

## **Even For A Democrat, Hillary Clinton Stands Out As Violent, Aggressive**

By Robert Barsocchini

Global Research, June 11, 2016

Couuntercurrents 10 June 2016

Region: <u>USA</u>

Robert Parry <u>says</u> in his latest piece that while the Democrats have been "a reluctant war party" since 1968, by nominating Hillary Clinton, they have once again become an "aggressive war party".

Noam Chomsky <u>notes</u> that indeed, Hillary Clinton would be more "adventurous", ie aggressive, than Trump or Sanders in terms of foreign policy, but he and other analysts, like John Pilger, disagree with Parry that the Democrats were, during the period Parry suggests, and perhaps any other, what a rational person would call "reluctant" to kill.

Looking back briefly at a couple of examples of Democratic initiatives, as well as who formed the Democratic party, we see that when it comes to butchering people, the Democrats have never been shy.



John Pilger <u>points out</u> in a recent article that "most of America's wars (almost all of them against defenceless countries) have been launched not by Republican presidents but by liberal Democrats: Truman, Kennedy, Johnson, Carter, Clinton, Obama."

<u>Kennedy</u> began the US genocide against the people of Vietnam, demanding bombings and attacks with chemical weapons like napalm, and began a terrorist campaign against Cuba that continues to date.

Johnson, who <u>viewed</u> the Vietnamese people as "barbaric yellow dwarves", continued the genocide in Vietnam and Indochina.

Carter supported numerous genocides and terrorist campaigns.

Bill Clinton, among many horrific acts, committed a major genocide against the people of

Iraq, and helped lay the foundation for today's nuclear war tension by expanding NATO to Russia's borders.

One of Hillary Clinton's <u>many crimes</u> was to continue this expansion by supporting a US-backed, neo-Nazi and neo-con integrated coup in Ukraine while referring to the president of Russia as "Hitler" – by far the most aggressive stance towards Russia of any US candidate.

See Pilger's article for some of Obama's crimes, which in several ways are uniquely extreme.

Truman defied his military advisers and many others and carried out mass nuclear executions of civilians as a way to influence the government of Japan (and likely the Soviet Union), then followed his nuclear attacks by further targeting Japanese civilians with the biggest TNT-based mass-execution of civilians in human history up to that point. Executing civilians was a prominent part of his 'Democratic' philosophy. He publicly stated that "the German people are beginning to atone for the crimes of the gangsters whom they placed in power and whom they wholeheartedly approved and obediently followed." His logic, an example of the standard definition of "terrorism", would suggest that Israelis, who support almost entirely their state's illegal annexation and massacres of Palestine, should be targeted and killed until they "atone" for what their government is doing, and that US civilians who supported the sanctions against or invasion of Iraq (etc.) should likewise be punished until they "atone". This is also the principle behind the 9/11 attacks, though US citizens who support terrorism committed by their own state are quick to engage in the "wrong agent" –genetic- fallacy when this is pointed out.

Looking back further than Truman, we find the Democrats comprised the bulk of the prochattel-slavery bloc. As noted at <a href="Pbs.org">Pbs.org</a>, "after the Civil War, most white Southerners opposed Radical Reconstruction and the Republican Party's support of black civil and political rights. The Democratic Party identified itself as the "white man's party" and demonized the Republican Party as being "Negro dominated," even though whites were in control. Determined to re-capture the South, Southern Democrats "redeemed" state after state — sometimes peacefully, other times by fraud and violence. By 1877, when Reconstruction was officially over, the Democratic Party controlled every Southern state. The South remained a one-party region until the Civil Rights movement began in the 1960s. Northern Democrats, most of whom had prejudicial attitudes towards blacks, offered no challenge to the discriminatory policies of the Southern Democrats."

Backing up again, we see that in fact the Democratic party was <u>founded</u> by supporters of the sadistic <u>genocidaire</u> Andrew Jackson, who enjoyed making clothing from the skin of people who were exterminated in service of expanding the un-free world.

Are Republicans therefore a superior ogranization? Of course not. The two parties check and balance each other to maintain and expand the world's leading terrorist state.

As we can see, it is nothing new or different for the Democrats to be a party of expansionist gangsters. What is remarkable of Clinton, then, is that even against this gory and tyrannical backdrop, she stands out as especially evil, corrupt, and extremist in her US religio-national supremacism. As Professor Johan Galtung notes, two countries today (and occasionally their proxies) continue to wage aggressive war, thanks to their belief that they have been anointed by their gods: the US and Israel. And Hillary Clinton is as fundamentalist as they

come.

As Chris Hedges and Noam Chomsky, among others, have recently <u>noted</u>, US elections are "a carnival... a way of making people passive, submissive objects". Rather than petering out and cowering to the Democratic party, Chomsky says, Sanders supporters should "sustain the ongoing movement, which [should] pay attention to the elections for 10 minutes but meanwhile do other things." However, at the moment, "it's the other way around. It's all focused on the election. It's just part of the ideology. The way you keep people out of activism is get them all excited about the carnival that goes on every four years and then go home, which has happened over and over."

Robert Barsocchini is an internationally published author who focuses on force dynamics, national and global, and also writes professionally for the film industry. Updates on Twitter. Author's <u>pamphlet</u> 'The Agility of Tyranny: Historical Roots of Black Lives Matter'.

The original source of this article is <u>Couuntercurrents</u> Copyright © <u>Robert Barsocchini</u>, <u>Couuntercurrents</u>, 2016

## **Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page**

## **Become a Member of Global Research**

Articles by: Robert Barsocchini

**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: <a href="mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca">publications@globalresearch.ca</a>

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: <a href="mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca">publications@globalresearch.ca</a>