operatives as frauds.

Amusingly, Taibbi gives himself away in spectacular fashion, since anyone can see he is angry at having to perform this function. Although he is fine with playing the CIA's lowpost man on banking, it appears that he resents being sicked on Truthers. Whether this is because he has some scruples left or because he likes to pick his own shill assignments is unclear, but he doesn't even try to make his articles convincing or readable. His articles on Wall Street corruption are fairly well written and researched, and contain enough fact to look genuine. But his articles on 911 are nothing but *ad hominem* and four letter words. Has his research team deserted him, or are we just seeing the fruits of a different research team from a different sector? The 911 conspiracy debunking wing at the CIA must be where they send the new guys, the college recruits who can't yet be trusted outside the cubicle. These 3rd string debaters from Southern West Virginia State Junior College are the ones that made *Popular Mechanics* look ridiculously outgunned years ago, but they haven't gotten any better since then. If anything, they are worse now than they were in 2005, and they don't bother to even season their newer "arguments" with any facts or proposed facts. We can only suppose that it is because any time they mention *anything* with any substance, be it a fact of physics, timeline, or weather, they get slaughtered. I don't think the so-called debunkers have ever presented a "fact" that stood up to scrutiny. Every single thing they have stated as fact has turned out to be a bold lie, an inversion of logic, or a total invention. So they apparently gave up. All they have left is that those who don't agree with the mainstream theory are "clinically insane." That is all Matt Taibbi has. That is his whole argument: 911

Truth is a mass delusion. He has no *evidence* that it is a mass delusion, such as figures from mental hospitals showing a sharp rise in patients admitted due to 911 Truth. No, it is just a feeling he has, a feeling phoned in from Langley, Virginia.

I understand why Taibbi is mad. He is being made to look like a fool, and he can't say no. He is being sent out into the arena to face the lions, and isn't even being given a sword or a net. Of course he prefers his old job, being fed information from the Fed that makes them look bad but not too bad.

And even there, we may assume that Taibbi is just disguising what has already been planned. For instance, if he is now attacking Bank of America, it is probably because BoA has already been put on the block by the Fed itself. To see what I mean, let me point you to George Clooney's movie of a few years back, on Edward R. Murrow. It was called, "Good Night and Good Luck." Clooney attempts to whitewash Murrow (who was also CIA or army intelligence) by painting him as a champion of freedom against Joseph McCarthy. But what we know now is that the FBI and CIA had themselves turned against McCarthy by 1954. McCarthy didn't fall because Congress or the American people turned against him. He fell because J. Edgar Hoover turned against him. The press turned against McCarthy because they were *ordered* to turn against McCarthy. The press was already controlled by the early 1950's, and we know that from Congressional testimony during the Church Committee hearings. It is part of the Congressional Record. What this has to do with Taibbi is that just as Hoover had turned against McCarthy, we may assume that Goldman Sachs or JPMorgan or someone has turned against BoA. BoA is the next target, and soon we will have not just one central bank—the Fed—we will have one bank period. Taibbi's job is to justify this by further scapegoating BoA.

I am not apologizing for BoA. I hate BoA. But ask yourself this: is BoA the biggest monster? Not even close. The job of people like Taibbi is to keep your eyes off the biggest monsters, and on the smaller monsters that the big ones want to eat next. In the same way, Lehman Brothers was savaged before it went down. Although it went down in very curious circumstances, no one investigated it because they were glad to see Lehman go down.

The same goes for Julian Assange and Wikileaks. The CIA is in control of its own leaks, which is convenient. It leaks some minor damage to make the press look progressive, and this minor leak keeps your mind off bigger things. It is all about destroying focus. You need to be told a thousand things everyday, nothing the same as yesterday. No story goes anywhere. No follow-ups. Just a constant line of new tragedies. It is called induced trauma. You are being traumatized on purpose. You are like a deer permanently caught in the headlights.

What to do? Don't give up. Don't "tune out, turn off." Just change the channel to one or two that aren't controlled, and stop the rest. Like the Amish, limit the input. Quality, not quantity. Focus. Remember the past. Study it. Don't let it be rewritten out from under you. And look for a meaningful act. They still exist, and many of them aren't that hard or dangerous. [Write-in a vote](#), for instance.