

Democrat “Debate” Ignores War Crimes of the State

By [Kurt Nimmo](#)

Global Research, October 18, 2019

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [History](#), [Media Disinformation](#), [US NATO War Agenda](#)

Did you watch the Democrat debate? I didn't. I haven't had cable television and access to the alphabet propaganda networks for well over a decade. I suppose I could have watched it on the web, but why bother? The outcome was predictable.

For instance, it was predictable the candidates had no intention of addressing the forever wars engineered by the ruling elite. That is a strict no-go zone. Ask Tulsi Gabbard what happens when a hopeful dwells too closely on war and its consequences. The war party propaganda media have relentlessly attacked her.

And yet, we can't trust Tulsi to follow through. On Wednesday, virtually every member of the House of Representatives, both Republican and Democrat, supported [a resolution to condemn Trump's decision to move troops out of Syria](#). [Here is the final roll call](#).

Scroll down to the bottom of the document. Those not voting include Gabbard and Elijah Cummings. Mr. Cummings had an excuse—he was in the hospital, awaiting death. But what about Tulsi? She didn't vote “nay” on this bill, more than likely due to its deceptive wording—manufactured outrage over Turkey's decision to invade northern Syria and massacre an unknown number of Kurds.

Do you really think the Demopublican war party cares about the Kurds? Of course not. The resolution is another anti-Trump stunt designed to tarnish the self-proclaimed stable genius as we slip and slide into the election season.

Tulsi opted out, realizing if she voted against the bill she would be ruthlessly pilloried by the war propaganda media, not that it really matters—they have gone after her for months now, even though she carts around the same identity demagoguery as her fellow Democrats.

If we really want to know what the Dem side of the Demopublican party favors, it might be instrumental to read a [Julian Zelizer op-ed posted at CNN](#).

Mr. Zelizer enumerates what he considers top priorities for the red and blue serpentine hydra navigating the murky water of the swamp.

What should immigration policy look like in the 21st century? How would they define the limits of presidential power? Will internationalism continue to be a priority—in terms of policy and institutions—over the next decade? What are the steps that need to be taken to curb the devastating effects of climate change? How can the federal government start to reverse the growing economic inequality that defines our country? How can we begin a new phase of the civil rights movement that deals with institutional racism? What are the key goals in the pursuit of women's full equality? How can we do more to

ensure that people are not discriminated against because of their sexuality?
What is the proper role of government in taxing and regulating the economy?

Did you see anything in there about ending the wars? Neither did I. Instead, we are subjected to unabashed veneration of war crimes.

The history of great leadership revolves around moments when US presidents have been able to tackle these sorts of challenges. Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman defeating the forces of fascism and participating in the establishment of institutions such as the United Nations and NATO that entrenched liberal alliances...

Nazism—not fascism per se, which is alive and well within the state—was primarily defeated by Russia, not FDR (who, it can be argued, lied America into a war it overwhelmingly wanted nothing to do with) or Truman (who is the only human to have presided over nuking hundreds of thousands of innocent Japanese civilians).

As a nation, it is clear that we are in desperate need of great leaders. We face an enormous number of problems and crises that keep going unaddressed from one administration to the other. The debates should offer a first forum for voters to hear what a potential president has to say about how we can get out of these messes.

No, as a nation, we need to reject what the ruling corporate elite designates as “great leaders,” modeled on the aforementioned war criminals.

The reason “problems and crises... keep going unaddressed from one administration to the other” is simple—first, there is very little difference between leaders selected by the state, and second the ruling elite thrive on crises, most manufactured in Hegelian *ordo ab hoc* (order out of this) fashion, a very effective method of emotionally manipulating the plebs and gaining consensus for war, torture, mass surveillance, and rampant violations of international law.

Finally, and somewhat comically, liberal Democrats are [expressing their outrage](#) that supposed liberal lesbian Ellen DeGeneres yucked it up with “conservative” war criminal George W. Bush during an NFL game in Texas.

Of course, as framed by the corporate media, this incident had nothing to do with Bush’s neocon wars of mass destruction, but rather LGBT issues that are of far more importance to liberals than the ongoing wars that have killed well over a million innocent people and destroyed entire nations.

So Ellen DeGeneres is excoriated for hanging out with Bush because he is a war criminal – which he is – but its alright to hang out with Obama who is also a war criminal? Someone who understands the Western mind please explain that one to me.

— Ajamu Baraka (@ajamubaraka) [October 10, 2019](#)

DeGeneres would have us follow her "[lessons in kindness](#)." However, her version of soft and squishy (and highly selective) kindness seems to be tailored for those who sit in exclusive boxes at football games played in stadiums paid for by taxpayers. She can forgive Bush for his support of anti-LGBT legislation while completely ignoring he is one of the vilest war criminals in recent memory.

*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons above or below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

Kurt Nimmo writes on his blog, Another Day in the Empire, where [this article](#) was originally published. He is a frequent contributor to Global Research.

Featured image is from the author

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Kurt Nimmo](#), Global Research, 2019

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Kurt Nimmo](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca