



How U.S. Media Enable the Genocide in Gaza | Prof. Robin Andersen

This transcript may not be 100% accurate due to audio quality or other factors.

Dimitri Lascaris (DL): Good day, this is Dimitri Lascaris coming to you from Montreal, Canada, for Reason2Resist on July 21st, 2026. In May 1923, Julius Streicher founded the sensationalist newspaper *Der Stürmer*, which translates loosely into "The Stormer" or "The Attacker". And from the outset, the chief aim of this German newspaper was to promulgate anti-Semitic propaganda. The first issue had an excerpt that stated, quote, "as long as the Jew is in the German household, we will be Jewish slaves, therefore he must go", close quote. And that's just one of countless examples of the openly anti-Semitic nature of *Der Stürmer*. 23 years later, on October 1st, 1946, a Nuremberg tribunal found Streicher guilty of crimes against humanity and sentenced him to death. The judgment against him read in part as follows, quote: "For his 25 years of speaking, writing, and preaching hatred of the Jews, Streicher was widely known as the 'Jew-Baiter Number One'". In his speeches and articles week after week, month after month, he infected the German mind with the virus of anti-Semitism and incited the German people to act of persecution. Streicher' incitement to murder and extermination at the time when Jews in the East were being killed under horrible conditions clearly constitutes persecution on political and racial grounds in connection with war crimes as defined by the charter and constitutes a crime against humanity.

Now, today, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and his former defense minister, Yoav Gallant, have been indicted by the International Criminal Court for crimes against humanity, but so far, none of the influential propagandists who promote, justify, and whitewash Israel's genocidal atrocities and who promote hatred of the Palestinian people has been indicted by an international tribunal or even by a domestic court for inciting the murder of Palestinians. Could this happen today? Should it happen today? Well, to help us answer this question, we have invited Robin Anderson onto our program. She joins us now. She is a professor emerita of media studies at Fordham University and an award-winning author. Her work examines film, television and media coverage of war, the environment, politics and elections. And she's also on the board of directors of Fairness & Accuracy In Reporting, which I've quoted on numerous occasions, an outstanding media critic organization. And Robin is the author of a new book on US media coverage of Israel's genocide in Palestine. It's

called *The Complicit Lens* and came out earlier this year. Thank you so much for joining us today, Robin.

Robin Andersen (RA): Oh, thanks for having me. It's a pleasure to be here, Dimitri.

DL: So Robin, I'd like to hone in on this book because it is, I understand, the first comprehensive analysis of this extremely important subject, how the US media covered and continues to cover the ongoing genocide in Gaza. And I just want to say before I launch into this, two things: Number one, if people find this report to be informative, please like and share it. If you're not already a subscriber, please become one. And number two, when we talk about media coverage, we often use the phrase – and I certainly do this, I've done this many times – "mainstream media". I'd like to try to avoid that phrase because it seems to imply that these massive for-profit corporations actually represent the bulk of society, that they are quote-unquote mainstream. I personally think that they're extremists and so I try to use that term and I use the phrase "corporate media". I think that is a bit more clear. In any case, that's my own choice of vocabulary. I don't know how you see this issue, Robin. Maybe you want to respond to that at the outset and we can get into your book.

RA: Sure. There's a lot of ways to refer to what I call mostly "establishment media". Because you're right. It's no longer representing the mainstream of American culture, American public opinion. They don't represent us anymore. They represent government elites. And because they are tied very much economically in the boards of directors, these are the same people that are the extractive industries, the military industrial complex. So these are no longer entities that gain their profit from reflecting what mainstream public opinion is. So we call it corporate media. I call it – actually I think one of my footnotes is that I kind of tell the reader what I'm talking about because I use them interchangeably, rarely mainstream. I use corporate, I use big journalism, I kind of like that phrase. And I use legacy and legacy media, possibly is maybe very important because it's the media that was around before the internet. So we're talking the papers of record mostly, and CNN, and legacy media, particularly the one that The New York Times and CNN that I just referred to, they are agenda-setting media out there, agenda-setting entities. And of course, we know that certainly that's true of The New York Times.

DL: And sadly so. So with that, let's get into the nitty gritty of this excellent book. I'd like to start with the way in which the corporate media covered October 7th. Your book has a good deal to say about that. I'm referring here, obviously, to the Al-Aqsa Flood attacks launched by Palestinian militants. What did you find in that regard?

