

Post-election 2006: “Changes in course” and other post-election delusions

By [Larry Chin](#)

Region: [USA](#)

Global Research, November 14, 2006

[Online Journal](#) 14 November 2006

Following what appeared to be an election landslide that put the Democrats in control of both houses of the US Congress, America’s Democratic Party faithful are euphoric, and insanely optimistic about a Democratic “house cleaning” that will not only bring down the “now-repudiated” Bush administration, but stop the war in Iraq, “restore oversight and ethics,” and “end corruption.” Put down the champagne, stop the hysterical laughter, and wake up: none of it will happen.

On all of the most urgent matters facing the world, there will be no salvation, no real “change of course,” no criminal proceedings against the most openly criminal administration in US (and perhaps world) history. There will be no end to the war.

The “9/11 war on terrorism” will not only continue, but also intensify and expand under “new management,” from a “bipartisan consensus” in Washington. Between a Bush White House (that hasn’t gone anywhere) and a compliant Democratic Congress, we simply return to the good old days, circa the George H.W. Bush era — in more ways than one.

Robert Gates: a dangerous old course

It has been clear for months, perhaps years, that the Bush administration’s management of the “war on terrorism” had become bad for business.

The peevish and insane Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld was the obvious weak link, the most unpopular figure, and had to go. A symbolic makeover, endorsed by Wall Street’s geopolitical elites, is what the world got on November 7, 2006, with a Democratic election victory that washes over the endless US war machine with neoliberal trappings.

Mere minutes after Rep. Nancy Pelosi officially accepted her new role as Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Bush administration attempted to trump the fanfare by replacing Rumsfeld with George H.W. “Poppy” Bush’s inner circle emissary, former CIA Director/National Security Council heavyweight and Iran-Contra-connected intelligence manipulator Robert Gates.

Loud Bush-friendly media reports have immediately declared that the Rumsfeld ouster “promises a new course” that is certain to “head off catastrophe,” hailing Gates as “the anti-Rumsfeld” and a “moderate” visionary “who is not a neocon.” Gates, these reports lavish, is of the James Baker/Brent Scowcroft/George H.W.Bush school of “pragmatists,” a “diplomat,” who will push for a new blueprint based on a geostrategy being pushed by the Iraq Study Group. This group is headed by long-time war criminals James Baker and Lee Hamilton (which itself reflects long-standing US geostrategic goals that have remained in place since

the Jimmy Carter administration), and one of many methods being devised to promote continuing military adventures across the Middle East.

Gates, a throwback Middle East conquest agenda from the murderous William Casey/George H.W.Bush era, is being touted as a panacea. He is a harbinger of the terror to come and a [legendary manipulator of intelligence](#)

In bitter irony, as reported by [Black Box Voting](#)'s Bev Harris, Gates was also a director of a [voting machine company](#).

The Democrats will welcome the "expertise" of Gates. America will stay in Iraq (the bases being built are permanent, and aren't going anywhere), and move onward, perhaps into Iran, and across the "Grand Chessboard," all the way across the Eurasian continent, into Venezuela and Latin America, and into the Pacific Theatre, for showdowns with China.

Bipartisan consensus war machine

In *America's "War on Terrorism,"* [Michel Chossudovsky](#) wrote, "A large section of the US public thought that a change in direction might occur if the Democrats had won the 2004 presidential elections.

"Yet the Democrats are not opposed to the illegal occupation of Iraq and Afghanistan. Nor are they opposed to the militarization of civilian institutions, as evidenced by their 1996 initiative to repeal the Posse Comitatus Act. Moreover, their perspective and understanding of 9/11 and the 'war on terrorism' is broadly similar to that of the Republicans.

"This ongoing militarization of America is not a Republican project. The 'war on terrorism' is part of a bipartisan agenda. Furthermore, successive US Administrations since Jimmy Carter have supported the Islamic brigades and have used them in covert intelligence operations.

"While there are substantive differences between Republicans and Democrats, Bush's National Security doctrine is a continuation of that formulated under the Clinton Administration in the mid-1990s, which was based on a 'strategy of containment of Rogue States.'

"In 2003, the Democrats released their own militarization blueprint entitled, 'Progressive Internationalism: A Democratic National Security Strategy.' The latter called for 'a bold exercise of American power, not to dominate but to shape alliances and international institutions that share a common commitment to liberal values.'

"The militarization of America is a project of the US corporate elites, with significant divisions within the corporate establishment on how it is achieved.

" . . . influential voices within the elites would prefer a 'softer' police state apparatus, a 'democratic dictatorship' which retains the external appearance of a functioning democracy.

"The Democrats' 'Progressive Internationalism' is viewed by these sectors as a more effective way of imposing the US economic and military agenda worldwide."

With Washington power now more evenly shared between the Bush administration and a

Congress headed by the Democrats, the world faces the nightmare of a true bipartisan consensus “war on terrorism” and US police state.

This “war without end” paradigm will continue into the foreseeable future, with America under the jackboot of a new president. Whether it is John McCain, Hillary Clinton, or another, neocon or neoliberal, the [geostrategy is the same](#).

