

Boston Marathon Bombing a Bush-Cheney Conspiracy?

☒ The father of the Tsarnaev brothers was interviewed in Russia, and an aunt was interviewed in Canada. Both claimed that the boys were framed, that this whole thing was a setup.

They may not know it, but they have set the table for America's vast horde of conspiracy theorists. I imagine that these wackos are combing their imaginations right now, and that in the days just ahead they will favor us with their speculations.

Do you need a little food for thought, guys? Glad to provide some.

First of all, we have to implicate Dick Cheney in this. We know that with George W. Bush's approval he masterminded the charade on Sept. 11, 2001, in which 19 kindly, lovable Al-Qaeda militants were framed for the destruction of the World Trade Center and the severe damage to the Pentagon. The plot involved all law-enforcement agents of the United States, all Republican members of Congress, the entire Bush administration, and Fox News. Oh, and did I mention Israel?

Some say that the U.S. establishment may not actually have executed the 9/11 attacks themselves, but that they had full information about the plot, and that they let it happen because they knew they could use it as a pretext to remove Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq. Either way, it is Cheney's fault, and Bush's, and the Tea Party's. And perhaps, though this is not certain, the pro-Life evangelicals and Rick Santorum. And a substantial portion of the people who are against same-sex marriage. And let's throw in Mitt Romney, just in case.

This incident in Boston is essentially a repeat of that

scenario. We are not blaming President Obama or anybody in the present administration for this. Once again, we are blaming Bush and Cheney. They are both retired, with too much time on their hands, so they began looking around for ways to harm their fellow citizens, a task at which they are masters.

At the suggestion of a white-supremacist militia leader who lives nearby, Cheney decided some months ago to kill and injure a substantial portion of the participants and fans who planned to attend the Boston Marathon. The plot was given extra gravitas because of the Marathon's proximity to Patriot's Day. Patriot's Day, which commemorates the battles at Lexington and Concord in 1775, has been a rallying point for white supremacists, because many of the people who fought for the Colonies in those battles owned slaves.

Cheney, who is believed to surreptitiously keep slaves on his cotton farm in Wyoming, thought it would be especially appropriate to conduct a terrorist attack on the Boston Marathon because Massachusetts is a blue state.

Then how, you may wonder, did the dupes in law enforcement come to the conclusion that the explosions at the Marathon were detonated by two obscure young men wearing baseball caps?

The preliminary explanation is that in fact the bombs were planted with the cooperation of George Bush's two daughters. They are known to have visited the lingerie counter at Lord & Taylor, adjoining the Marathon route, not long before the race began. While the sales staff was making a fuss over them, their bodyguards slipped away and planted a phony tape in the store's surveillance camera. The tape showed the two fall guys, the Tsarnaev brothers, walking along a sidewalk carrying backpacks. There is nothing illegal about walking, or even carrying backpacks!

As to who actually planted the bombs, the principal suspects are Clarence Thomas and John Boehner, although the list of

suspects can be expanded to include Marco Rubio, Ted Cruz or Rand Paul if any of them seems likely to win the GOP presidential nomination next time. President Obama, who is aware of the speculation about a conspiracy in Boston, strongly favors a scenario in which Boehner would be implicated. Some of the more level-headed people in his inner circle have opposed this theory, saying that it is dubious, and that without proof it could turn out to be a lie.

To which Obama is said to have replied: "Lie, shmie, as long as it helps elect Democrats."

Is "Liar" the New "Racist"?

☒ During the Bush era, it used to drive me nuts when I'd hear an obnoxious Democratic politician or pundit on television emphatically insisting that George W. Bush had "lied" about *Weapons of Mass Destruction* to take us to war in Iraq. It didn't seem to matter how many fellow Democrats in congress had drawn the same conclusion as Bush did from the national intelligence reports. It didn't seem to matter how many other countries' intelligence agencies drew the same conclusion as ours did. It didn't seem to matter that the Clinton administration had made the same claim. The notion that Bush "lied" was mainstreamed through the media and became conventional wisdom among many on the left. For whatever reason, it wasn't good enough for them to accept that the administration was *wrong*. Their battle-cry was that Bush *lied*, despite no proof to substantiate that conclusion.

Whether it was a calculated political tactic or an emotionally-driven narrative fueled by hate, the Republican brand was certainly damaged by those who alleged that Bush was

an inherently heartless liar who threw away American lives for U.S. oil interests.

Conservatives certainly didn't forgive and forget the over-the-top rhetoric.

Right-leaning pundits have recently been employing a similar tactic against President Obama, insisting that he "lied" when he projected that our national unemployment rate would be around 5.5% right now as a result of his economic stimulus program. As we know, the U.S. unemployment rate has yet to fall below 8% since Obama took office, and 8% was the number he told us we'd never rise above in the first place. A failure? Yes. But I wince when I hear fellow conservatives play the *liar card*. They might believe they're warranted in doing so, based on the amount of flack that Bush took, but they're wrong.

A "lie" is a false statement made with *deliberate* intent to deceive. It's important for society that people understand and accept that.

I'm as harsh of a critic as anyone when it comes to the Obama administration's ridiculous economic policies, but I don't doubt for a second that President Obama's economic forecast in 2009 was the result of him and his administration being dangerously naive... Not inherently dishonest. Why should I dispute that he believed his bold act of throwing a trillion dollars into the economy, regardless of how irresponsible and reckless the delegation of funds were, would magically fix everything? It's the kind of belief that most fiscal-liberals share, because they have no understanding of macroeconomics and how the free market works. No politician in their right mind would *knowingly* concoct such a politically damaging, false prediction when the actuality would surface before their re-election campaign.

Now, I'm not suggesting at all that politicians don't lie. Of

course they do. They do it all the time. For many of them, it's like second nature. And when they're caught spreading a lie, they should absolutely be taken to the woodshed, publicly shamed, and held accountable. However, they don't typically suffer any significant backlash for knowingly spreading untruths. It's the reason why Nancy Pelosi can publicly insist that she was unaware of terrorists being water-boarded by our government. It's the reason why the Obama re-election campaign can continue putting out ads accusing Mitt Romney of things he never did.

Barefaced lies are often met with public indifference, and I think part of the reason why is that accusing someone of lying has become nearly as mundane as accusing someone of being a racist.

Labeling someone as a "racist" used to be a serious charge reserved only for those who have displayed unequivocally racist behavior. Yet, the accusation has largely become a simple tool to silence opposing viewpoints, and is thrown around so routinely and recklessly in our public discourse that many people don't take the claims seriously anymore. It's a real shame because racism absolutely exists, but legitimate claims have been marginalized because "wolf" has been cried far too many times.

Calling someone a liar is nearly as damaging of a charge, because like racism it goes right to an individual's character. Personal character is important in our country – perhaps now more than ever in a political environment where true integrity is rarely witnessed.

For whatever reason, people don't yet seem *quite* as comfortable calling someone a liar as they do a racist (which is odd considering that being a racist has more serious connotations), but as a deficit of shame in our society persists, I'm sure that will change.

I want accusations of racism and dishonesty to actually mean something again. That will only happen when we demand legitimacy behind such claims. Unfortunately, we're not engaged enough as a society to make that happen.