RA: Well, October 7th possibly is the first thing we can turn to to kind of begin to answer your question about incitement. Genocide does not happen without incitements and genocide cannot happen without the continuing justification of that. Now I think that we've seen that with this particular genocide. Most genocide has been focused on the incitement of genocide, most legal cases. In terms of the Geneva Conventions, the way we define incitement is this: you are an elected official, so you have a platform, you're on some kind of a mainstream

media platform, and it's at a time of great tension. And also, it's identified as rhetoric and also usually considering mythologies instead of facts.

So I think what we see with October 7th is very much the incitement to genocide, you mentioned Gallant, and I would say also Alon and they went on mainstream media, it was widely circulated with almost no pushback, where they would say, "well, Hamas attacked innocent Israelis, and instead of being appalled, Palestinians were celebrating. And so that means they are an animal, they are inhuman and we're going to" – and then they laid out a policy of genocide: they're not going to have any more water, they're not going to have any food. We're going to cut off all the electricity and we're going to turn it into a tent city. And that's exactly what they did. At that point, journalists could have said, "but wait, that violates several rules of war, disproportionate violence, the fact that you're making civilians pay, you're attacking civilians for what your leaders or your fighting representatives, your resistance group has done – all of those are in violation of international rules of war". So that's what happened. They did lay the groundwork.

There's evidence to assert that the journalists knew that what they were doing was just plain wrong. For example, at the end of March, the New York Times journalists released the memos that were being formulated in their editorial boards of what they could and could not say. We had that from CNN staff members by the end of January, mid-January, 2024. This is 2024, not very far into it. And the CNN journalist says a little bit later, because they were leaking a lot of stuff that was happening at CNN, and he said on a phone call, "many of us were disturbed that our anchor were repeating the things that the Israeli officials and military guys were saying that sounded a lot like incentive to genocide and that comprise the first seven or eight pages of South Africa's suit brought against Israel in the International Court of Justice".

The New York Times, we can say, might have been even more explicit, and if you want to evaluate in terms of worse or better, possibly worse, in that they had banned a whole bunch of words that human rights organizations and the international community use to identify when a state is committing genocide or has committed a war crime. So you couldn't say "occupation". You couldn't say "apartheid". You certainly couldn't say "genocide". And when it came to "massacre", you didn't want Hamas to take over your platform. So best not to use those kinds of "emotional terms". That was from CNN. So what we had was the overall dehumanization of Palestinians with simply body counts. And then also the body counts were "suspected" from the "suspicious" – and it in no way was – Gaza Health Ministry or the " Hamas-led" Gaza Health Ministry. So discounting on discounting. And so there was a perpetual and constant dehumanization of Palestinians in every way on the media. So this is what I would say to those charges. That's incitement to genocide.

DL: And part of this incitement campaign included fantastical, gory allegations of atrocities committed by Palestinian militants which either did not happen or to this day there remains inconclusive evidence as to whether any of it happened and I'm thinking here particularly of the claims of mass rapes by Palestinians, a question to which the New York Times delved

extensively. There was a claim of, as I recall, a pregnant Jewish woman, an Israeli woman, having her fetus cut open. Another woman was alleged to have had her breast cut off. There were the beheaded babies. How did you find that the major media organizations in the United States dealt with those fantastical and really gory accusations?

RA: Well many of them simply carried the beheaded baby stories, which there was not one iota of evidence for, not a shred. And within a month the Israeli insurance service had listed all of the people killed on October 7th. There was exactly one infant, one person under two years old. So there was no rounding up babies and then burning them or beheading them, which is of course what Netanyahu told President Biden. So this didn't happen. It simply didn't happen. They weren't there. The same thing you mentioned, the fetus torn out of the mother's belly and then the baby was stabbed and then she was stabbed – this invention was told by a fellow named Yossi Landau, who was with ZAKA, who was presented to the international journalism community as actually kind of a first responder – almost a legitimate one, in fact. The PR people said that, oh, they kind of thought that they were humanitarian workers, that they had been trained, for example, in neutrality and also medical forensic procedure. ZAKA was none of that. ZAKA was a voluntary, very fanatical, if you will, organization that Israel had deemed were the ones they were going to send in to look at deaths of their official remit, look at unexpected or unusual deaths, but they weren't supposed to really do that for Arabs. Anyway, so Yossi Landau, in front of the international jury, you could see him tell the story on tape, right on tape online. And he pauses, and he gets very emotional. And he starts to almost tear up. So that's how good these people were at acting. He invented that story. Haaretz debunked that within a month and a half. Haaretz had gone to Kibbutz Be'eri where she was supposed to be pregnant and were supposed to have lived, and all the people like Kibbutz Be'eri said, no, we didn't have even a pregnant woman here.

