

## "CONCEIT OF THE ANOINTED?"

---

*I wonder who Thomas Sowell was talking about*

*Recently I've composed a couple of longer email messages to my Coffee Coaster "VIPs" list, especially commenting on the latest developments in the Hillary/Obama conflict and the redeployment of the Ron Paul campaign for president... now to be transformed into a full fledged, fulltime action group [think Moveon.org for libertarians] supporting candidates and policies toward Constitutional liberty.*

Dear Righteous Beanie VIPs,

The eminent free-market economist and author Thomas Sowell has a phrase that characterizes quite a few G-people, mainly of the leftist persuasion, who are advocates of a strong (though highly caring and sensitive) central state. He believes they have a sense of themselves--through compulsory legislation, primarily--as indispensable to the fortunes of millions of us (not unlike a nerdy kid with a deluxe ant farm). And his term for that is "the conceit of the anointed." I don't think I could come up with a better description of Hillary Clinton... or a better summary of my disdain for her as a person.

... the kind of person who knows what's best for me.

And as I indicated in yesterday's message most of my social milieu has that same sense of discomfort about Ms. Clinton: "Please, Mother, I'd rather do it myself." And we distrust someone who constantly tells us all the good things she's going to do for us ONCE SHE HAS REAL POWER.

Obama, we have pretty good evidence, is much less motivated by the trappings of power, much less interested in being anointed a savior, than in sharing power with the citizenry through a government—to use a Texas simile—as open as the barn door in a high wind (or at least a strong breeze). I look at him and I see someone who simply wants to serve as a facilitator while we work out our own problems... in fact, I think he'll insist on it. "He makes me want to be a better citizen." Can anyone seriously suggest Hillary wants to let us solve our problems ourselves... away from the nanny central state?

So what gives?

How did Hillary manage to eke out Texas and hold onto Ohio? And what does it mean for the prospects of a Hillary nomination and subsequent campaign to (effectively) anoint John McCain as the next Dictator in Chief? Well hard to say, but the post from Marc Cooper this afternoon points out how Hillary won:

*"Clinton regained her footing this past week primarily by running a classic, Republican-style campaign of negative, fear-based ads. She blanketed the airwaves with a detestable spot that, stripped to its core message, warned that if Obama were selected, your children could be murdered in their beds in the middle of the night. Somewhere up above (or more likely from down below), departed GOP mudmeister Lee Atwater is cracking a grin."*

And that's the point that Democratic delegates will probably have to keep in mind when they assemble in Denver in June. It's my impression the people voting for Hillary today are a lot like the people who voted for the Bushwhacker team in previous election seasons: they're trapped in a politics of fear—a fear that precludes abstract reasoning about how we can reestablish some semblance of a free society and who's the best candidate to do that—and the Clinton team is playing that fear like a violin. To these people in the fear-based, perceptual-emotional consciousness trap, the only type of person who can RULE is one who has this "conceit of the anointed" going for her/him... much like the "I am the decider" aura of His Holy Dipwad. Having someone who declares himself king or queen gives the less conscious among us an added feeling of security.

*In balance to the Red Phone ad—and even if one concedes it may not have been a "detestable" slam against her opponent, it's clearly fear-based pandering for votes—I recall getting a charge out of the unauthorized Apple Girl ad someone threw up on the Web several months ago. This ad suggests Hillary is a droning totalitarian in women's clothing—the totalitarian assertion is unjustified (but as justified as the implication that Barack will be asleep at the switch when it comes to protecting your children).*

I feel the same sense of wonder watching people vote for Hillary as I did when their soul brothers voted for the Bushoviks. "What goes on in their minds?" Well, we shouldn't be looking that high. People have been manipulated and lied to for so long, they've lost any expectation of a world in which they can achieve reasonable goals in liberty. Somebody else is going to have to do things for them, and they don't want much, *'just let me have my government or corporate job, or even flipping burgers, don't take that away from me, if I lose the house and have to move in with relatives, at least let me have a stipend for food. [As Rand used to say, the necessities: "a cave, a club, and a chunk of raw meat."]* I'm easy. Also, *more important than anything is to destroy the terrorists even if it means wasting a few freedoms in my neighborhood.'*

But on a positive note, it looks like Obama will have the delegate lead going into convention no matter what. If Obama doesn't get the nod, then McCain being the more consistent fear-inducing politician will beat Hillary. (The principle is when two people share the same premises, the more consistent practitioner wins... e.g. a killer beats out a pickpocket.)

