

Hillary Says Trump Is Most Dangerous Presidential Candidate Ever - But She Is...

By [The Daily Bell](#)

Global Research, July 21, 2016

[Daily Bell](#) 19 July 2016


Region: [USA](#)

In-depth Report: [U.S. Elections](#)

Hillary Clinton said Monday that Donald Trump, the presumptive Republican nominee, was the most dangerous presidential candidate in the history of the United States. -CNN

Clinton, in an interview with CBS News' Charlie Rose, believes Donald Trump has "no self-discipline, no self-control, no sense of history, no understanding of the limits of the kind of power that any president should impose upon himself."

All of this could be applied to Clinton. She is by far the more dangerous of the two candidates.



If Clinton gets into office, she will start or expand wars and through large economic programs will ensure the US's quasi-depression deepens and that the economy never truly recovers at all (even though it may seem to.)

If things aren't getting worse, Hillary's power is not advancing. She is good at making things worse.

As her opponent, Donald Trump's main recommendation is that he has not been a politician before.

Donald Trump has chiefly been a builder and businessman.

But Hillary has basically been a politician.

Economically speaking, politics is price fixing. Laws are price-fixes, forbidding people from taking certain actions in favor of other ones.

We may agree or disagree with these price-fixes, but they exist and are a function of lawmaking.

Price-fixes always distort and degrade economies. The more laws you have, the more price-fixing and the more degradation.

We've often argued for private justice for instance in which individuals work out their own civil and criminal differences.

The less price-fixing (state control), the better.

The modern state – with its massive economic, political and judicial interference – is already well on its way to toppling.

Hillary Clinton has done well in the current system. She and her husband have built a gigantic non-profit and reportedly use it to trade favors with powerful people around the world.

She and Bill are connected at the highest levels and can influence US political and military decisions.

People will pay lots of money to anyone with this sort of clout. But the money does not apparently go directly to the Clintons. Instead it reportedly goes to their non-profit, so it does not seem as if the Clintons are accepting payments for their “help.”

How well is this non-profit run? Here, from an April 2015 New York Post in an article entitled, “Clinton Foundation a ‘Slush Fund.’”

The Clinton Foundation's finances are so messy that the nation's most influential charity watchdog put it on its “watch list” of problematic nonprofits last month. The Clinton family's mega-charity took in more than \$140 million in grants and pledges in 2013 but spent just \$9 million on direct aid.

The group spent the bulk of its windfall on administration, travel, and salaries and bonuses, with the fattest payouts going to family friends ...

“It seems like the Clinton Foundation operates as a slush fund for the Clintons,” said Bill Allison, a senior fellow at the Sunlight Foundation, a government watchdog.

Supporters of the Clintons would no doubt disagree with this assessment, as would Hillary herself.

In her interview, Hillary said of Trump, “What he has laid out is the most dangerous, reckless approach to being president than I think we've ever seen.”

More from the article:

“There is a lot of fear in our country. And when Americans are worried they’re looking for answers. He’s providing simplistic, easy answers,” Clinton said.

The article quotes poll numbers that indicate Americans are more confident about Hillary’s experience and ability to be president, even though they don’t trust her.

This is unfortunate. As political price-fixes must by definition make economies worse (unless they are removing laws), the more “experienced” a politician is, the more destructive he or she has the capacity to be.

In fact, Hillary and Bill are multimillionaires many times over. Their overarching priority is self-enrichment and the accumulation of power.

Bottom line: Hillary is being groomed for president because she will help usher in the next wave of democracy, which is a form of global technocracy.

This form of government will emphasize the power of multinational corporations and those who run them.

These corporations, more than ever, will work closely with powerful politicians to generate and expand wars necessary to advance globalist control.

When the Gutenberg press undermined the Catholic Church and the divinity of kings, the powers-that-be began to promote “democracy.” The French Revolution was created to further the concept.

Now that the Internet has exposed the phoniness of most “democracy,” a new form of governance is being promoted. This will emphasize the global marketplace as run by multinational corporations and their technocratic “experts.”

New international trade courts are being created that will allow corporations to have equal footing with nation-states.

None of this is coincidence.

Trade deals TPP and TPIP are both foundational building blocks of this new era. Hillary, from what we can tell, is intended to be the point person to advance this paradigm.

Tomorrow’s globalism, as Hillary’s backers conceive of it, will be racked by war and ruled via corporate authoritarianism. As we pointed out previously, [HERE](#), Hillary is no “democrat” and no “liberal.”

Conclusion: Win or lose, Hillary will continue to be a dangerous backer and builder of corporate, globalist technocracy. If she wins, she’ll pursue her goals on the national stage. If she loses, she will continue to work behind the scenes. Either way she’s dangerous.

The original source of this article is [Daily Bell](#)

Copyright © [The Daily Bell](#), [Daily Bell](#), 2016

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [The Daily Bell](#)

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