

The two winners of the 2008 presidential election: fear and war

By [Larry Chin](#)

Region: [USA](#)

Global Research, March 07, 2008

[Online Journal](#) 7 March 2008

The 2008 US presidential charade has already been decided. Come November, the next White House occupant (who will be installed via political malfeasance, computer vote theft and other election “irregularities”) will be the puppet who proves to be the most effective in echoing Bush-Cheney’s “war on terrorism” lies, and expanding the Bush-Cheney “national security” agenda.

The American populace will bow to the “next Bush” who will “keep them safe” from “Islamic jihadists.” Facing a new and increasingly brutal regime (probably under McCain), many brain-addled Americans will be stunned that “it is happening all over again,” oblivious to the fact that their own acquiescence helped make it possible.

Washington’s bipartisan consensus “war on terrorism” deception

Amply demonstrated by the rhetoric of each of the prospective US presidential candidates, the “terrorism” lie is also the key to the election. The candidates know that the ill-informed US population remains petrified, and still thoroughly manipulated by fear of “another 9/11.”

As exhaustively detailed by [Michel Chossudovsky](#), author of *America’s “War on Terrorism,”* and in [“Washington’s consensus al-Qaeda deception”](#), the “war on terrorism” deception is a manipulation supported by an elite consensus, and a cover-up promoted equally by Washington’s political factions and both Republican and Democratic parties.

This myth, which rests on the perpetual fabricated threat of an outside enemy, has been the key to the power wielded by Bush-Cheney. It remains at the core of every official and unofficial decision made by this criminal regime, and its complicit bipartisan Washington partners. The “terrorist” threat to the US homeland, and its many propaganda variations, are now embedded fixations in the American psyche, reinforced by endless corporate media bombast.

The Washington consensus has remained united behind the lies and cover-up of 1) the atrocities of 9/11, a US-led false flag operation, 2) the fact that “Al-Qaeda” is an [Anglo-American military-intelligence covert operation](#), and 3) the use of “anti-terrorism” as a pretext to invade and conquer Afghanistan and Iraq, and its use as the justification for future war across the Middle East and Central Asia, Africa, and other vital geostrategic regions.

Which candidate will be the most effective mass murderer?

Clinton, McCain and Obama are backed by [hawkish national security teams](#) headed by some

of the world's master war criminals (Kissinger, Brzezinski, Albright, etc.). These elite connections, and their ramifications, which promise the deepening of the war, remain unaddressed and ignored.

John McCain is deeply corrupt and ruthless — the perfect extension of Bush-Cheney. McCain's participation in the 1980s savings and loan scandal, as a member of the infamous Keating Five, is a matter of historical fact. Also a matter of record are McCain's brutal views on war and killing, which are best exemplified by his 2001 op-ed, [War is Hell. Now Let's Get On With It](#).

Despite their inexplicable reputations as liberals, Democratic presidential hopefuls Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama, are now locked in a bitter and destructive struggle over who is the more Bush/Cheney-esque; who is the superior "anti-terrorist" and protector of "American security."

Clinton and Obama have both repeated the same slippery and [all too familiar](#) "war on terrorism" deceptions favored by the elite neoliberal faction:

- "The Bush administration has failed to fight the 'real war on terrorism' begun after 9/11."
- "Mismanagement and blunders of the war in Iraq have created radical jihadist insurgencies that will the destroy the United States."
- "The Iraq mistake has distracted us from fighting the 'real' war on terrorism."
- "We should declare war on Saudi Arabia and Pakistan, which harbor the real 'terrorists' who attacked us on 9/11."
- "The Iraq distraction has prevented us from capturing Osama."
- "The world was united after 9/11, but Bush squandered it all."

Other variations popular with the Clinton and Obama camps include:

- "Al-Qaeda is reforming in Afghanistan, because of Bush policy failures, and must be dealt with."
- "Iran has become increasingly radical and dangerous because of Bush's Iraq policy, and now must be dealt with."

Both Clinton and Obama repeat bald-faced lies about "bringing troops home," when it is clear that their agenda will do neither. US bases in Iraq are permanent. Some troops could be redeployed, but the US geostrategic foothold in the region is permanent — and they know it.

Both enthusiastically support war waged under the NATO banner, the [US-backed Kosovo criminal apparatus](#) (created by the Bill Clinton administration), and other atrocities.

In a telling exchange during a recent debate, Clinton and Obama each kissed the feet (and

other body parts) of the powerful AIPAC war lobby, declaring Israel and Israeli security “sacrosanct,” leaving no doubt that a presidency under either of them promises a continuation of genocidal Middle East policy.

The gutter tactics of Hillary Clinton

Hillary Clinton’s recent primary victories in Texas and Ohio were the result of gutter politics directly out of the Karl Rove playbook. Clinton has stooped to every trick in this book, and the most below-belt attacks and open lies in recent memory.

