

---

---

# TED CRUZ: “ELMER GANTRY” FOR PRESIDENT?

A Theocracy to Bring Back the Confederacy by “Legal Means”

By Pierre Beaudry, 3/23/2016

---

---

## FOREWORD

*“For the first time in History, a team specialized in psychological operations is attempting to fabricate a candidate for the US Presidential elections and win him a home in the White House. His victory, if they succeed, would prove that it is possible to falsify the electoral process itself. It would also call into question the power of the military on civil institutions.”*

Thierry Meyssan, [\*Ted Cruz PsyOp\*](#)

Here is what the British Empire system is planning for you in the United States. They are setting up the United States for a subversion of our Constitution in the course of the current Presidential election. They are preparing you for a “Confederate Theocracy,” the process of which they have just initiated in Chicago on March 11, 2016, when the buffoon Donald Trump was forced to cancel his meeting because of the presence of paid professional agitators.

His main opponent, the “Elmer Gantry” of the American Presidential elections, Ted Cruz (Cross), accused Trump of “creating an environment leading to such violent discords.” Cruz was right, and he agrees with such “Trump discords,” because they are a crucial component of his own campaign for the Presidency.

A similar situation occurred in Ohio the next day, where Trump was ushered to safety by his security staff. When you see something like this taking place during an election, don't fall for the trap of thinking that these are just "political dirty tricks." In American politics, when you smell a rat, it is very likely because there is a rat. And, this "rat" is the signal that the time has come for the British to push for their choice campaign, the "Confederate Theocracy" of Ted Cruz. The question is: "Is this election the beginning of the British Empire's colored revolution for the United States?"

## INTRODUCING THE NEW "ELMER GANTRY" OF AMERICA

*"Yeah. Well, the point is, is, can you change things from the truth? And if you can't do it, then you have to teach yourself how to do it, and that's what's lost. Everybody wants to be practical. And practical people are usually useless people, or worse."*

Lyndon LaRouche, [LAROUCHE PAC POLICY COMMITTEE SHOW](#), Monday, March 14, 2016.

While the attention is currently directed almost exclusively on the Donald Trump and Hilary Clinton campaigns, the real hidden danger of this Presidential campaign is located within the Ted Cruz campaign. The irony of the current Presidential election in the United States is that the British are playing up Donald Trump as a diversion during the first half of the campaigning period, while their real candidate in the wings is Ted Cruz.


Let's do a brief profile of each of them and see why the British are trying to subvert the American Constitution with Ted Cruz. The profile of Donald Trump is the easier of the two: he is obviously a fool and a provocateur who made his fortune by developing bullyness as a new style of telling it like it is perceived. The American middle-class like him because they believe he is going to bring back the America they have lost. As for Ted Cruz, he is an "absolutist" Confederate fanatic. He is a more complicated figure and a perfect British choice of candidate because he believes, like the British oligarchy does, that if he controls the terrain of the

battle, he will win. And, since the British have total control over the terrain and over Cruz, they believe that Cruz will win.

For the British financial back up of Cruz, I recommend you take a look at [“The Man Who Out-Koched the Kochs”](#) by Annie Linskey, *Bloomberg*, October 23, 2014. For a more serious investigation, I recommend a careful study of the revealing article on Ted Cruz by Jeffrey Toobin, [THE ABSOLUTIST](#) in the *New Yorker*, June 30, 2014. However, for a report that is closer to the truth about Cruz, I recommend Thierry Meyssan's [Ted Cruz PsyOp](#), in the *Voltaire Network*, February 8, 2016.