So over and over again, the Times particularly would use Yossi Landau. So for the rape story, there's a big picture of Yossi Landau. In the online story, there's Yossi Landau, and he's saying, "oh, I didn't take any pictures when we were going through these horrors. I regret". So they used him to confirm the information, even though in that rape story, again, there is no forensic evidence, there is no visual evidence, there is not independent and verifiable testimony, there's no actual victims of rape testimony. Oh, supposedly all these women were so traumatized, they couldn't speak to anybody. Isn't that convenient? So, you know, 70 journalists, people around the world, have called on the New York Times to correct the story. They never have. They've never admitted that this was a rank piece of trauma porn, which is what I call it in my book, and how I write about it. Journalism professors really enjoined the New York Times to do an investigation and correct this record. And they didn't. So atrocity propaganda, as Richard Saunders said, why did the media not talk about what Hamas did, but Hamas didn't do? Because the atrocity propaganda was designed to incite the most feared disgust and retaliatory emotions that exist so that we would feel okay with going in and wiping out Palestinians, so this is disproportionate violence. You had to have this horrible narrative to justify the horrible violence which they were about to perpetrate.

DL: I just want to add one footnote about that one infant who was killed. As I recall, Robin, that infant died of a bullet wound, not because somebody cut the infant's head off. And this brings me to the next lie, I'm going to call it that, and that is that all of these civilians who died, and according to the Israelis, as I recall the numbers approaching 800 or maybe slightly nexus of 800 of the 1139 were classified as civilians. We know beyond a shadow of a doubt that some number of them, it may certainly be unclear about how many, died at the hands of the Israeli military. For example, there were eyewitness accounts of the Israeli soldiers firing hails of bullets into houses where Palestinian militants were together with hostages. And we know that there was enormous firepower brought to bear by Apache helicopters on vehicles that were containing both Palestinian militants and Israelis and that were heading into Gaza. So how did you find that the US media performed on the question of how these civilians actually died?

RA: Oh, they did story after story of the victims. They were the cause celebre for months. And then when the hostages were also reported, they were presented in their full humanity as people. They went to their homes. They went to their communities. They talked about their role. They put pictures of them up. We don't have any of that about Palestinians. But to answer your question about the Hannibal directive – yes, Israel called in the Hannibal directive that day. And right now online the tape of Ben Gvir talking about "we're just going to kill our soldiers, we're going to wipe everybody out". But Haaretz had published an investigation into the military and how they called in a Hannibal directive in December, again of 2023. Right from the start, you had one of the generals actually saying right after October 7th, "this looks like it was a mass Hannibal".

And then Haaretz investigation where they interviewed high top level military officials right down to the people in Apache helicopters that you're talking about, and they all confirmed, yes, we killed civilians. That was in the Israeli media. Widely available, of course, to any of our establishment media, legacy media, to anybody who wanted to read. Today, still, the US establishment media has never corrected that record and told the truth about October 7th, told the American public what really happened on October 7th, because of course that perfect origin narrative of Hamas going in on October 7th, and as the mantra goes, brutally killing Israeli, mostly civilians, and taking 200 hostages or 250 hostages, was the phrase that justified any single thing that Israel had done. They would bomb apartment buildings, the Jabalia massacre, the Flour Massacre – the media would repeat at some point in those stories, "this is in retaliation for the Hamas attack of October 7th. Israel says they're doing this to protect themselves after the horrible attack of October 7th". So it doesn't work so well as persuasion if you say, well we don't really know how many Hamas killed on October 7th, we know that our own military killed quite a few of our own civilians. So that doesn't work quite as well.

DL: Yeah. Another issue you raise that gets far too little coverage in the discussion about pro-Israel propaganda is undeclared conflicts of interest. Your book cites some particularly notorious examples of, for example, highly influential figures in the US media having a strong connection to the Israeli military and saying absolutely nothing about it. Could you

talk to us about, not just that type of undeclared conflict of interest, but any other undeclared conflicts of interest which you found in the course of your research.

