

Hillary is a Candidate for the “Political Machine”: Four Reasons Why a Hillary Clinton Presidency Is “A Real Possibility”

By [Timothy Alexander Guzman](#)

Global Research, March 02, 2016

[Silent Crow News](#) 1 March 2016

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Intelligence](#), [US NATO War Agenda](#)

In my opinion, Hillary Clinton will be President in 2017. Yes, Donald Trump will most likely be the Republican presidential nominee but the Presidential elections are still 9 months away and anything can happen. You see, whoever occupies the White House will have to follow the blueprint supplied by a political machine or the system.

What is the “machine”?

John F. Kennedy’s address before the American Newspaper Publishers Association on April 27, 1961 when he spoke about how the system operates

“It is a system which has conscripted vast human and material resources into the building of a tightly knit, highly efficient machine that combines military, diplomatic, intelligence, economic, scientific and political operations.”

Where does Hillary Clinton fit in? Kennedy went on to mention

“Its preparations are concealed, not published. Its mistakes are buried not headlined. Its dissenters are silenced, not praised. No expenditure is questioned, no rumor is printed, no secret is revealed.”

Mistakes are buried, its dissenters are silenced and no secret is revealed (except for Hillary’s Email-Gate which revealed numerous secrets), it does sound like Hillary Clinton may qualify for all of the above just mentioned. Make no mistake; Hillary Clinton is a candidate for the political machine. Here are a few reasons why I believe Hillary Clinton can possibly become the U.S. president come this November.

Hillary’s ‘Benghazi-Gate’ and why she will NOT go to Prison

No charges of supporting terrorist cells with high-grade weaponry will be brought against Hillary Clinton. No prosecution, no jail time, nothing. Clinton was summoned to testify before a congressional committee and was questioned on her role as the Secretary of State during the Benghazi attack which left 4 Americans and close to a dozen injured. Pulitzer-prize winning investigative reporter Seymour Hersh published an in-depth report exposing the reasons behind the Benghazi attack in the London Review of Books titled ‘*The Red Line and the Rat Line*’:

The full extent of US co-operation with Turkey, Saudi Arabia and Qatar in assisting the rebel opposition in Syria has yet to come to light. The Obama administration has never publicly admitted to its role in creating what the CIA calls a 'rat line', a back channel highway into Syria. The rat line, authorised in early 2012, was used to funnel weapons and ammunition from Libya via southern Turkey and across the Syrian border to the opposition. Many of those in Syria who ultimately received the weapons were jihadists, some of them affiliated with al-Qaida. (The DNI spokesperson said: 'The idea that the United States was providing weapons from Libya to anyone is false.')

In January, the Senate Intelligence Committee released a report on the assault by a local militia in September 2012 on the American consulate and a nearby undercover CIA facility in Benghazi, which resulted in the death of the US ambassador, Christopher Stevens, and three others. The report's criticism of the State Department for not providing adequate security at the consulate, and of the intelligence community for not alerting the US military to the presence of a CIA outpost in the area, received front-page coverage and revived animosities in Washington, with Republicans accusing Obama and Hillary Clinton of a cover-up. A highly classified annex to the report, not made public, described a secret agreement reached in early 2012 between the Obama and Erdoğan administrations. It pertained to the rat line. By the terms of the agreement, funding came from Turkey, as well as Saudi Arabia and Qatar; the CIA, with the support of MI6, was responsible for getting arms from Gaddafi's arsenals into Syria. A number of front companies were set up in Libya, some under the cover of Australian entities. Retired American soldiers, who didn't always know who was really employing them, were hired to manage procurement and shipping. The operation was run by David Petraeus, the CIA director who would soon resign when it became known he was having an affair with his biographer. (A spokesperson for Petraeus denied the operation ever took place.)

The operation had not been disclosed at the time it was set up to the congressional intelligence committees and the congressional leadership, as required by law since the 1970s. The involvement of MI6 enabled the CIA to evade the law by classifying the mission as a liaison operation. The former intelligence official explained that for years there has been a recognised exception in the law that permits the CIA not to report liaison activity to Congress, which would otherwise be owed a finding. (All proposed CIA covert operations must be described in a written document, known as a 'finding', submitted to the senior leadership of Congress for approval.) Distribution of the annex was limited to the staff aides who wrote the report and to the eight ranking members of Congress – the Democratic and Republican leaders of the House and Senate, and the Democratic and Republican leaders on the House and Senate intelligence committees. This hardly constituted a genuine attempt at oversight: the eight leaders are not known to gather together to raise questions or discuss the secret information they receive.

The annex didn't tell the whole story of what happened in Benghazi before the attack, nor did it explain why the American consulate was attacked. 'The consulate's only mission was to provide cover for the moving of arms,' the former intelligence official, who has read the annex, said. 'It had no real political role.'

Washington abruptly ended the CIA's role in the transfer of arms from Libya after the attack on the consulate, but the rat line kept going. 'The United States was no longer in control of what the Turks were relaying to the jihadists,' the former intelligence official said. Within weeks, as many as forty portable surface-to-air missile launchers, commonly known as manpads, were in the hands of Syrian rebels. On 28 November 2012, Joby Warrick of the Washington Post reported that the previous day rebels near Aleppo had used what was almost certainly a manpad to shoot down a Syrian transport

helicopter. 'The Obama administration,' Warrick wrote, 'has steadfastly opposed arming Syrian opposition forces with such missiles, warning that the weapons could fall into the hands of terrorists and be used to shoot down commercial aircraft.' Two Middle Eastern intelligence officials fingered Qatar as the source, and a former US intelligence analyst speculated that the manpads could have been obtained from Syrian military outposts overrun by the rebels. There was no indication that the rebels' possession of manpads was likely the unintended

Judicial Watch announced on May 18, 2015 that they obtained documents from the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) regarding actions by the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Department of State from a 2014 court order through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) lawsuit is clear evidence that weapons were being shipped to Syria VIA Libya:

Weapons from the former Libya military stockpiles were shipped from the port of Benghazi, Libya to the Port of Banias and the Port of Borj Islam, Syria. The weapons shipped during late-August 2012 were Sniper rifles, RPG's, and 125 mm and 155mm howitzers missiles.

During the immediate aftermath of, and following the uncertainty caused by, the downfall of the ((Qaddafi)) regime in October 2011 and up until early September of 2012, weapons from the former Libya military stockpiles located in Benghazi, Libya were shipped from the port of Benghazi, Libya to the ports of Banias and the Port of Borj Islam, Syria. The Syrian ports were chosen due to the small amount of cargo traffic transiting these two ports. The ships used to transport the weapons were medium-sized and able to hold 10 or less shipping containers of cargo.

The weapons shipped from Syria during late-August 2012 were Sniper rifles, RPG's and 125mm and 155mm howitzers missiles. The numbers for each weapon were estimated to be: 500 Sniper rifles, 100 RPG launchers with 300 total rounds, and approximately 400 howitzers missiles [200 ea - 125mm and 200ea - 155 mm.]

There was evidence that the Obama administration with Hillary Clinton as the U.S. Secretary of State at the time was shipping weapons from Libya to the Syrian rebels which cost the lives of 4 Americans including U.S. Ambassador J. Christopher Stevens and left several others injured. After all, *"What difference - at this point, what difference does it make?"* Hillary Clinton adamantly told the Select Committee on Benghazi in a hearing last October regarding the Benghazi attacks. There is no difference because Hillary Clinton will not be prosecuted nor will she face any charges for any war crimes she committed during her position as Secretary of State. If Hillary can get away with supporting terrorists, she can get away with anything regardless what federal agencies who are investigating Hillary's actions including the FBI will not charge the former first lady and Secretary of State who is on the road to the Whitehouse. You can forget the *"Hillary for Prison"* slogan, it will not happen. She is powerfully connected to big money and power just like the bankers who never go to prison.

