

The Agenda is Set: Elect the War-Hawk for the Sake of “Progress”

washingtonsblog.com/2016/06/agenda-set-elect-war-hawk-sake-progress.html

By WashingtonsBlog

June 11, 2016

By Kit, Off-Guardian.org.



Hillary Clinton is the most qualified person to “rule the world”, if she can get around the “insane” US Constitution

With the democratic nomination now officially all but certain (Sanders, quite obviously, never had a chance), the Guardian has thrown their full editorial weight – such as it is – into a pre-emptive defence of Hillary’s record and an hysterical celebration of the “progress” that the election of this particular bank-backed, corporate-bought, war-hawk would (apparently) demonstrate.

First there was Jonathan Freedland’s [anaemic plea](#) that Sanders’ voters get in line and stand with Clinton against the “true enemy”, Jill Abramson [followed with gushing sentiment](#) and simpering praise. And then? Then came [Polly Toynbee, going full Guardian](#). Never go full Guardian.

The headline:

Those out to demonise Hillary Clinton should be careful what they wish for”

“Demonise”, in this instance, seems to mean “accurately describe her political career and possible criminal activities”. If you can demonise someone by holding a mirror up to their face, chances are that person is a demon.

The choice of the next US president is now so stark that it's time the left put aside its sneers and pray that this strong woman will get to rule the world”

“Rule the world?” Does the US president rule the world? I think I missed that particular UN resolution. As I recall, the POTUS doesn't even wield supreme executive power within their own nation, the US constitution prevents that...but we'll get to that later.

As for the starkness of the electoral field – I have to say I agree with Toynbee there. The choice between a bombastic orange billionaire, who sometimes seems to be running for president as an elaborate prank, and a proven corrupt and dangerous war-hawk, backed by lunatics like Victoria Nuland is indeed a stark one. Nuclear winter type stark. Perhaps literally.

This is a time to celebrate. At last, a woman leads a major US party to fight for the presidency.

Yes. At last, a woman. It doesn't matter who the woman is, what she has done, how much she cheats to get there. Irrelevancies used to “demonise” her. Hillary is a woman, and thus her being president is A Good Thing...because progress. This is going to be key to Clinton's campaign, and [you will hear it a lot](#). It's one of only 2 real tactics the Clinton camp have at their disposal. “What's the other”, you ask? Simple: Lying. [A lot of lying](#).

...as the first woman to enter the White House, she will also step through the door as by far the most qualified and experienced arrival there for generations...”

Now, this isn't technically a lie...but only because we don't know what Toynbee means by “qualified”. If being a shambolic Secretary of State and highly unpopular first lady makes you qualified then sure. If being proven to [lie for your own benefit](#), time and time again, makes you “qualified”, or being firmly behind [every American military intervention](#) for the past 25 years...then I guess Hillary has qualifications to spare.

...a searing firestorm of abuse...Why so fierce, so unreasonable, so vitriolic?”

This is called a strawman. Having made a statement, one which is not backed up by any citations or quotes, she will attempt to “explain” this fictional phenomenon with some cloying cod psychology:

If you are naturally left of centre, especially if you are a woman, yet you find you instinctively dislike her, ask yourself why. There may be some good reasons...

So, liberal traitors – especially the female liberal traitors – why do you “instinctively” dislike Hillary Clinton? I mean there *may be some* good reasons, for example:

...she's not as radical as Sanders; she is not a natural rabble-rouser at rallies; she is the wife of a past president; she's called "robotic" in her careful choice of words; and as a flesh-presser she warms the cockles of few hearts.

To rephrase: You may not like her because she has no principles, is a bad public speaker, her election reeks of nepotism or she comes off as cold and sociopathic. Toynbee volunteers these facts – and we should note that these are the qualities the media list when *they are trying to make her look good*.

There are others: You *MAY* not like her because she planned and executed an [illegal coup in Honduras](#), the destruction of Libya and execution of its head of state, she backed the Afghan and Iraq wars, she lied to cover up for a pedophile by [blaming his 12 year old victim](#), the many alleged crimes, or any of the other callous and dreadful instances of dishonesty and [self-aggrandisement](#) she has taken part in.

These are the reasons you *MAY* think justify your “instinctive” hatred of this woman. But Toynbee knows better. She knows why you *REALLY* don't like her – It's because you're a misogynist who doesn't understand how tough it is for a woman:

If women of the left do break into the bastions of power, the sisters often view them as sell-outs to the establishment, as if permanent outsiderdom and victimhood is the only true mark of feminism.

You see? You “instinctively” dislike her, because you assume she must be a member of the establishment. That is the burden of the female “liberal”. You start a few wars, attend a [few Bilderberg conferences](#), get a few million dollars donated to you from the most powerful banks in America, speak at the Council of Foreign Relations a few times and suddenly – BOOM – you're viewed, unfairly, as part of the establishment.