Regardless, we can't count ourselves out, the liberty-focused, rationality-focused sorts that tended to connect with the Ron Paul campaign. We're not going away; indeed we may be the straws that ultimately put the Obama camel in the White House—sorry for the mixed metaphor. We're also building for the future in the Republican Party, even making some moves among the Democrats.

(Obama's people were fascinated by the Ron Paul people, especially the enthusiasm of the young for Constitutional liberty and rethinking the Cartel Pathocracy financial system.) And don't forget the Libertarian Party either: "all your freedoms all the time." The future belongs to those who care.

Live free and flourish!

###

### ***Special Concerns about Hillary:***

How is it possible to ignore her vote to authorize George Bush to invade Iraq, especially when she has never apologized for it or stated she made a mistake doing so? We have undeniable further evidence she supports the American imperial state from a yes vote she cast on a Sept. 2007 Senate resolution calling on the administration to declare Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps a terrorist organization. This was a resolution sponsored by Republican Senator Kyle, Democratic Senator Lieberman, and co-sponsored by Senator McCain. This vote was pure saber-rattling toward Iran, intended to give the president political cover for attacking that country. (Fortunately, the National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) then came out stating there was no evidence Iran was pursuing nuclear weapons.) [While Obama publicly opposed the Iran resolution, he, strangely, did not take time from his campaign to vote against it.]

### ***Special Concerns about Obama:***

Let's be clear, only Ron Paul is close to the perfect candidate for president; Obama is at best a long shot to move the cart of liberty forward... which is the only standard worth having. But we do have info—check out the data from his site—that suggests he's been an effective legislator: esp. in regard to protection against gross police abuses, tax cuts, nuclear nonproliferation, taking care of veterans, alternatives to oil addiction, online access to detailed government spending activity, and government ethics legislation. He also states he will repeal the Military Commissions Act, restore habeas corpus, shut down Guantanamo, end torture and renditions, and abide by the Geneva Conventions. He's also the only candidate to advocate decriminalization of marijuana.

The remaining concern is economic liberty, and it's a substantial one, as I noted in my book review of *The Audacity of Hope*. Here's an analysis from Clive Crook, a "pro-market egalitarian" writer for the *Financial Times*, that I find generally aligned with my view. After pointing out that Obama has been playing the "central-government-qua-great-protector-of-working-class-wealth" [my phrase] card to the Democratic primary voters, Crook concludes:

*Perhaps, for a Democrat, this position is a political necessity. It is a badge of economic ignorance, nonetheless.*

*Elsewhere, though, one sees flashes of an independent intelligence in Mr Obama's economic pronouncements. He is no knee-jerk anti-capitalist: he lauds the "free market that has been the engine of America's great progress". He is cautious about mandates and other forms of dirigisme [It's not in my dictionary either]—which is why some party liberals still view him with suspicion.*

*Mr Obama is a paradox, as yet unresolved. His plan and his votes in the Senate show that he is a liberal, not a centrist. And he is no wavering or accidental liberal. His ideas are of a piece. He sees—or convinces people that he sees—a bigger picture. And yet this leftist visionary is pragmatic, non-ideological and accommodating of dissent. More than that, in fact, he seems keen to listen to and learn from those who disagree with him.*

So with Bama, on economics, we have a ray of hope.

Keep in mind, with Clinton or McCain, we have absolutely no hope of economic liberty... or civil liberty or peace; each is hopelessly in bed with the real enemy of us all, the Cartel Pathocracy (CP). With Bama we at least stick it to the enemy on two out of three salients (civil liberties and peace), and give the enemy potential trouble on the other salient (economic freedom).

###

Yesterday, 3/9/2008, was another special day of ignominy for our country: George Bush vetoed the bill sent from Congress that would have prevented the CIA or any agency from engaging in waterboarding or other forms of torture. There were no demonstrations in the street [at least none that the CP media reported] and I haven't heard anyone advocate a tax strike.. much less a full-baked revolution. Sad. I'll have more on the crimes of these particular pathocrats later. For now, for common people as ourselves, we are best advised to use our voting franchise for at least a small measure of redress of injustices.

And, any way you cut the mustard, that means Bama.

2008 March 10

Copyright © Brian Wright | *The Coffee Coaster*™

*Conceit of the Anointed* | Hillary Clinton | Barack Obama | Election 08