Follow the Money

Citigroup Inc, Goldman Sachs, JP Morgan Chase and Co, Lehman Brothers and Morgan Stanley are major banking institutions who contributed to Hillary Clinton's campaign. DLA Piper and Skadden, Arps et al are major corporate law firms who represent corporate interests also contribute to Hillary. The Soros Fund Management run by billionaire Zionist

George Soros is a major contributor to Hillary Clinton. Speaking of Zionist influence, major Zionist contributors to Hillary's campaign is Republican and Casino owner Sheldon Adelson, Media Mogul Haim Saban who also sponsors AIPAC and owns Univision, a Spanish-language "propaganda" Media Company, Herbert M. Sandler (known for his role in the 2008 subprime mortgage meltdown). Influential people in Hollywood support Hillary Clinton including Jeffrey M. Katzenberg, CEO of Dreamworks SKG, and director Steven Spielberg who are also Zionists. Between major corporations, Hollywood and pro-Israeli billionaires, Hillary Clinton will not fall short on cash donations to continue her campaign for the White House. In Washington D.C., money is power which Hillary has plenty of. 90% percent of Hillary Clinton's contributions are from corporations or law firms that provide services to major corporations. The rest are influential Zionists who run the entertainment industry and major corporations. U.S. elections are dominated by money (although Trump has his own money) and that is something Hillary Clinton can take to the bank.



The Main-Stream Media Supports Hillary

The Main-Stream Media (MSM) supports Hillary Clinton and that is an important fact to consider. Time Warner has contributed more than \$500,000 to Hillary Clinton's campaign for some time according to Opensecrets.com. Time Warner owns New Line Cinema, HBO, Turner Broadcasting System, CNN and Castle Rock Entertainment to name a few.

The editorial board of *The New York Times* endorsed Clinton this past January:

For the past painful year, the Republican presidential contenders have been bombarding Americans with empty propaganda slogans and competing, bizarrely, to present themselves as the least experienced person for the most important elected job in the world. Democratic primary voters, on the other hand, after a substantive debate over real issues, have the chance to nominate one of the most broadly and deeply qualified presidential candidates in modern history.

Hillary Clinton would be the first woman nominated by a major party. She served as a senator from a major state (New York) and as secretary of state — not to mention her experience on the national stage as first lady with her brilliant and flawed husband, President Bill Clinton. The Times editorial board has endorsed her three times for federal office — twice for Senate and once in the 2008 Democratic presidential primary — and is doing so again with confidence and enthusiasm

The *New York Times* admits Clinton's hawkish stand although they are a propaganda mouthpiece for the establishment:

Mrs. Clinton can be more hawkish on the use of military power than Mr. Obama, as shown by her current call for a no-fly zone in Syria and her earlier support for arming and training Syrian rebels. We are not convinced that a no-fly zone is the right approach in Syria, but we have no doubt that Mrs. Clinton would use American military power effectively and with infinitely more care and wisdom than any of the leading Republican contenders

Mrs. Clinton will use "more care and wisdom" with America's military power? I guess Libya

and Syria is a good example for the New York Times where death, destruction and chaos are out of control. The online political news source thehill.com published an interesting article titled 'Is the mainstream media in the tank for Clinton?' which states that in The Times, Clinton was praised while Sanders was criticized:

The Times' main news story called it "a dominant performance." The story commended Clinton's "agility" and her "assertiveness" and found her critique of Vermont Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) "forceful," her assessment of his logic "stinging." Plus, she laughed, smiled and joked, which never hurts, especially when there are concerns about a candidate's "likability." The accompanying "News Analysis" characterized Clinton's performance as "commanding" and said she was "blunt" and "effective." Even the adverbs in the two reports favored Clinton: "aggressively," "crisply," "emphatically," "energetically." Sanders, by contrast, was "exasperated," "unsure," "sheepish" and "reactive." One of his only positive moments was when he "zestfully defended" Clinton against attacks on her use of private email while secretary of State. Over on the op-ed side, meanwhile, columnist Frank Bruni described Clinton as "energetic," "buoyant," "effervescent" and "poised."

The MSM will continue to promote Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump will be criticized heavily as his popularity continues to dominate the campaign trail. The MSM is a weapon that will push the Clinton agenda while propagandizing the masses and that is something that the MSM is very good at. Look for the MSM to demonize Donald Trump as Clinton's "*mistakes are buried, not headlined.*"

Robert Kagan and the Neocons

✘ The New York Times published an opinion piece in 2014 claiming that there is a strong possibility that the "Neocons" are ready to support a Hillary Clinton Presidency. The article titled '*The Next Act of the Neocons: Are Neocons Getting Ready to Ally with Hillary Clinton?*' about Robert Kagan's support for Hillary Clinton. Kagan is the Husband of Victoria Nuland, the Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs at the United States Department of State under the Obama administration who was responsible for the Coup that took place in the Ukraine in 2014:

After nearly a decade in the political wilderness, the neoconservative movement is back, using the turmoil in Iraq and Ukraine to claim that it is President Obama, not the movement's interventionist foreign policy that dominated early George W. Bush-era Washington, that bears responsibility for the current round of global crises.

