The Case Against Hillary Clinton

The case against Hillary Clinton (click onto it at that link) seems to me to be so strong (and I've checked the soundness of all of its sources), so that I'm even asking myself whether I shouldn't vote the Presidential line at all (or else vote there for a 'protest' candidate, which is effectively the same thing as not voting at all) on November 8th, or should instead even go so far as to vote for Donald Trump, in order to prevent her from becoming President.

Then, I saw recently a reader-comment at a news-site where the unpalatable Presidential options were being discussed, and one "patriot" said there that on November 8th, anything would be better than a vote for Trump, to which another person responded:

> Not so; I've never voted Republican in my life, but if Hillary is the candidate, I'll vote for Trump, because he has no record in public office (and what he says contradicts himself routinely so can't be believed), whereas she has an extensive record in public office (and she lies almost as much as he does, and so her words also are null), and that record is disgusting:
>
> http://www.washingtonsblog.com/2016/02/hillary-clintons-six-foreign-policy-catastrophes.html

Since I wrote that, I was forced to ask myself whether I would vote for Trump if the only real alternative turns out to be Hillary; and, I concluded that, yes, I would, and that the reason is precisely because I don't trust either candidate, but that only in the case of Hillary am I *certain* that she as President would be catastrophic. At least with Trump, I have no way of knowing what his *real* policies would be.

This isn't to say that I agree with what either candidate says, or would be saying as President; it's to assert that only Hillary has an actual track-record regarding public policy — and that it's catastrophic.

A proven catastrophe is *far worse* than a merely *possible* catastrophe; so, if Hillary Clinton turns out to be the Democratic nominee, I shall vote for Donald Trump, and then just hope that the worst things that he had said regarding public policy were lies, and that the best things that he had said regarding public policy reflected his actual beliefs.

Anyone who would say in response to this, "But that's to believe in the horrible policy-prescriptions from Trump" would be missing the point here: this point is the exact opposite: I *don't* believe what either of those candidates say; I know that they're both pathological liars; but, only one of them has an actual record, and it's catastrophic. Hillary offers not only her lies but something real (a record that's highly relevant to the office she's seeking) — and it's repulsive. Trump, by contrast, offers no relevant track-record at all on public-policy matters. That's not a virtue on his part, it's a lack of the worst possible vice (a vile record of *actual policies while in public office*), for a potential U.S. President.

Given a choice between a *proven* psychopath, versus merely a possible (or even a *likely*) psychopath, I'll definitely opt for the latter. It's the only intelligent thing to do. Anything else would be suckerdom.

If you want to see her actual vile record on global warming, click here, and here.

If you want to see her vile record against the public and for the top 0.001%, click here.

If you want to see her exploitation of women and Blacks to win elections, click here.

If you want to see her actual support for the *Citizens United* decision she condemns, click here.

If you want to see her solid record of backing American invasions, click here.

If you want to see her actual support for mega-rich tax-evaders, click [here](#).

And, as far as Trump's promises about any of these things, they should be ignored as much as her promises about them should be. Even what he has actually done as a businessman isn't necessarily an indication of what he'd *do about the governmental policy-issue*. In fact, Trump's most blatantly bad promises (such as regarding immigration) are far more likely to be quickly abandoned by him as President, than Hillary's are if she becomes President, because whereas Hillary's (such as blocking single-payer health insurance) are supported by the Establishment, Trump's are opposed by them (which is why [even Republican donors have been donating more to Hillary's campaign than to Trump's campaign](#)). (What do those Republican mega-donors know that the general public don't? They know Trump.)

When life offers a choice between bad options, one still has an obligation to make that choice, and to do it intelligently. In the case of voting (or else *not* voting) for the President of one's nation, it's more than merely an intellectual obligation: it's one's civic *duty*. That's why I, as a person with progressive values, will vote for Trump if Hillary becomes the Democratic nominee.

Investigative historian **Eric Zuesse** *is the author, most recently, of [They're Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010](#), and of [CHRIST'S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity](#).*

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: **Eric Zuesse**

About the author:

Investigative historian Eric Zuesse is the author, most recently, of They're Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010, and of CHRIST'S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca