# THE FOLLIES OF PIERS MORGAN

*Posted on October 25, 2024 by Keghart*

**Category:** Opinions

**By Garcia Wilde**, 24 October 2024

It has been a dismal year with a caravan of villains and mendacious actors who have populated the airwaves and polluted them in the process. The villains came in several sizes. In the large-size, four-star category were Israeli Prime Minister Benyamin Netanyahu, his genocidal cabinet, Defense Minister Yoav Gallant, and former Israeli PM Naftali Bennett. The hypocritical Biden cabinet also belongs in the big league of villains. There have also been midget villains. People like Jeffrey Epstein's revolting lawyer (Alan Dershowitz) and a lunatic loudmouth named Rabbi Shmuley who was once the spiritual adviser of aberrant Michael Jackson. Then there is the British, including such luminaries as the facile dark angel Douglas Murray, harridan TV interviewer Julia Hartley Brewer, former British Prime Minister Boris Johnson….and lugubrious, mushy-mouth Piers Morgan whose real name is O'Meara but he changed it after his father's death and adopted the name of his mother's brand-new husband.

At the best of times, Morgan has had a checkered journalistic career. He has been fired several times, has edited salacious publications such as *The News of the World* and other tabloids. He has injected racism into one of the newspapers he had edited. That resulted in the British press board to condemn him for breaking the "journalistic code of conduct." Unrepentant, Morgan has continued to ignore journalistic canons.

There's reason to believe that when Morgan kicks the bucket, his gravestone will ask: "Do you condemn Hamas for Oct. 7?" For more than a year now, whenever Morgan interviews anyone sympathetic to the Palestinian justified cause to get rid of fascist settlers who occupy Arab Palestine, he starts by asking: "Do you condemn Oct. 7 as a terrorist act?"

Obviously, for O'Meara-Morgan history began on Oct. 7, 2023. Otherwise, why would he ignore the preceding 76 years when Israel grabbed Arab Palestine, drove out 750,000 to 900,000 Palestinian civilians into the desert and to refugee camps, killed hundreds of thousands of Palestinians, and turned into hell the life of surviving Palestinians? It's tiresome old stuff to Morgan to recognize Israeli brutality and the fact that the Zionists ruined the lives of millions by turning them into homeless refugees. As we know, Israel also converted the Gaza Strip into the world's largest (2.5 million residents) concentration camp.

According to Morgan, there was peace and truce between Hamas and Israel before Hamas attacked on Oct. 7. The facts? There was no peace. Two weeks earlier, the IDF has shot in the ankles of a large number of Gaza youth while Israeli planes had bombed Gaza.

Morgan is "appalled" by the "heinous, barbaric, monstrous…" attack of Hamas when 1,200 people were killed. He doesn't say that about 400 of the dead were IDF (Israeli Defense Forces) armed soldiers and that many civilians were killed by IDF helicopters and tanks per Israel's notorious Hannibal Doctrine. The directive orders Israelis to kill an Israeli if they believe the latter is about to be captured. Hamas had no intention to kill civilians: the militant group's mission was to take hostages

to swap them for 10,000 civilian Palestinians illegally held in Israeli prisons where they were regularly tortured. Why kill Israelis when you plan to swap them for Palestinians? Hamas' plan was sabotaged when Israel unleashed its Hannibal Doctrine.

While he mourns the death of Israelis, Morgan is blind and deaf to IDF's killing of 500 Lebanese civilians in a single day. His manner, his facial expression, his choice of words clearly signal that the death of 1,200 Israelis is a far greater crime than Israel's killing of 40,000 (some say as many as 180,000) Palestinians, including 15,000 children. "Morgan" means sea in Welsh. Yes, Morgan is at sea when the subject is Arab victimhood for 76 years.

The dunderhead pro-Zionist propagandist has the temerity to say the Hamas-Hezbollah-Houti attack on Israel was an existential threat to the Zionist entity. Of course he knows that the combined resistance army has about 60,000 fighters. Morgan must know that Israel has a standing army of 170,000 soldiers, 465,000 reserves, and 8,000 militiamen. Israel also has 581 aircraft, 2,200 tanks, 128 helicopters, an unknown number of cannons, rocket launchers, all supported by high-end electronic and spying paraphernalia. Hamas-Hezbollah have 60,000 fighters. No planes, no tanks, no ships. Some existential threat.

When Morgan criticizes Hamas, he refuses to mention that Israel helped create Hamas, as a counterpoint to the Palestine Authority and nourished it by allowing billions of dollars of donations from the Gulf be handed to Hamas. Morgan also doesn't mention that "terrorist" Hezbollah was founded as Lebanese civilian resistance to the 18-year occupation of Lebanon by Israel.

The illegal occupation of the West Bank by 750,000 Israeli settlers is a secondary issue for Morgan although it signals Israel's illegal annexation of the West Bank.

The bias, the inconsistency, ignoring the inconvenient truth, the double standard continues… Russia invaded Ukraine but Israel didn't invade Palestine; Israel has the right to defend itself but not the Palestinians. He says the Palestinian foe is at the doorstep of Israel. What about the presence of the world's sixth strongest army at the doorstep of Palestinians?

When losing a debate, Morgan has a standby gimmick to salvage himself. He would utter: "You and I know that what you're saying is not true" or "People around the world watching you would now wonder about what you just said" or "we can all agree that what you say is not accurate."

