

Those Worried About the Bomber's Skin Color Need Help



David Sirota

In the wake of the terrorist attack in Boston this week, there are plenty of things that Americans are worrying about. They're worrying about the surviving victims who are suffering terribly from life-changing injuries, and those who are clinging to life. They're worrying about the families of the victims, and the pain they're going through right now. They're worrying about the possibility of follow-up attacks and whether or not they're safe when they attend public events. They're worrying about the ability of our law-enforcement agencies to find the person or persons responsible and stop them before they can hurt anyone else.

Certain people, however, are worried about something quite a bit different – something that doesn't particularly make sense at a time when our nation is reeling from an unspeakable act of violence. They're worried about what color the bomber's skin is.

David Sirota of *Salon* is one of those people. He wrote a column soon after the bombing that's been getting a lot of attention, primarily for its mind-numbing headline: "Let's hope the Boston Marathon bomber is a white American."

The average person would probably read that headline and ask themselves why *anyone* would 'hope' for such a thing. They'd probably also wonder why one race would be preferable to another in defining a monster who is responsible for the death and suffering of many innocent victims.

For those of us paying close attention to the ideological

clashes that go on in our country every day, however, Sirota's viewpoint actually isn't all that surprising. In fact, it's pretty darned predictable. He's a very liberal guy who writes for a very liberal publication. And like some on the far-left, he fears that if someone from an ethnic minority commits the kind of act we saw in Boston, our *fundamentally racist society* will collectively target the entire ethnicity as being responsible for the atrocity.

Because, after all, that's what we do in modern-day America... Right? Remember how we indiscriminately chased down Muslim-looking people after 9/11 and held them responsible for the deaths of nearly 3,000 victims? Yeah, I don't remember that either.

Still, Sirota is very concerned about this. So much so that he hopes that the bomber is a *white guy*, because white guys have what Sirota calls "white male privilege". This means that other white guys won't be held responsible for the acts committed by one white guy.

I know this sounds a little confusing, but believe me, it makes sense to a certain type of person.

Others in the media have expressed similar concerns in the past, including *Newsweek's* Evan Thomas. When Nidal Malik Hasan was identified as the shooter in the Fort Hood massacre back in 2009, Thomas expressed dismay in the revelation of Hasan's ethnicity.

"I cringe that he's a Muslim," said Thomas. "I mean, because it inflames all the fears. I think he's probably just a nut case. But with that label attached to him, it will get the right wing going and it just – I mean these things are tragic, but that makes it much worse."

Ah yes, the obligatory *right wing* – those knuckle-dragging morons who are completely incapable of distinguishing between a murderous terrorist and those who merely share a common

ethnicity with him. Oh brother.

While the ethnic-blame narrative is largely based on a straw-man argument, there's something deeper going on here. People hoping (whether they admit it or not) that the Boston bomber is *white* are looking at this horrific event through a prism of *white guilt* instead of through a prism of morality. They're prioritizing social justice over actual justice. They're seemingly more interested in *potential* victims (brought on by what they view as a culturally-insensitive society) than they are in the *actual* victims of a heinous bombing.

Of course, people like David Sirota can't offer up any compelling evidence to warrant their concerns. That doesn't stop them, however, from believing they are the *enlightened ones* for presuming that the prejudices of Americans *less evolved* than themselves will inevitably lead to the assignment of blame to an ethnic collective, rather than to an individual and a network of that individual's associates.

I find it fascinating that someone who fancies himself as an intellectual, as Sirota clearly does, doesn't see the irony of it all. He clearly views America as still being tainted with strong ethnic bigotry, but he doesn't realize that in preferring a terrorist who has "white male privilege" he has adopted a mindset pulled directly from our country's dark racial past.

American history is riddled with examples of people who convinced themselves that a perpetrator needed to be of a certain race in the interest of preserving cultural stability. Is that really a legacy that some liberals want to associate themselves with now?