But, putting aside the forced gendercentric argument and massive intellectual dishonesty, there's some far more worrying agenda being whispered subliminally into the minds of Guardian readers here – Hillary's greatest opponent is not the republicans, it's not the patriarchy, it's not the other women who so resent her rise to power.

No, it is the law itself:

*Unlike most, she knows how to wield the power levers, insofar as the **insane US constitution** allows any president to carry out their manifesto.*

The United States Constitution is insane folks. I'm not sure which specific part of the most [important egalitarian legal document](#) of all time Toynbee has taken issue with – and she declined to answer when I asked her on twitter. But there's a lot of good places to start.

For one thing: Limiting the power of the chief executive, making them answerable to the legislative body in order to prevent tyranny? That is obviously stupid when your head of state is a WOMAN who only wants to be nice. No, that has to go. The three separate branches of government should obviously be reshaped into a supreme executive with control over both legislative and judicial bodies. After all, how can you expect to implement a “manifesto” when you don’t have absolute power?

Free speech? Well, this is an antiquated notion, from a time before “progress” when people didn’t understand what was definitively correct. Now we have reached consensus on what is “right” and what is “wrong” there is no need for freedom of speech – and in fact it is a hindrance, as people will only abuse their “right to free speech” by spreading propaganda, or broadcasting opinions which we have all agreed are wrong. As [the Guardian has made clear many times](#), [free speech is meaningless](#) if people use it to bully and disenfranchise minorities. If free speech is being used to inflict hatred and tyranny on women, ethnic minorities or the trans community, then what use is it? Free speech doesn’t mean hate speech...but unfortunately banning hate speech DOES mean banning free speech sooo....yeah.

Right to bear arms? Absolutely crazy. The very idea that civilians having access to firearms is important as a general principle in guarding against tyranny is foolish. There isn’t going to BE any tyranny anymore, because we’ve handed absolute power over to a woman who has banned the “tyranny” of “free speech”.

This frightening statement gives us a flash of the future – of the agenda already set in place. The US constitution has been largely ignored and misinterpreted for years to excuse totalitarian laws, such as the Patriot Act. But when Clinton is president, it will come under full-blown attack. Make no mistake: Clinton will be president, there’s no doubt about that. The election will be fixed, either literally like in 2000 and 2004, or more subtly by simply making the alternative bizarre and unelectable – as in 2008 and 2012. The latter possibility even explains the rise of Trump.

I don’t know if the man is genuine or not, I don’t know if he really believes he can win, but I understand his role. He is there to guarantee a Clinton victory. That’s why the press talks up his “violent” supporters, and balloons any and every tiny comment he makes into “racism” and “sexism”. He exists so that people like Toynbee can say this:

Outside, the world looks on aghast at any possibility America could choose a racist, sexist brute over a feminist with a long track record of standing up for the right causes.”

...and have there be a tiny kernel of truth to it. A very tiny kernel.

Consider professional wrestling. It’s fake, everybody knows that, it only just barely pretends to be otherwise. An elaborate action-based soap opera, with wild stunts and expensive tickets. That is all that American democracy has become. In wrestling it is predetermined who will win, they have labels for their wrestlers. First there is [the Face](#), the hero, the good guy. He fights fair, he has a noble cause. He wears the American flag like a cape. When his music pipes up, we cheer because we’re supposed to. And the other guy? [He’s the Heel](#). He’s obnoxious, he cheats, he’s mean for mean’s sake and smiles when we boo. And when your Face is Hillary Clinton, you need a HELL of a big Heel. Enter Donald Trump. A cartoon character. The caricature of the everything we’re supposed to hate about the GoP.

The fact that Clinton has still somehow contrived to be behind him in the polls tells you all you need to know about the desperate struggle the media face in turning Clinton into a believable hero.

Regardless, Clinton WILL be President. But it won't be a sign of progress, it will be a neon display highlighting everything that has gone wrong with the American political system. It won't be because she's a woman, or a liberal, or an idealist. It will be because she sold her soul to finance her ambition for fleeting prestige and the appearance of power.

Rarely has any candidate so deserved their place.

In this case I tend to agree with Toynbee – never before has a candidate SO obviously worked SO hard to become president. Never before has a candidate so brazenly sold out the values they were (at best) pretending to hold dear. Never before has a candidate so artlessly and obviously lied about so many things. Never before has a candidate been so open and obvious about the Faustian pact they needed to make to get where they want to go, so obviously played the political game of the oligarchs who really run the country, in order to get her pay-off.

Editorials such as Toynbee's will appear on the regular all through the campaign, all variations on a theme, all attempting to re-write Clinton's history and hinging on the worst kind of puddle-deep identity politics. The truly tragic part is that they KNOW they are lying, they KNOW they will be called on it, they KNOW what they ARE, and they resent us for telling them. That's why they say stuff like this:

And if you want a reminder of what women like her are up against, just read the comments that will no doubt follow this.

The comments, as you'd expect, were full of people commenting on her obvious bias, pointing out her half-truths and correcting her glaring factual errors. In the world the Guardian wants Clinton to build, this will be called "demonisation".

And it will be illegal.