


LETTERS TO AMERICA #79

May 7, 2024 12:40:45 EST

Q !!120613817 ID: 177645 No. [5760-4800-6096-050724](#) 

#79 Politicization of the Deep State: Examining the Overwhelming Political Donation Trends Among Federal Employees During the 2016 Election For Hillary Clinton and Their Implications for Government Impartiality and Policy Integrity

At this pivotal moment in time, America finds itself entrenched within a crisis of unprecedented magnitude, one surpassing the gravity of even the tumultuous period of 1776. This isn't merely a crisis; it's a confluence of conflicts. At its core lies an exhaustive information war, but paramount to that, a spiritual battle for the essence of America and the very souls of its people, reminiscent of biblical proportions. The annals of the last fifteen decades bear witness to an insidious proliferation of corruption, tyranny, and moral decay within the fabric of America. The magnitude of malevolence, treachery, sedition, and blatant disregard for the sanctity of human rights, freedom, and liberty, orchestrated by a cabal of global elites driven by insatiable greed and thirst for power, is nothing short of abhorrent. We find ourselves navigating through a juncture in time where the imperative for every American, every patriot, to rise in defiance, to safeguard our liberties and resist the encroaching tyranny lest they slip through our fingers forever. Letters To America serves as a beacon of truth amidst the pervasive fog of deception, illuminating the shadows of deceit that have enveloped our government for generations, empowering you to discern the truth amidst the pervasive darkness of corruption and manipulation, offering insights into the entrenched evils and pervasive corruption that have ensnared our government and compromised the very essence of America, all for the pursuit of personal gain.

Letters to America is a very detailed collection of intel and information based on the truth that the American people need to know about that has been hidden in the shadows and suppressed for far too long. Letters to America is not just a compilation of facts and data; it embodies a profound commitment to unveiling the concealed realities that the American public

deserves to be aware of, truths obscured in the obscure corners and silenced by the mainstream media [FAKE NEWS] outlets. It is a repository of untold stories and hidden narratives and agendas, shunned and suppressed by the behemoth of big tech platforms, including the likes of Facebook. The driving force behind Letters to America is singular and unwavering: the dissemination of unfiltered, unvarnished truth to the people of this great nation. Its mission is to empower individuals to awaken to the veracity that surrounds them, to be informed people, capable of making choices and decisions rooted in the bedrock of truth rather than the quicksand of misinformation, lies and deceit. With depth, integrity, character, and purpose, Letters to America aspires to be the torchbearer of honesty in an era where the clarity of truth is often overshadowed by obscurity.

In today's Letter to America, like always, we embark on a profound journey into the depths of our collective consciousness, where uncomfortable truths reside that are waiting to be acknowledged and confronted. As we navigate the tumultuous waters of our world, it becomes clearly evident that our awareness, or lack thereof, profoundly shapes our understanding of the narratives that unfold before us. The revelations that are chronicled within this letter unveil hidden truths that will challenge preconceived notions, test the boundaries of our beliefs, and ultimately, illuminate the path towards a more enlightened existence. It is in our capacity and our willingness to explore these unsettling truths, to engage with them authentically, and to foster a deeper sense of integrity that will pave the way for a nation that transcends division and seeks the profound unity that binds us all as Americans.

Your level of awakening and consciousness serves as a lens through which the intricate layers of meaning within today's letter unfold, revealing the profound wisdom and insight chronicled within its words. As you delve deeper into the text, your heightened awareness allows you to grasp the subtle nuances and hidden truths hidden between the lines, enriching your understanding of the message and the world around you.

-

It is impossible to deny that the Deep State has been significantly politicized. This perspective is supported by notable evidence indicating that, during the 2016 presidential election, an overwhelming majority of political donations from federal employees, approximately 95 percent, were directed towards the Clinton campaign. Such statistics prompt a deeper examination of the political affiliations and potential biases within the ranks of those who serve in non-elected positions within the government.

The implications of this are profound, suggesting a possible alignment between the bureaucratic apparatus and specific political ideologies, which could influence the impartiality required for effective governance. This situation raises critical questions about the integrity of public service and the need for mechanisms that safeguard the nonpartisan nature of federal employment, ensuring that government actions and decisions are guided by principles of fairness and justice, rather than political loyalty.

