

FROM CHENEY-BUSH TO HILLARY?

Do the horrors of King George mask the hazards of Queen State? (Part 2: Hillary)

Before launching into my brief analysis of the Hillary phenomenon and candidacy, I want to make a small observation regarding the increasingly fragile lifeline extended to the Cheney-Bush junta by its diehard supporters. I may have a few friends and/or colleagues still holding out for the virtues of this presidency against all objective revelations.

Come on, guys. With Plamegate clearly showing Cheney-Bush lied for war, it's time to admit they weren't just "burning leaves" over there in the neighborhood death camps. Real men do not support fascist traitors.

Which leads me to the question of the hour, well, two questions:

- 1) Would the current Democratic frontrunner, Senator Hillary Clinton, make a dramatically better president than George?"
- 2) Is any of the current field of presumed candidates dramatically better than Hillary?

My answers are emphatically Yes and Yes.

The depth of the Bush night, as we have demonstrated, makes any of the presumed candidates daylike. Still, Hillary or any of the Democrats I've heard from—with the possible exception of Dennis Kucinich—show little interest in jettisoning their big-government/corporate albatross.

And our country has been marched so far down the Orwellian police-state path, that albatross will sink us for sure.

Nor do any of the Republican candidates—with the possible exception of antiwar Senator Chuck Hegel of Nebraska—show signs of wanting to restore Constitutional freedoms. This may be the year to vote Libertarian with conviction. George Phillies is the frontrunner for the nomination.

Why, though, would Hillary be a particularly bad choice?

My short answer is her victory would represent the subordination of substance by style. By substance I mean principles of liberty. Even though none of the candidates knows or cares much about individual liberty and constitutional government, Hillary knows or cares about them least of all (except for Rudi Giuliani). Gender novelty doesn't redress that.

We can assume she agrees with her husband's political premises and probably his policies. Bill did little to throttle back the Leviathan state, presiding over a government murder of innocent civilians at Ruby Ridge, a government massacre at Waco, and coverups of the Oklahoma City bombings and TWA Flight 800.

Bill Clinton also launched a federally funded program that resulted in the addition of about 75,000 police in communities across the country... "to further eat out our substance."

On civil liberties and peace, Hilly voted for the Bushovik war, never decried war crimes, depleted uranium, or the administration's demonstrated role in planning and executing the massacre of 911. Arresting half a million peaceful marijuana users every year doesn't bother her either.

Finally, she's an absolute zero—make it a negative number—when it comes to health, education, and welfare. Incredibly (considering how bright we're told she is) she sees continued government compulsion and monopoly in these areas as solutions.

On other routine matters of governance, yes she seems to read other publications besides the Bible and keep to her work schedule. She's as articulate as any statist pol. These qualities don't make her stand out among the others.

But she is very stylish, presents herself well on The View.