### Where Mercer's Money Went

Spending by Robert Mercer and his family foundation




Note: Spending includes Mercer's federal giving 2008-2014 and his foundation's giving 2008-2012. Sources: Federal Election Commission, Mercer Family Foundation tax documents

Bloomberg

**Figure 1** The Mercer money behind the American Presidential Election. Photo Bloomberg.

What the Linskey article goes through, essentially, is how the Cruz campaign is being funded by the British strategic communication firm SCL-

Cambridge Analytica, which is a psychological warfare outfit. What the Jeffrey Toobin article goes through is a significant clinical study of the Cruz profile and its “Confederacy” connections. The report from Thierry Meyssan is the best because he hits directly at the truth of the British psychological warfare operation against the American citizenry.



**Figure 2** Robert Mercer, Cruz’s primary financial backer, has given millions to Strategic Communications Laboratories SCL-Cambridge Analytica, a British Intelligence outfit run by Cambridge University lecturer, psychologist Aleksandr Kogan, who has been hired by Cruz for the purpose of “behavioral microtargeting” American voters. Kogan boasts that he has gathered data on more than 40 million American profiles. Source, **Ted Cruz using firm that harvested data on millions of unwitting Facebook users** [Harry Davies/*The Guardian*]



**Figure 3** Ted Cruz pompously staring at you from his Washington DC Senate Office. Photograph by Pari Dukovic.

The Presidential campaign has now reached the turning point. The time has now come to introduce violence into the campaign and build up the support for an apparent alternative to FASCISM with an appeasement campaign under the guise of a CHRISTIAN FUNDAMENTALIST THEOCRACY. Yes, that is how Satan dresses up in Texas. **(Figure 3)** What are the buttons they are going to push on the American population? There are two satanic buttons: One is a conservative purist, the other a liberal Wall Street populist. So, my question is: “Why have the British chosen Cruz to become President of the United States?”

The reason is not simple, but very evil. It is because Cruz is a lawyer trained in picking up the pieces after compromises on principles have been made, that is, when the cases go into appeal. He is an appellate lawyer. What is significant about that, you ask? Cruz gets to define the terrain where the final battle is going to take place after the defendant has been weakened. Following in Margaret Thatcher footsteps, Cruz has defined his approach as: “First you win the argument, then, you win the vote.” This is a typical British parliamentary procedure.

Although Cruz claims to be a literalist Constitution lawyer, he is an appellate lawyer at heart. He will defend your right to be wrong, but only after you have given up your principles to be free. The crux of his character can be found in his choice of “narrative,” as he calls his legal or political argumentation. The epistemological framework of Cruz’s mindset goes back to his senior thesis at Princeton. New Yorker reporter, Jeffrey Toobin, made an important point about the framework of Cruz’s way of thinking. He wrote:

“At Princeton, Cruz wrote a senior thesis about a topic that was obscure at the time but later became of wide interest in the conservative legal movement: the Ninth and Tenth Amendments. The Ninth states, ‘The enumeration in the constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people’; and the Tenth reads, ‘The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people.’ Ever since the Bill of Rights was ratified, near the end of the eighteenth century, the meaning of these provisions has proved elusive to scholars and judges. Robert Bork compared the Ninth to an inkblot. Liberal scholars have generally viewed the Ninth Amendment, in particular, as a guarantee that the Constitution represents a floor for, or a ceiling on, the rights of individuals. In his thesis, Cruz wrote that he intended to ‘elaborate upon a conception of the Ninth and Ten Amendments which revitalizes the Founders’ commitment to limiting government, to restraining the reach of none-too-angelic leaders.’ The conclusion is debatable, but the level of erudition in the thesis is extraordinary, especially for a twenty-one-year-old who had not yet

gone to law school.” (Jeffrey Toobin, [THE ABSOLUTIST](#), the *New Yorker*, June 30, 2014.)

What is the argument, here? The claim to have the right to fight against the enemy, the Federal Government. The principle underlying the Ninth and Ten Amendments is used as a “right” to claim that states’ rights are superior to federal power, that individual rights are superior to the power of the Federal Government, i.e., the argument of the Confederacy. How can the American people be made to believe that their government is the enemy of the people? The cynical title of Cruz’s 1992 undergraduate thesis demonstrates clearly that this was his underlying assumption: *“Clipping the Wings of Angels: The History and Theory behind the Ninth and Tenth Amendments of the Unite States Constitution.”*

Cruz’s legal argument of Cruz is aimed at limiting the power of the Federal Government, not for the “general welfare” of the people, but for the benefit of a few privileged people, like the Wall Street oligarchs. And that is the reason why Alexander Hamilton, among others, argued that a bill of rights was unnecessary and even harmful to the constitutional government of the United States. As Cruz complained:

“They [Federalists] claimed a) that it was unnecessary, b) that it would be ineffective, and c) that it would be harmful. They outlined three ways in which it would be harmful: 1) it would imply that government had powers over everything not enumerated (instead of the current presumption that the people had rights against the government for everything not enumerated, 2) it would imply that government had powers over the general areas mentioned in the rights and that it was only constrained from directly violating them, and 3) because rights would probably be defined too narrowly, it would imply that all rights not mentioned did not exist.

“Hamilton argued that it was unnecessary:

‘[B]ills of rights are, in their origin, stipulations between kings and their subjects, abridgments of prerogative in favor of privilege, reservations of rights not surrendered to the prince...[T]hey have no applications to

constitutions, professedly founded upon the power of the people and executed by their immediate representatives and servants. Here, in strictness, the people surrender nothing; as they retain everything they have no need of particular reservations' (Alexander Hamilton, *Federalist No. 54. 512-3*)." (Quoted in Ted Cruz, [\*Clipping the Wings of Angels\*](#), p. 44)

"General welfare" gets transformed into "privileged welfare." Note how Cruz changed the terrain by defining American politics as being the fight between the Government and the People as opposed to what Hamilton had identified as the fight between the representatives of the people and kings. For Cruz, the Federal Government is not the representation of the people, but the enemy of the people. And he wants to be President?

Cruz is a dangerous man, because he has no moral scruples about using deception as a way to get to his end; that is, in this case, to bring back the confederate rights of the "privileged people," by legal means. This is no longer Republicanism; this is pure unadulterated Oligarchism. Cruz's goal consists in changing the constitutional terrain on which the nation was built and ushering in a "Wall Street Confederacy." Take the Medellin court case as another example.

In 2008, Ernesto Medellin was condemned to death for rape and murder in Houston Texas. The World Court of the United Nations called for reopening the case, as well as those of fifty other Mexican nationals who were on death row, because none of the defendants had been given consular services from the Mexican government, a right which the United States had been treaty-bound to honor. The George W. Bush administration was in agreement with the World Court and acquiesced to the demand. It looked as if Ted Cruz, then Solicitor General of Texas, had no leg to stand on and that it was an open-and-shut case. However, since the case had both legal and political ramifications, Cruz chose to shift the "narrative" from the legal to the political terrain, and won his case by resorting to a "confederate justice" trick. His legerdemain tactic is summed up in his own words:

"In both Law and politics, I think the essential battle is the meta-battle of framing the narrative. As Sun Tzu said, 'Every battle is won before it's fought. It's won by choosing the terrain on which it will be fought.' So, in



litigation, I tried to ask, ‘What’s this case about?’ When the judge goes home and speaks to his grandchild, who’s in kindergarten, and the child says, ‘Paw-Paw, what did you do today?’ And if you own those two sentences that come out of the judge’s mouth, you win the case.”

“So let’s take Medellin as an example of that,” Cruz went on. “The other side’s narrative in Medellin was very simple and easy to understand. ‘Can the state of Texas flout U.S. treaty obligations, international law, the President of the United States, and the world? And, by the way, you know how those Texans are about the death penalty anyway!’ That’s their narrative. That’s what the case is about. When Justice Kennedy comes home and he tells his grandson, ‘This case is about whether a state can ignore U.S. treaty obligations,’ we lose.

“So I spent a lot of time thinking about, ‘What’s a different narrative to explain this case?’ Because, as you know, just about every observer in the media and in the academy thought we didn’t have a prayer. This is a hopeless case.’