RA: One of the first content analyses was done by FAIR of the Sunday morning programs. And in fact it was a content analysis that covered a certain period of time right in the beginning of who was being invited onto the set to speak about this. And it was the same people that we saw throughout the War on Terror, and then in Afghanistan, actually, and in Ukraine, in which I wrote about this for Project Censored. The airways are filled throughout the first half of the 20th century, really, with ex-military officials who now are invested in the military industrial complex. They're heading up these weapons manufacturers, things like that. So the people who were invited were politicians. And there were exactly three Palestinians with over 50 presentations and repeated visitors to these programs that were ex-politicians or ex-military people. So that's who was providing commentary.

And they hand over their airways to basically people whose whole world view is about war, it's about belligerency. All they talk about is we need violent retaliation, we need war, we need to use our weapons. They actually sometimes say, "we need to use our weapons". So in general, about any news coverage of war, we don't have a position which talks about humanitarian principles, or peace, or alternatives to war, such as diplomacy. It is not in our establishment. I almost said "mainstream" there. It is simply not part of their language. I point this out in my chapter about the student protests and the student encampments, particularly at Columbia and what we know about what the students were doing when they were gathered together to mourn what was happening and to make sense of it to themselves. And they were what I call a beloved community. And in some of our alternative and independent media we're talking about, this is about love. When they unfurled that banner saying Hind's Hall, named after the five-year-old girl who was brutally murdered in January 2024, they knew what was happening. And they were grieving her. And it was a banner of love, as one journalist wrote in *The Intercept*. And they didn't and do not have language that protects civilians or even cautions, that, gosh, war isn't really about victory or democracy, it's kind of really about death. And all of these weapons are really very deadly. They do not talk about that. They don't warn about the dangers to civilians and the slaughter of civilians. And they never really talked about that in the beginning. They never charged Israel with disproportionate violence or killing civilians. It was always "Israel went in to get Hamas". Oh, okay, so they killed 400 civilians just to get one Hamas commander. That is against every rule of war. But the establishment media conveniently never spoke about the rules of war because it simply isn't in their lexicon.

DL: You know, in my experience – far too much experience in the corporate world, Robin – but in my experience in a corporate world, it's standard for large corporations, particularly in the media, to have internal codes of ethics. And declaring one's conflicts of interest is just a standard part of any sort of run-of-the-mill corporate code of ethics. These large media corporations in the United States, like New York Times, CNN and so forth – did they not have codes of ethics requiring the disclosure of conflicts of interest? Or do they simply ignore them and never enforce them when it suits their political purposes?

RA: Well, I did come across one public editor at The Times who reviewed the fact that David Brooks – let's just talk about the Jerusalem Bureau for a minute, the New York Times Jerusalem Bureau. That bureau, what we've identified, is geostructural conflict of interest. That bureau in Jerusalem, in a fancy Jerusalem neighborhood, is built on top of a house that a Palestinian journalist who used to work for the BBC had to flee during the Nakba with his family in a taxi. And they left that place because they felt under attack and indeed they had marauding gangs at that point. They were terrorists. You had marauding gangs at that point terrorizing Arabs. They killed 15,000. They displaced 150,000 during the Nakba. And those people left. That is where the Jerusalem Bureau is. It's on top of this house.

So if you think about, for example, the coverage of the Right to Return, 2018, the Right to Return marches that lasted for almost a year, when they shot down nonviolent peaceful Palestinians at the wall, protesting their exclusion and demanding the right to return – it was a huge enterprise. And it was planned and promoted by civil societies in Gaza and civil groups. It wasn't even Hamas-led. They killed almost 300 of them. They warranted 33,000 of them – that was the right to return. It puts the New York Times with their bureau on top of a house that Palestinians had to flee right in the middle of that conflict of interest. How are they going to cover that? And I can tell you they didn't do a very good job. And meanwhile, you had the Human Rights Watch and you had Amnesty International documenting that and saying Israel's response needs to be presented in front of foreign investigation in the International Court of Justice. Israel was already breaking international law well before October 7th. So that's why this arbitrary origin date of October 7th was always designed to create a particular encapsulated narrative where everything that Israel did was going to be in response to Hamas.