The data unearthed by The Hill presents a stark portrayal of financial contributions, highlighting a significant imbalance in the distribution of political donations across various government agencies during the 2016 electoral cycle. Particularly disconcerting is the revelation that over 99 percent of donations from employees at the U.S. State Department were directed towards Hillary Clinton. This overwhelming skew raises potent questions about the diversity of political thought within key sectors of the federal workforce, as well as the potential implications such uniformity could have on policy formulation and diplomatic engagements. The concentration of financial support for a single candidate from a department so integral to international affairs and domestic policy suggests an urgent need for introspection and reform within governmental structures to ensure a balanced representation of political affiliations and opinions. Addressing this imbalance is crucial not only for fostering an environment of robust debate and decision-making within the federal government but also for maintaining the public's trust in the impartiality and integrity of its institutions.

The markedly skewed ratio of political donations from federal employees could potentially shed light on several perplexing occurrences within the political arena. Notably, there was an intriguing effort by some State Department officials to nominate Joseph Macmanus, a prominent aide to Hillary Clinton during her tenure as Secretary of State, as the U.S. ambassador to Colombia. Macmanus's pivotal role during the Benghazi incident and his close association with Clinton underscore the deep-seated connections that may influence such nominations. Further compounding the complexity of these political maneuvers is the involvement of the Deep State in employing strategies that align with communist ideologies in Colombia, supported by figures such as Fidel Castro and Barack Obama. This interweaving of personnel, policy, and ideology may also help explain the continuity of certain foreign policy initiatives across different administrations, such as the support for gay rights in Africa, which persisted despite significant shifts in leadership. This phenomenon suggests a level of bureaucratic momentum that can carry forward specific

agendas, irrespective of the changing dynamics at the top, pointing to a deeper, systemic influence within the structures of governance that may prioritize continuity over change, often transcending the dictates of electoral politics.

The patterns of political donations within federal agencies, such as those observed at the U.S. Department of Education, underscore a disturbing confluence of political bias and policy control. With over 99 percent of campaign contributions from this department favoring Clinton, compared to a mere two hundred and twenty-three dollars for Trump, there emerges a vivid portrait of ideological uniformity that influences educational policies and practices. This overwhelming financial support for Clinton aligns closely with her endorsement of the Common Core standards, which aim to establish a consistent, nationwide educational framework. Such alignment raises concerns about the extent to which political preferences shape the directives imposed on educators and influence the educational landscape at large. The near-total consolidation of control over classroom practices by the Department of Education, as mirrored in the distribution of campaign funds, invites scrutiny regarding the integrity of educational governance and the preservation of a diverse and balanced approach to education policy. This scenario points to a broader issue of how deeply political affiliations are woven into the fabric of bureaucratic decision-making, at the expense of plurality and autonomy in educational philosophy and practice.

The stagnation in policy reform, particularly evident since the transition from the Donald Trump administration to the Joe Biden administration, highlights the enduring influence of entrenched bureaucratic structures and their agendas. This is exemplified by the persistent advocacy of the Common Core standards by the U.S. Department of Education, despite widespread opposition from a diverse coalition of teachers and parents. Such resistance underscores the disconnect between top-down policy initiatives and the grassroots feedback from those directly impacted by these educational frameworks. The continuation of these standards, initially promoted for the purpose of unifying and elevating educational benchmarks nationally, now serves as a contentious symbol of federal overreach and a one-size-fits-all approach that many believe stifles local control and innovation in education. This scenario reflects a broader trend within federal agencies, where the inertia of established policies often prevails, impeding significant change and reflecting a bureaucratic preference for maintaining status quo, irrespective of changing administrations or the evolving public sentiment. This reveals a critical aspect of governance, where the longevity of certain policies may be more indicative of

institutional persistence than of their efficacy or popularity among the people.