Clinton’s penchant for fear-mongering is exemplified by the now-infamous [“Red Phone” Ad](#). In this malodorous work, [endorsed by the right wing](#) and hailed as a smashing success by venal Clinton strategists, Obama’s ability to deal with a 3 a.m. “international security” crisis is called into question.

Here again, the 9/11 “terrorism” lie is placed front and center, obliterating every other issue.

The peevish Clintons are so hungry for power, that they destroy the Democratic Party, and hand the White House to the Republicans and Bush-Cheney-McCain, to achieve their objective. Clearly, [the beneficiaries are the Republicans](#), and Bush-Cheney-McCain.

It is also no surprise that Clinton’s Texas and Ohio success was assisted by [orchestrated conniving](#) by right-wing radio host Rush Limbaugh. Armed with the certainty that McCain is already the Republican nominee, Limbaugh and other fanatical right-wingers swarmed to cast votes for Clinton in “cross-over” states. Limbaugh’s stated goal was to “bloody up” Obama (perceived by the right wing to be more liberal and more dangerous), force the Democrats deeper into self-destruction “for fun,” making a McCain victory that much more certain.

This is not the first time Clinton has benefited from shenanigans (and Republican help), nor will it be the last. Her [New Hampshire primary results were manipulated](#), giving her a surprise victory despite exit polls favoring Obama by big margins. Clinton has continued to bully and intimidate her peers in the Congress (her “super delegates”), and force the Democratic Party into giving her delegates from Florida and Michigan, despite the party’s rules that do not permit delegates from those uncontested states.

Of course, it is no coincidence that criminal activity saves a Clinton or a Bush every time one faces political defeat. The political and criminal connection that the Clinton faction shares with the Bushes is a matter of historical fact, going back to their criminal activities in Arkansas. The Bush-Clinton milieu has cooperatively ruled the United States for decades.

In fact, a McCain-Clinton ticket, with Jeb Bush and other intelligence-connected neocons in their administration, would offer the most honest representation of what the American empire really is.

Obama’s support for war and death squads

Despite his stirring rhetoric, razor sharp intellect and immensely appealing persona, Barack Obama’s foreign policy agenda is virtually identical to that of Bush-Cheney-McCain and Clinton, including his approach to the “war on terrorism.” The differences in nuance, over which a bitter campaign is being fought, are slight.

Obama has repeated his earlier promise to take unilateral military action to “take out terrorists” anywhere in the world, where “actionable intelligence” identifies terrorists, and governments (where these terrorists are found) fail to act. This is no different than existing Bush-Cheney policy. In a recent debate, Obama stated that he would send troops back into Iraq (after a hypothetical pullout) if, hypothetically, “Al-Qaeda reforms in Iraq.”

As reported by [Jeremy Scahill](#), author of *Blackwater: The Rise of the World’s Largest Mercenary Army*, Obama has even expressed support for continuing to outsource war-related activities to Blackwater USA. This itself should eliminate any notion that Obama is in any way “antiwar,” or anti-criminality.

An Obama presidency would offer a soothing and momentary illusion of false hope to many Americans.

But if recent events are any indication, even false hopes will be squashed, well before a national election contest begins.

Every election in modern US history has been a criminal manipulation, choreographed and rigged by political elites and performed by handpicked elite puppets, each backed by their teams of corrupt war criminals, intelligence/security “advisors” and think tank assets. The 2008 affair will be no different.

It is still a fact that corporations (primarily connected to the Republican political apparatus) control the American vote, and with increasing technological sophistication: [Diebold](#), [ESS](#), [Sequoia](#), and [SAIC](#). In fact, new generations of their machines will be used in 2008.

Democratic Party “war on terrorism” complicity in Congress

In activities paralleling the red herrings bandied about by the presidential campaigns, the bipartisan consensus in the US Congress is demonstrating (again) that it will not act to stop Bush-Cheney on domestic surveillance. Congressional Democrats are also unable to muster meager opposition of any kind to Bush-Cheney’s Iraq war.

The [Iraq Redeployment Act](#), pushed by Senator Russ Feingold, is a perfect example of Democratic Party ignorance and complicity. Feingold’s bill limits funding, except for “hunting Al-Qaeda terrorists,” and for “training Iraqi troops to fight Al-Qaeda.”

Given that the “hunt for Al-Qaeda” has been the eternal bipartisan consensus pretext for US geostrategy, and given that “Al-Qaeda” is blamed for the host of Iraq problems (including, but not limited to, “insurgencies”), the Feingold bill essentially accommodates continued funding for eternal war.

The Feingold bill, like the rest of Democratic Party’s “war on terrorism” rhetoric is the definition of a zero-sum charade.

The presidential campaign to hell

Without an end to the “terrorism” lie, there will be no end to the “war on terrorism.”

Given the intensity with which this lie is being wielded by Clinton, McCain and Obama, and with the Anglo-American empire’s very survival at stake, clearly there will be no end to war, no matter who is the next White House occupant.

The original source of this article is [Online Journal](#)
Copyright © [Larry Chin](#), [Online Journal](#), 2008

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Larry Chin](#)

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