

They Didn't Smell Cheney's Breath!

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

February 16, 2006

Did it occur to you, that almost everything which Vice-President Cheney said about the events of the past weekend, was almost a complete lie? What is Cheney really trying to hide with that utterly unbelievable *mea culpa* told to Brit Hume?

To begin with, Vice President Dick Cheney is, clinically, as his "*virtù*," a pathological liar. On this, consider as probable evidence the following tidbit from a report written by *EIR* economic analyst John Hoefle:

"Media Matters for America reported that Katharine Armstrong told the 2/14 *Washington Post* that she, her mother Anne Armstrong, and her sister, Sara Storey Armstrong Hixon, decided on Sunday morning after breakfast to report the shooting incident to the media."

Which should be believed: Cheney or Katharine Armstrong? Take the rest of his belated statement to Brit Hume, et al. There is no part of Cheney's tale (or, should we say, "tail") which has standing when the source of his utterance is taken into consideration.

It is not merely that he lies; lies fall from his lips like a species of feces from the flipping tail of a hippopotamus. This behavioral pattern of his is, specifically, clinically psychopathic. Without rhyme or reason, he just lies and lies and lies and lies. It is as if feces were his species!

But, after that is said: What really happened that Saturday? Why did Cheney's party go to such extraordinary lengths to prevent the sheriff's men from smelling his breath on his way on from the ranch that day? Was the day spent only as a shooting party?

The point is, that in any case of a potentially fatal shooting under the publicly stated conditions of the day, one thing law enforcement must do as soon as possible, is to check for possible intoxication. Were Cheney inebriated during that day, he had to bluff his way past any contact with law enforcement until such time as the effects of alcoholic intake had been washed out of his system. According to the initial report issued, the Sheriff's department was not allowed to approach Cheney.

Take all the statement from Cheney's own side into account. Present that to a body of experts. Is that statement believable to any body of experts in relevant forms of gunnery practice? Look at the significance of the Katherine Armstrong

statement as reported by Media Matters for America. What might be the significance of the gap between the time, on Saturday, Cheney is reported to have left the premises of the ranch and the time, on Sunday, when Katherine Armstrong decided to call the "media"? Why did Karl Rove et al. hold back the press release available to be issued on Saturday evening?

Not Only in China

Character Tells: Cheney's Doom

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

February 15, 2006

Apparently, most of the Democratic politicians have not yet come out from under the stupor of the sudden capitulation to Alito's nomination. This time, on the issue of cowardly Cheney's shooting his victim, it is the TV's nightly comedians, not the elected politicians, who are closest to the world's current political realities. Which is to say that the famous Democratic donkey, which should have responded immediately to this issue, needs a solid kick in the party's ass.

It could be said to Cheney, as the character in *The Iceman Cometh* said to first hearing of the shocking truth, "Hickey, you took the life out of the booze!" Cheney, you took the life out of the beer served before the shooting started that ominous Saturday afternoon.

What set Cheney up for the political chop in these events, and also the career of that Lady Macbeth to which he is married, was the way he displayed his utter lack of personal moral character, and of just plain guts, in both his shooting of his victim, and in the way he reacted, on reflex, to attempt to cover up the truth about the incident. Cheney's reaction to his folly, was a flood of the most immediately obvious kind of pathetic whimpering, wild evasion, and outright lying which he has shown in any public appearances since his January 2001 inauguration. The TV comedians here, and in other parts of the world, got the smell of the situation in their nostrils as soon as the story broke. The leadership of the Democrats in the Congress apparently did not.

According to every account supplied, Cheney turned and shot the man coming up behind him in the line of march. It was just that simple. Forget the spin. Then, as the circumstantial and other related evidence shows clearly, he attempted an

immediate cover-up of the event, taking steps to attempt to prevent press attention, or law enforcement reaction to the event. According to all credible accounts, the White House knew, but kept the public lid on the development until Karl Rove & Company, deigned to inform the White House press spokesman only shortly before what was a credibly astonished McClellan went out to meet the clamor of an energetic press corps.