The entrenched political leanings within federal departments, particularly those with considerable power and influence, have raised substantial concerns about the integrity and impartiality of these institutions. A striking illustration of this issue can be seen in the Department of Justice (DOJ), where during the 2016 election campaign, an overwhelming 97 percent of donations from its employees went to Hillary Clinton. This statistic becomes even more significant given that many of these donors were part of the same department responsible for investigating Clinton's use of a private email server during her tenure as Secretary of State. Despite a change in administration and the appointment of Jeff Sessions as Attorney General, the DOJ has remained heavily staffed by bureaucrats whose allegiances appear to align more closely with Clinton's policies, which critics argue aim at expanding governmental reach and dismantling traditional constitutional safeguards. This scenario highlights a broader systemic issue within the federal bureaucracy, where the personal political biases of employees potentially influence the execution of their duties, thus undermining the foundational principles of neutrality and fairness expected in government operations. Such dynamics challenge the effectiveness of administrative changes at the top, as the prevailing institutional culture continues to reflect and promote an established political agenda, rather than adapting to the directives of new leadership.

The overwhelming slant in political donations from employees across various federal departments, notably the US Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, Commerce, Energy, and others, starkly contrasts with the traditionally conservative leanings of key demographic groups they serve, such as American farmers. This pronounced funding disparity raises profound concerns about the potential for entrenched bureaucratic biases that may not accurately reflect or serve the broader public interests. For instance, while over 99 percent of donations from the Agriculture Department favored Hillary Clinton, it underscores a significant ideological divergence from the conservative base traditionally associated with the farming community. Similarly, high percentages of donations to the Democratic Party from departments like Health and Human Services and Housing and Urban Development, coupled with nearly 95 percent of contributions from the IRS to Clinton, amid longstanding accusations of the IRS targeting conservative entities, paint a picture of a federal workforce possibly at odds with a sizable segment of the people. Furthermore, the disclosure that former EPA bureaucrats distributed guides on resisting pro-Trump policies not only exemplifies this divide but also illustrates a

proactive stance within parts of the bureaucracy against the then-sitting Trump administration's directives. Such scenarios contribute to growing public skepticism regarding the impartiality and integrity of federal agencies, suggesting a deep-rooted political culture that may be resistant to change regardless of the elected government's mandates or the preferences of the electorate. This situation poses serious questions about the democratic accountability of non-elected officials and the real-world implications of their continued partisan alignments.

What emerges from the pattern of political donations within key federal departments is a compelling illustration of a deep-seated opposition within the bureaucracy to President Trump, who, elected by the people, stands ostensibly at the helm of these very agencies tasked with policy creation and implementation across critical sectors such as commerce, health, education, agriculture, housing, and foreign policy. The Deep State, a network of bureaucrats whose allegiances lie firmly with the Democratic Party, reveals a probable continuity in their support and financial backing for Democratic causes, irrespective of the Trump administration. Moreover, many of these individuals are entrenched in positions that offer a level of job security virtually unparalleled in the private sector, underpinned by comprehensive civil service laws that significantly hindered the ability of the Trump administration to enact personnel changes. This structural protection not only empowers these bureaucrats to pursue agendas independent of, or even contrary to, those of the Trump administration but also extends their influence over the daily lives of Americans. The implications of such a dynamic are profound, as they challenge the accountability and governance, where elected officials are supposed to guide the bureaucracy but instead may find themselves at odds with an established, ideologically motivated apparatus. This underlying tension can subtly yet powerfully shape everything from legislative priorities and fiscal budgets to the minute details of regulatory practices, affecting the entire fabric of American life.

These skewed donation trends from various federal agencies towards Hillary Clinton, even those traditionally supported by or benefiting from Republican administrations like the Defense Department, Homeland Security, and Veterans Affairs, raises significant concerns about the motivations and allegiances of federal employees. Some analysts suggest that these trends can be seen as a form of self-preservation. Faced with Donald Trump's campaign promises to reduce federal control and spending, many bureaucrats might have felt a tangible threat to their job security and institutional influence, prompting them to financially support the candidate they believed would best protect their interests. While this rationale may

appear to justify the disproportionate support for Clinton, it's essential to scrutinize the broader implications of such behavior. Trump's significantly lower receipt of donations, even from agencies that stood to benefit from his policies, underscores a potential systemic bias within the federal workforce. This bias not only challenges the notion of a politically neutral civil service but also points to a deeper cultural and institutional resistance to policy changes proposed by the Trump administration. Such a scenario suggests that these donation patterns are not merely coincidental but indicative of a concerted effort within parts of the bureaucracy to align with and support a political agenda that ensures the continuation of their current roles and powers, thereby influencing the governance and political landscape far beyond simple electoral outcomes.

Qx