“Cruz decided to change the narrative into one about the separation of powers. He refashioned the case from a fight between Texas and the United States to one between the executive branch and the legislative branch of the federal government, with Texas advocating for Congress. He argued that the President could not order Texas to reopen the cases without the specific authorization of Congress. Cruz dueled with Stephen Breyer and other skeptical Justices for well over the allotted thirty minutes. Breyer ribbed Cruz: ‘As I read the Constitution, it says all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every state—I guess it means including Texas’—the audience laughed—‘shall be bound thereby.’

“‘Certainly, Justice Breyer,’ Cruz answered. ‘Texas, of course, does not dispute that the Constitution, laws, and treaties are the supreme law of the land.’ But, he went on, ‘the President’s order, in this case, was none of these.’ The questioning of Cruz became so raucous that, at one point, Justice

John Paul Stevens felt compelled to interject, ‘You said there are six reasons. . . . I really would like to hear what those reasons are without interruption from all of my colleagues.’ Cruz won the case, six-to-three, with Stevens joining the Court’s conservatives.” (Jeffrey Toobin, [THE ABSOLUTIST](#), the *New Yorker*, June 30, 2014.)

This is how Cruz intends to pull the Constitution from under your feet. The point to be made, here, is that, as President of the United States, Cruz would be a passionate defender of this sort of Confederate “Exceptionalism.” Aside from his confederate agenda, Cruz has also embraced the fundamentalist view of eliminating the separation of church and state and subverting international law and treaty agreements. As to his religious proclivities, Thierry Meyssan noted in his article:

“His father, the Evangelist pastor Raphael Cruz, is a Cuban immigrant who preaches that God gave men of faith the job of governing “America”. He claims that at the end of times, which is coming soon, God will give the wealth of evil men to the just [8].

Ted’s wife, Heidi Cruz, was the Director for South America to the National Security Council in the days of Condoleezza Rice. She then became vice-president of Goldman Sacks, tasked with the management of the fortunes of clients from the South-West US [9].

At the start of his Presidential campaign, Ted Cruz generated very few favorable opinions, and the Press commented on his unempathetic character. However, thanks to the help of SCL/Cambridge Analytica, he quickly formed a huge support group, and won the Republican primaries in Iowa.” (Thierry Meyssan, [Ted Cruz PsyOp](#))

On the international scene, Cruz would be the first to forbid the United States from joining the BRICS on the grounds that it would endanger the sovereignty of the United States. Cruz is passionate about rejecting international laws that might infringe upon American sovereignty. As he said to the *New Yorker* about his role in the U.S. Senate: “I personally have been passionate for a long,

long time about protecting U.S. sovereignty, that our laws should reflect American values, American mores, and not be governed by the laws or tribunals of foreign nations or foreign institutions. I urged my soon-to-be colleagues to protect U.S.



sovereignty, and ultimately they did so.” ([THE ABSOLUTIST](#))

**Figure 4** A photo of the Ten Commandments Monument at the Texas State Capital, promoted and defended by Ted Cruz in 2005. (Photo: Office of the Attorney General of Texas.)

There is every reason to worry about the future of the United States if someone like Ted Cruz were to be elected President, because his kind of thinking leads to McCarthyism. Cruz is not just a very dangerous man because he wants to constitutionally exclude the United States from international cooperation like the BRICS, but because he is using a new confederate type of British deception that is based on states’ right and a very restricted role of federal power.

The Cruz thesis on [Clipping the Wings of Angels](#) and the Medellin case demonstrate clearly how Cruz’s mind works. Now, you understand why the British are funding the Cruz Presidential campaign: he is a complete Confederate stooge working for the benefit of the Wall Street happy few. Are you going to let Ted Cruz pull the American Constitution from under your feet and change its “narrative” to a Confederate Theocratic Constitution?

**FIN**