When he is defeated in an argument, Morgan says: "It's not true" or "it's complicated" or "there will always be civilian casualties in war."

Amazingly for a journalist, he craves plaudits by boasting that he "tries to be fair to both sides." A bouquet of wilted roses are on their way, Piers.

Because his ignorance and his bias are clear as his lugubrious intonation, he is easily cornered by deft debaters such as the amazing Mahdi Hasan and British rap singer Lokey. The pair ran circles around a flustered Morgan.

While pro-Palestinian guests are given short shrift and a brief time for their interview, Morgan becomes an expansive, friendly, and understanding host when the guest is from Israel. His modus operandi is to toss soft ball questions, give the guest all the time in the world, and be embarrassingly respectful of the PR oracles of Tel Aviv. When he "interviewed" Naftali Bennett, the far right former prime minister of Israel, his first question was: "How comfortable are you with the way Israel is conducting the war?"

For many years, Morgan was an employee of arch-Zionist and media mogul Rupert Murdoch who for years pretended he was an Australian patriot although his heart beat for Zion. Murdoch has donated large sums of money to Israel, including to the organization which promotes Israeli settlements on Palestinian lands. A few weeks ago, Hasan asked Morgan whether he would condemn his godfather. Morgan refused to condemn Murdoch and repeatedly protested: "What's it got to do with me?" Yes, indeed. Why would the man professing to exude truth, integrity, and professionalism condemn his criminal sugar daddy?

Finally, Morgan hates to mention that Israel knew a YEAR before OCTOBER 7 that Hamas was planning an attack. He hates to mention that Egypt and Saudi Arabia had warned Israel of an impending attack. He hates to mention that even Israeli soldiers at the Gaza wall told their superiors that Hamas seemed to be planning something drastic. Israel ignored the warnings because Tel Aviv was looking for an excuse to occupy and annex Gaza. These are facts Morgan hates to discuss.

Morgan would never acknowledge that what he prefers to discuss is slanted CONSEQUENCES and not the true the ORIGINS of the conflict. As a citizen of Britain he should also be circumspect when he blames Palestinian freedom fighters when the root cause of the conflict is imperial Britain which opened the doors to colonialist European Jews to settle in Palestine against the rightful wishes of the indigenous Palestinians.

*****

# Comments

**Garcia Wilde** – 2024-10-30 06:38:40
Reply to Zaven Kalayjian's incomprehensible comment: In his "response" to my article, Mr. Kalayjian focuses on the rivalry of "capitalist and imperialists" versus "Marxism/socialism/indigism." He finds the latter wanting and assumes I am an adherent. This is a deplorable misreading of the article when one considers that none of these political ideologies are even mentioned in the article. The essay is a critique of Piers Morgan and in particular his bias against the Palestinians. Mr. Kalayjian, please read the article again. While you are at it, check the definition of "extrapolation" in the dictionary. By the way, "indigism" is not a word. Finally, if you think your play on my last name ("Wilde's wild ideas...") is witty, think again.

**Zaven Kalayjian** – 2024-10-29 16:48:39

Garcia Wilde's critique of Morgan is an amusing example of revolutionary rantings against the usual suspects of imperialism/colonialism/Zionism-Nationalism. Yet this 'unholy trinity' is only the tails-side of the power coin that is constantly flipping in the air of international politics. It will never land. Tomorrow, when mendacious actors and villains representing the other unholy trinity (Marxism/socialism/indiginism) are chopping down tens of millions in the name of progress and utopia, it will be the capitalists and imperialists who will resist and come to the rescue, as they did in the 20th century. Neither side has a better claim to the moral high ground. However, in my opinion, when it comes to a more accurate analysis of human nature and behavior that leads to measurably healthier and happier lives, capitalist/imperialists do much better than Marxists. Free competition and democratic governance have propelled society much further toward harmonious prosperity than any Communist's fever dream. Not perfectly, by any stretch, but much more humanely than the 20th c. Marxist poster-children who actually achieved enough power to do anything of significance toward their version of utopia, i.e. Stalin, Mao, Castro, etc. (Yes, those guys again...) In Wilde's echo chamber, chants of "imperialism" and "colonialism" may mean something. In international politics, these words are empty and devoid of moral judgment. They represent only preference for a side. But, unfortunately for Wilde and his audience, moral principles do not actually influence international politics. There is only power. Sometimes morality aligns with power; sometimes, not. I don't know why Wilde's wild ideas find their way into Keghart, and that more frequently than I'd like. But, as a small and weak (economically and militarily) nation, it serves us Armenians NOTHING to chime in with the Marxists OR the Imperialists. Whiny and ridiculous voices coming from centers of weakness don't make a difference in the international arena - only military and economic strength matters. Better we not make enemies unnecessarily of powerful nations by loudly condemning something or someone that represents, ultimately and merely, arbitrary principles of human organization that are flip-sides of the same damnable coin. In a word: Piers Morgan/Israel/the West couldn't care less about the rantings of Garcia Wilde. Armenians should care less, too.

**Keith Garebian** – 2024-10-29 00:36:44

Garcia Wilde captures accurately all the imperial arrogance of a faux-journalist who is vastly proud of his pompous prejudices that spectacularly illustrate some reasons why Britain deserved to lose its Empire.