“War on terrorism” and 9/11 manipulations central to Pelosi’s “100 Hours”

One of the first priorities articulated by Nancy Pelosi, as part of her “First 100 Hours” program, will be to push implementation of the recommendations of the [9/11 Commission](#) — in other words, cement in place the cover-up of 9/11, hide the commission’s own criminality, and implement disastrous measures based the commission’s lies.

This should immediately ends any fantasizing that Pelosi and the Democrats have any thoughts about a “change in course.”

[9/11 Commission: a 571-page lie](#)

The view of an increasing number of elites is that administration’s “war on terrorism” “went off course” when Bush-Cheney “mishandled” the war by going into Iraq in a “sloppy” fashion. It is time, therefore, to restore the war consensus created by 9/11 and take back the “squandered opportunity” to wage the “real” war.

Pelosi, Reid and the Democrats have unanimously and aggressively pushed for an “even more aggressive “war on terrorism” to “really go after Osama.” The Democrats, like the Bush administration, intend to “make America safe” by militarizing it, and continuing to gut the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

The only course dictated by the American Empire is the road to hell, made possible by deception and denial, and the 9/11 atrocity that it planned, executed and continues to use to justify endless war and endless resource conquest. Count on the pro-war Democrats working with Bush to keep America on this road, [disenfranchised, false-flagged, and still stupid](#).

Peak Oil: not an issue for the Dems, either

The Democrats, the so-called “environmental” leaders, continue to ignore the environmental and planetary issue of energy depletion.

Even as the scientific facts of [Peak Oil](#) have gradually moved towards [center stage](#) at the [highest levels](#), Washington continues to publicly deny the unfolding crisis, still hiding [the overriding paradigm that forced 9/11](#) and the war’s [continuation](#).

There is no official Democratic Party platform, no policy agenda, recognizing Peak Oil or energy depletion, besides too-little too-late and unrealistic gestures towards alternative energy and global warming.

Even as Democratic Party elites, such as former CIA Director James Woolsey, cover their own homes with solar panels, they will leave the rest of America in the dark.

A Democratic Party landslide — or was it?

As [previously noted](#), every aspect of the American vote is manipulated. It is not possible to determine the degree to which any election reflects actual votes or a manufactured, scripted outcome. What is consistent is that vote fraud is always rampant.

It is a fact that four hard-wired Republican/neocon corporations control the American vote: [Diebold](#), [ESS](#), [Sequoia](#), and [SAIC](#). Nothing happened prior to, during, or after the 2006 election to change this fact. There was no new oversight, and no new methods of accountability put into place. In fact, there was more confusion, with more new and untested technology being used for the first time. These conditions should have resulted in another Republican theft.

Three consecutive elections since 2000 were stolen by Republican-connected forces. Why and how then did the Democrats won so easily, almost miraculously, unless it was by design?

Anecdotal reports suggest that Democrats, at the very least, were beneficiaries of more malfeasance than previous contests. Some Republican voters, for example, filed complaints after seeing their votes electronically flipped to Democratic candidates (in the same manner that Cynthia McKinney lost her congressional seat, in large part from machines in Georgia electronically flipping votes for her to her Republican opponent).

It remains unclear what actually happened on election night 2006. Widespread and creative dirty tricks, election day irregularities, voter suppression, intimidation, and electronic malfeasance clearly suggest that the 2006 election was every bit as dirty as the previous contests. (See the coverage by [VoteTrustUSA](#) and [Black Box Voting](#).)

While the exhausted and desperate Democratic Party faithful is eager to believe that “Democratic Party values finally registered,” and “old fashioned get-out-the-vote works,” and that the “will of the people” prevailed, the smell test still awaits those who refuse to buy this propaganda.

No impeachment, no “oversight”

In their victory speech, the new Speaker of the House, Rep. Nancy Pelosi and new Senate Majority Leader, Senator Harry Reid, promised “friendly bipartisanship.” In other words, the Democratic leadership will continue to softball and glad-hand a criminal executive branch.

Pelosi is on record refusing to support an impeachment process against Bush-Cheney, the most openly criminal presidency in history, and even believes that impeachment is a “stupid” idea.

Rep. John Conyers and Rep. Henry Waxman have made moves towards investigations and hearings against Bush-Cheney, but without the full support of leading members of Congress, the chances of any serious prosecution of Bush-Cheney is nil.

For all the hopeful talk of a “return to checks and balances,” at best these Democrats will buzz around like mosquitoes, and roll over.

The greatest geopolitical crimes in world history occurred with Democrats in full control of the Congress. What did a Democratic Congress do prior to 1994 but enable and provide political cover to Clinton, Bush and Reagan/Bush? Hold limited-hangout hearings that ultimately let political criminals such Oliver North off the hook?

What is “bipartisanship,” except endless “closed door” activities, old-boys-network “hearings” that accomplish nothing, and cooperative cover-ups that shield American citizens from the most important decisions, made with their tax money, and their country?

“Bipartisanship” is code for “letting both factions in on the action,” with both factions benefiting from malfeasance. There is nothing to indicate that this Congress will be any different.

Finally, for any individual naïve enough to believe that Democrats will end corruption, and stop the Jack Abramoff/Enron abuses of the George W. Bush administration, simply consult the history books on the deep corruption of all previous Democrat-dominated periods.

Like war, elite crime is bipartisan.

The original source of this article is [Online Journal](#)
Copyright © [Larry Chin](#), [Online Journal](#), 2006

[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