But I'm glad you went back to conflict of interest because just their bureau chiefs – I have a chapter in the book called The Compromised Media Landscape, which arguably is mostly about the New York Times – but their bureau chiefs also, Jodi Rudoren, Eric [Ethan] Bronner, were aligned with these seminars that Israel would put on for international young journalists to come so that they could basically be indoctrinated by the Israeli state. And they had them. They took them all around to their usual sightseeing things about how wonderful and mythic Israel was and then they also talked about the horrible dangers they were in by hostile Arabs all surrounding them. We know all of those tropes. And Eric [Ethan] Bronner was one of the people who talked there, who talked to the youthful journalists. So every one of them – Rudoren had landed as a 16-year-old in the city of Jerusalem and she said, oh, what a beautiful city, I love this city, and I want to know so much about it and all its history. And yet she was specifically focused on the Israeli point of view in all of her ideas. When she first got there, she went on Facebook and she told her Facebook friends after she had visited some Palestinians whose family members had been killed from Israeli fire, she told them on Facebook things like – just to show you how absolutely divorced from Palestinian society, she was, she didn't speak Arabic, she didn't know anything – but she'd come back and she said, "you know, even though Israel had fewer casualties, it's almost like they were more traumatized than Palestinians. Palestinians have this culture of martyrdom. I was surprised", she said, and boy was I surprised when I read this, "I was surprised", she said, "that they were

kind of ho-hum about the loss of their family members". So this smacks back to any kind of dehumanization where "these people don't have the same values as we do, they aren't as sensitive as we are". And that's the attitude of the bureau chief in Jerusalem for The New York Times.

DL: Now, these people, some of whom you've mentioned, these more influential figures in the US media – I'll name a few who are particularly aggressive in promoting Israel: Dana Bash at CNN, a Wolf Blitzer, Sean Hannity over at Fox, of course, there's Bari Weiss, who's assumed an incredibly powerful role in the US media landscape. It's bad enough that they are promoting genocidal propaganda, but they are paid fabulous sums of money to do the things that they do. Can you give us a sense of the kinds of incomes these people are making? I don't think people really understand how obscenely they are paid, people like the ones I just mentioned.

RA: Well, I mean, I'm sure Bari Weiss was given \$150 million for that horrible Free Press page that nobody was subscribed to. And right there it was a big giveaway for her. But we know that anchor salaries are so disproportionate. And we've also known in media studies that they are completely divorced from what is happening with the American public. They are removed from the struggles, the economic struggles, of the working class in this country. We know that. And we also know that they are in a propaganda bubble. They have a standardized media frame that they follow for years. And, you know, you'll start to believe that stuff if you don't allow yourself to look at the footage or compare your work and what you're saying to the truly courageous Palestinian journalists that were on the ground in Gaza being killed by Israel in great numbers. The New York Times wasn't, the anchors and their people. They would occasionally go in and embed with the Israeli military, rarely or actually never telling their audiences, virtually never, that their script was going through Israeli censors. And that's the only conditions upon which they could embed with the Israel military after they went into Al-Shifa hospital and things like that.

But if you think about the ways in which they completely ignored Palestinian journalists and their deaths, it shows you just a kind of a vast gap, a huge schism between journalists who are members of this elite class and journalists who are on the ground struggling with the civilians who are being bombed by that elite class. And many people have asked me: what was with US journalists? How do they ignore the slaughter of Palestinian journalists in Gaza? How do they never talk about them? And we also know that these newsrooms are mostly packed with people of a certain class, but also disproportionately white. And I think these kinds of prejudices are built into newsrooms, these structures of economic inequality and racial disparity. They're built into the newsroom. And we've known that for a long time, and it really manifested itself when Israel went into Gaza, because Israel had been in the United States with their lobbying group, closing down Palestinian voices for decades already in the public sphere and in civil society, and they've been very successful. Right now, Israel is having a massive crisis because they understand that they finally have completely lost the narrative. They're basically dead in the water. They put three-quarters of a billion dollars in March into a new propaganda campaign, in which they start now calling, you'll notice,

instead of ethnic cleansing or "voluntary migration", which the media repeated, a "freedom of movement" for the Palestinians in Lebanon and in Gaza. They are allowing them "freedom of movement". So that's how they're going to get rid of them now. So that doesn't work either.

And what I like about the way you talk in your journalism, you identify what Israel is and what they do, and you identify and you use the language that should be used now for Israel, for Israelis and for the military. And we know full well that they are genocidal brutes, they are engaged in sexual torture as revenge and some kind of sick psychology. We know all that now. And also they can no longer hide behind the discourse of what they used early on to discredit any Palestinian who came on the air or wanted to write an article – the "do you support the state of Israel? Do you think Israel has a right to exist?" And dismantling that proposition, that myth, was started by Francesca Albanese. Francesca Albanese had this wonderful eloquent long answer, but ultimately she said "no state has a right to exist, people have a right to exist". Then Mehdi Hasan said, "if you're going to say Israel has a rights to exist, where are its borders? It's never claimed borders. So what do you mean by 'it has a right to exist? It hasn't ever defined itself. It's now 'Greater Israel'. They're going into Lebanon, Syria, they're doing all of this stuff". This entity, this is a settler colonial entity. It's an ethnostate, they don't really even represent – they say this state is for Jews. They haven't talked to all the diasporic community of Jews around the globe. Do they think that they want Israel to be existing in their names? I think the vast majority at this point, I think, the answer, and certainly it is clearly now in New York City, the answer to that is no.

