

Hillary Clinton Calls For 'Toppling' the 1%...While Being Bankrolled by the 1%

By [Nick Bernabe](#)

Global Research, April 22, 2015

[The Anti-Media](#) 21 April 2015

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Poverty & Social Inequality](#)

This really happened. As crazy as it sounds, Hillary Clinton is trying to repackage her [war-torn reputation](#) into a populist spitting image of progressive icon Elizabeth Warren. The [New York Times](#) reports that “Mrs. Clinton pointed at the top category and said the economy required a ‘toppling’ of the wealthiest 1 percent, according to several people who were briefed on Mrs. Clinton’s policy discussions.”

The *New York Times* and [Huffington Post](#) didn’t bother asking the questions that should have been asked, with their reporting easily summed up by the opening line in the HuffPo peice: “Hillary Clinton believes that strengthening the middle class and alleviating income inequality will require ‘toppling’ the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans, according to [a New York Times profile published on Tuesday](#).” That statement, so far, has gone relatively unquestioned by the corporate media.

But, as we all know, politicians tend to say things when they’re campaigning that differ greatly from what they actually do in real life. Firstly, Hillary Clinton’s stance that the 1% needs to be toppled goes directly against the interests of her biggest financiers. Behold her greatest campaign contributors since 1989 below:

Top Contributors

Senator Hillary Clinton

Campaign Finance Cycle:

Contributor	Total	Indivs	PACs
Citigroup Inc	\$782,327	\$774,327	\$8,000
Goldman Sachs	\$711,490	\$701,490	\$10,000
DLA Piper	\$628,030	\$601,030	\$27,000
JPMorgan Chase & Co	\$620,919	\$617,919	\$3,000
EMILY's List	\$605,174	\$601,254	\$3,920
Morgan Stanley	\$543,065	\$538,065	\$5,000
Time Warner	\$411,296	\$386,296	\$25,000
Skadden, Arps et al	\$406,640	\$402,140	\$4,500
Lehman Brothers	\$362,853	\$359,853	\$3,000
Cablevision Systems	\$336,288	\$306,900	\$29,388
University of California	\$329,673	\$329,673	\$0
Kirkland & Ellis	\$311,441	\$294,441	\$17,000
Squire Patton Boggs	\$310,596	\$305,158	\$5,438
21st Century Fox	\$302,400	\$302,400	\$0
National Amusements Inc	\$297,534	\$294,534	\$3,000
Ernst & Young	\$297,142	\$277,142	\$20,000
Merrill Lynch	\$292,303	\$286,303	\$6,000
Credit Suisse Group	\$290,600	\$280,600	\$10,000
Corning Inc	\$274,700	\$256,700	\$18,000
Greenberg Traurig LLP	\$273,550	\$265,450	\$8,100

A few [familiar faces](#) — Citigroup, Goldman Sachs, JP Morgan, Time Warner, 21st Century Fox (?) — which all happen to fall under the 1% category that Hillary is now claiming to despise. But Wall Street knows the name of the game, it is [their game now](#) after all, isn't it? [Politico](#) asked them what they thought about Hillary's pseudo-populist agenda a few days ago:

Back in Manhattan, the hedge fund managers who've long been part of her political and fundraising networks aren't sweating the putdown and aren't worrying about their take-home pay just yet.

It's 'just politics,' said one major Democratic donor on Wall Street, explaining that some of Clinton's Wall Street supporters doubt she would push hard for

closing the carried-interest loophole as president, a policy she promoted when she last ran in 2008.

[William Cohan](#) at *Politico* added,

Down on Wall Street they don't believe it for a minute. While the finance industry does genuinely hate Warren, the big bankers love Clinton, and by and large they badly want her to be president. Many of the rich and powerful in the financial industry—among them, Goldman Sachs CEO Lloyd Blankfein, Morgan Stanley CEO James Gorman, Tom Nides, a powerful vice chairman at Morgan Stanley, and the heads of JPMorganChase and Bank of America—consider Clinton a pragmatic problem-solver not prone to populist rhetoric. To them, she's someone who gets the idea that we all benefit if Wall Street and American business thrive. What about her forays into fiery rhetoric? They dismiss it quickly as political maneuvers. None of them think she really means her populism.

This must be some kind of inside joke.

Wall Street knows it's all politics. They continue funneling money into her campaign knowing that once she gets into office everything will be just fine for the 1%. These superficial, pseudo-populist calls for empowerment of the common working American will fall to the wayside once she's elected. Hillary Clinton's campaign is expected to raise \$2 billion dollars during her 2016 presidential run. A large portion of that money is expected to come from two of her closest support groups in the private sector: [Wall Street](#) and the [military-industrial-complex](#). Not exactly surprising considering her [cozy ties](#) to the banking industry and her track record of [supporting pretty much every war](#) America has been in since she became a politician.

The original source of this article is [The Anti-Media](#)

Copyright © [Nick Bernabe](#), [The Anti-Media](#), 2015

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Nick Bernabe](#)

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