Even as they castigate Mr. Obama, the neocons may be preparing a more brazen feat: aligning themselves with Hillary Rodham Clinton and her nascent presidential campaign, in a bid to return to the driver's seat of American foreign policy

According to *The New York Times*, the article claims other Neocon psychopaths followed Mr. Kagan's lead to back Clinton due to her hawkish stance:

Other neocons have followed Mr. Kagan's careful centrism and respect for Mrs. Clinton. Max Boot, a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, noted in *The New Republic* this year that "it is clear that in administration councils she

was a principled voice for a strong stand on controversial issues, whether supporting the Afghan surge or the intervention in Libya.”

And the thing is, these neocons have a point. Mrs. Clinton voted for the Iraq war; supported sending arms to Syrian rebels; likened Russia’s president, Vladimir V. Putin, to Adolf Hitler; wholeheartedly backs Israel; and stresses the importance of promoting democracy

Kagan recently made it official in a Washington Post article by supporting Hillary Clinton and at the same time criticizing Trump as the “*GOP’s Frankenstein Monster*” when he said “*For this former Republican, and perhaps for others, the only choice will be to vote for Hillary Clinton. The [Republican] party cannot be saved, but the country still can be.*” The Neocons in Clinton’s corner does solidify support from pro-Israel organizations and lobbyists including AIPAC with various warmongers from the Bush administration. Clinton will also gain support from the Israeli-government including its Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu who she promised that she will meet in her first month in office. Zionist power in America (New York, Illinois and California) supports Hillary Clinton and that is a force that can put her into the Whitehouse.

U.S. President Hillary Clinton?

I hope I am wrong about Hillary Clinton becoming U.S. President because she would no doubt lead the World towards more war and poverty, but to set the record straight, I don’t think Donald Trump would make a better president either although he is less hawkish than Hillary. But Hillary Clinton has the support from powerful people in Hollywood, banking institutions; the Military-Industrial Complex, Women’s rights organizations, AIPAC, Israel and multinational corporations to elevate her to the throne. Trump will most-likely be the Republican nominee (if of course, Michael Bloomberg or Mitt Romney don’t enter the race and steal Donald Trump’s votes) and that won’t change a thing when the elections take place in November. The establishment is looking to stop Donald Trump at any costs which I believe can happen, even if it means stealing the election through fraud.

So to the Alternative media including citizen journalists, bloggers and to the rest of the world, Hillary Clinton, a war hawk and a Neocon has a real good chance of becoming the first female U.S. president. A Clinton presidency will bring more wars, corporate power and more government control over the American people and to the rest of the world.

So is the world ready for Hillary Clinton presidency that will run a collapsing empire that will stop at nothing to maintain its imperial power?

Just the thought of it, America has a pretty bleak future if another Clinton is elected to the White House and not that “Freebee” Bernie Sanders would be any better although he is somewhat the lesser of two evils in at least in terms of U.S. foreign policy to a point. Trump the torturer and his two Latino (Marco Rubio is a full blooded Cuban born in the U.S. and Ted Cruz is half Cuban and American from Canada) rivals or any other GOP nominee will not win. The MSM and all of Hillary’s supporters will make sure of that. With major backers controlling the media, Hillary Clinton’s chances are pretty strong.

Hillary Clinton as U.S. President is an idea that the world might have to get used to. I really hope that I am wrong.

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Timothy Alexander Guzman](#)

About the author:

Timothy Alexander Guzman is an independent researcher and writer with a focus on political, economic, media and historical spheres. He has been published in Global Research, The Progressive Mind, European Union Examiner, News Beacon Ireland, WhatReallyHappened.com, EIN News and a number of other alternative news sites. He is a graduate of Hunter College in New York City.

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