Not everything has to be part of some social narrative. Rather than hoping for the bomber to meet a certain profile, we should all be investing our hopes in his or her capture.

Obama Compliments a Woman; Feminists Offended



Perhaps you've heard about the incredibly insensitive remark President Obama made the other day – the one that not only showed how indecent men can be, including even a progressive man like the president, but how words can be used as weapons to inflict great pain.

I'm referring to the ugly comment the president made about women. The comment he had to apologize for. Yes that comment: He said the attorney general of California – one Kamala Harris – was attractive.

Oh, the humanity!!!

The president was at his millionth fundraiser outside San Francisco when he said Ms. Harris was “the best-looking attorney general in the country.” What, in God's name, was this brute thinking?

Never mind that it's true, that she is the best-looking attorney general in the country, or that he had already said that Ms. Harris was “brilliant” and that “she is dedicated and she is tough” before saying she was also attractive. Never mind that he did not say, “The girl is smokin'” or “That babe is hot.”

What he did say was enough – enough, that is, to get liberal feminist panties in a knot.

 Mika Brzezinski, for one, on MSNBC was not pleased. On Morning Joe she said, “It just divides women and it just

divides people up to separate them by looks and probably was a little ham-fisted. I just think the whole thing, the whole dynamic about women and their looks puts women under a lot of stress that they don't need."

This, we should note, is coming from a woman who is a television host precisely because of her looks. It certainly isn't because of her depth. And if you don't believe me, just listen to her for two seconds. (That's Mika in the nearby picture showing not only leg but also how concerned she is about separating women by looks.)

Columnist Robin Abcarian wrote on the Web site of The Los Angeles Times that the comment was "more wolfish than sexist," and "may be a little problem he needs to work on."

Great idea! Maybe he could "work on" his "little problem" in between trying to finally get the economy up and running after more than 4 years in office and dealing with the North Korean whack job who keeps promising to blow us up with one of his nuclear weapons.

Joan Walsh, a left-wing member of the chattering class who if she wore pants would be Chris Mathews wrote on Salon that "my stomach turned over" when she heard about the comment. "Those of us who've fought to make sure that women are seen as more than ornamental – and that includes the president – should know better than to rely on flattering the looks of someone as formidable as Harris," she said.

None of this particularly interests me. I, like many of you, have come to understand how shallow liberal feminists can be; how they derive power by either being hurt or by faking it; how they love to wallow in their perceived victimhood. They see themselves as strong women. In fact, they're just the opposite, offended by every little slight, real or imagined. If a guy behaved that way he'd be called a sissy.

What does interest me is the president's apology, which was made for cowardly political reasons. Liberal Democrats count on the support of liberal women. So if even a few liberal women are upset, instead of telling them to Man Up – (wouldn't that be great?) – you apologize and to hell with your manhood.

Take a good look at the New Man, who really isn't that new anymore. He came out of the feminist movement, a movement that did a lot of good not just for women and girls, but for all of us. But it also turned more than a few men, who wanted to show just how down with the cause they were, into pandering wimps.

Memo to POTUS: Here's what a "real man" – the kind you'll find on Mad Men – would have said when the feminists started in with their predictable whining, over a compliment no less: "SHUT. UP."

And before any of those fragile women breaks down in tears, he might have added this: "Kamala Harris isn't complaining. And you know why? Because every woman in America – and 99 percent of the men – like it when someone says, 'Hey, you're attractive.' That's how we humans are wired. There's nothing wrong with complimenting a woman on her good looks, even if she is an attorney general or has any other job outside the house."

Instead, the president calls Ms. Harris and apologizes – *for paying her a compliment*. Frankly, I worry more about the fate of the nation because of New Men like that than I worry about what the aforementioned whack job in North Korea might do to us.

As for Mika and the other gals: If they don't like compliments on their looks, fine, we'll never say you look nice ever again. Happy? Now do us one small favor: Shut. Up.