Whether Cheney knew that there was a companion coming behind him, into the line of fire, is irrelevant. Cheney apparently says no; but no one has any reason to believe Cheney on that count, either. Firing in the direction of someone behind you in the line of march of the hunters, is pretty close to a case of “fragging.” Perhaps Cheney did not consciously intend to shoot Whittington personally, but in his lust to kill a bird, Cheney didn’t care whether Whittington was in his line of fire, or not. Cheney acted in the grip of his malicious passion of that movement, a passion which prompted him to break, passionately, the most elementary safety rule of that day’s hunt.

Cowardly Cheney lost it in the clinches, as he always will. This time the cowardice of the mafia hit-man type showed through the bully’s mask.

Cheney’s public statement has not helped his case at all. The statement is obviously simply a typical Cheney evasion of the point at issue, with Cheney caught, this time, with his hand in the cookie-jar of political history. The sheer cowardice of the pattern of evasion and lying in Cheney’s trail from the exit gates of the Armstrong ranch, reveals the innermost character of the man. The stench of that moral depravity, like the blood on Lady Macbeth’s hand, will not go away.

Simply, as perhaps nearly everyone of relevance at the White House knows, the time has come for Cheney to go, and take his “Lady Macbeth” with him. Shakespeare was right, after all. Cheney’s career is doomed. His stinking political pelt is there for anyone who might wish to take it as a trophy. Whew!

That much is obvious to any chivalrous TV comedian looking at these events from as far away as Germany’s nightly Harald Schmidt.

The issue is no longer really Cheney. The issue is the guts, or lack thereof, of leading, past and present, elected Democrats. This is no time for them to whimper and sniff at the sides of lampposts and fireplugs. The most crucial issue in world politics and strategy today, is the fact that Cheney is ripe for the political trash can. Get rid of him, Democrats, before the stench of continued Cheney presence in his present office, attaches itself to you!

Cheney, with this deed you have disgusted us all. It is time for you to go, and take the dwindling ranks of your admirers with you. This is one time, the President should whisper into Cheney’s ear: “You have become a personal embarrassment to me. It is time for you to go.”

Shoot, Look, & Listen

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

February 13, 2006

What Cheney did at the Armstrong Ranch this past weekend was once called “friendly fire.” Technically, cases of “friendly fire” include not only the companion shot in the face, but the cases of, for one, the shooter limping back from the battle to the aid-station after shooting himself in the foot, or, the other case, of the fellow eligible for the Vietnam draft, who avoided service for yet another time, by a miraculously timely impregnation of his wife. Both interpretations are appropriate for what Cheney tried to cover up this past weekend, after apparently mistaking his Republican ally for a flock of birds on Saturday. All come under the heading of “friendly fire.” Shakespeare would advise, “Keep Cheney away from his rival, President Bush.” Time to take his guns away from him, before he kills more innocent birds, and people, too.

Evasion like that perpetrated by Vice-Cheney, over the matter of the Saturday shooting incident, is not only a case of implicitly fraudulent negligence. It expresses a form of lying. Cheney lied in inducing the U.S. Senate to support what is still the ongoing asymmetric warfare in Iraq; Cheney is lying again—some would say, habitually—about the urgency of launching an attack on Iran whose included effect, apart from killing an enormous number of people, would almost certainly be to blow out the entire world’s present monetary-financial system.

What is needed now, is not more of Cheney’s “friendly fire,” but a downright hostile expulsion of the reckless shooter from the office of Vice-President, as Walter Mondale once said, “Early and often.”

This sweet Tuesday would be a good day to send sweet messages, such as “Dump Cheney while we still have a planet!” Who knows what new cases of “friendly fire” might be prevented in that way? London’s dumping Cheney accomplices such as Britain’s Blair and Straw, would be a very good idea, too. Unfortunately, since it is the time of the February events at which Democratic and Republican aspirants are lining up for the long-distance run to the November 2008 Presidential election, the perceptions of personal and national interests are not necessarily harmonious ones at this moment. The fighting Democratic Party of 2005 is needed back in the trenches, where the fight to save the nation, and probably also civilization, is the crucial issue of these days. The flopping on the deadly issue of the Alito confirmation, shows a certain ominous confusion among some of the leading Democrats,