DL: Certainly outside of Israel, the Jewish community is increasingly appalled by this so-called Jewish state. In any case, I'll close it out, returning to the question I posed at the outset. My own view is especially even stronger now having heard you describe what you found in the course of your research and in the writing of this book. These propagandists for Israel, especially in the West, are key cogs in the genocidal war machine because there has to be a certain degree of, if not public support for these policies, at least acquiescence in these policies. Without that, without broad base support or acquiescent in western government pro-Israel policies, Israel would never get away with these crimes. End of story. They would be held accountable. They wouldn't be receiving economic aid, military aid – all of that would dry up in a heartbeat if people were told the truth. So my own view, Robin, is that it is essential, particularly when people are being handsomely compensated in the Western media to say these lies, it is essentially that there be legal accountability. The authorities should pick two or three particularly prominent, well-compensated, influential, pro-Israel propagandists and make an example of them by prosecuting them for incitement to genocide. That's my own view as a lawyer and as a citizen. Anything you can add in that regard before we sign off today?

RA: Well, my favorite *bête noire* at the New York Times, of course, is Thomas Friedman. And he wrote a piece that really brought back all of the old stereotypes and really repulsive terms about insects and spiders devouring people from the inside and all of that stuff. And he applied that to the Middle East. And Jim Manyika said, this is the fourth level of genocide, because as one genocides studies. And he pointed that out – this is the same terminology that

Nazis use. So there is a connection between Nazi propaganda and Israeli propaganda. And of course, Thomas Friedman was the bureau chief and he presided over the purchase of the bureau at the time. There was one fellow in the Wall Street Journal right after October 7th, whose headline sounded to me a lot like incitement, where the subtitle said, "Israel has the right to eliminate" something like "that sick culture that resides next to them". And he didn't say people. He didn't say Hamas. He said "culture". And to wipe out a people, their identity, their culture, everything about them is genocide. So I believe that that headline could be scrutinized in the future in some legal body.

DL: Indeed. Now, I'm just going to put your book up on the screen again to remind people to look out for Robin's excellent work, *The Complicit Lens*, which came out earlier this year. It also has an introduction by Rashid Khalidi. Where can people find your work? Do you have a Substack, Robin? Are you active on social media? What's the best place for people to find your ongoing work?

RA: Oh gosh, I've written for a lot of outlets now. You can find me at Project Censored dispatch, my latest one was on Project Censored and I make the argument that you just made, why can't we hold Israel accountable to genocide, it's the media, and I made the exact same argument you just make about how, as long as mainstream media is going to continue to okay and condone this genocide, it allows the West and the EU and all of the people who have economic and diplomatic context if they support the state, it allows them to get away with it. And those are really the power structures. They speak to the power structures. Project Censored. I'm on the LA Progressive and CounterPunch. I even went on Informed Comment. And, oh, I got a piece on Jacobin about how clash of civilization underlies what we're living through now. So I have a Substack, but I rarely post my stuff there. I should, I know, but don't. But anyway, if you put Robin Anderson in some of these, on the search engine, you can find some of the stuff I've written recently about the book.

DL: That's great, and we hope that we can have you back on the program to continue our discussion. I'd like to have many more with you about the abject failings of the corporate media. Well, with that we'll be signing off today. So thank you very much. We're signing off. Where are you today, by the way? What part of the world are you in?

DL: Oh, I'm in New York.

RA: You're in New York. Signing off from New York and Montreal on July 21st, 2026.

END

Thank you for reading this transcript. Please don't forget to donate to support our independent and

non-profit journalism:

BANKKONTO:

Kontoinhaber: acTVism München e.V.

Bank: GLS Bank

IBAN: DE89430609678224073600

BIC: GENODEM1GLS

PAYPAL:

E-Mail:

PayPal@acTVism.org

PATREON:

<https://www.patreon.com/acTVism>

BETTERPLACE:

Link: [Click here](#)