

Hillary Clinton is A NeoCon

Why the Democratic Party, its Super-Delegates and the Mainstream Media Will Some Day Regret Sabotaging Bernie Sanders' Candidacy

By [Robert Parry](#)

Global Research, May 18, 2016

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Global Economy](#), [Terrorism](#), [US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [U.S. Elections](#)

Q: Why Will the Democratic Party and its Super-Delegates Some Day Regret Sabotaging Bernie Sanders' Candidacy?

A: Because Hillary is a NeoCon

This presidential election has been both invigorating and frustrating for me and many other progressives who have awakened and witnessed the real, but now weakening hope for the much-needed, nonviolent political revolution that has been proposed by the New Deal/Fair Deal, democratic socialist candidacy of Bernie Sanders.

If the Democratic Party continues sabotaging this highly respected, increasingly popular, increasingly electable and very well-liked altruistic candidate and denies him his deserved candidacy because of the party's pro-Wall Street, pro-War Street insiders, it will regret having done so as much as the GOP will regret running Donald Trump as their candidate.

After a disastrous, long dry spell of rule by the pro-economic colonialism, pro-militarism elites (that control both political parties), another rare, highly ethical, truly democratic politician who is not beholden to the powers that be) has successfully – albeit totally unwelcomed by the establishment – interjected himself into the consciousness of the American electorate and has ignited the imaginations and hopes of millions of folks who have “felt the Bern”.

But there have been other American idealists throughout history that have also felt the Bern, but such people-power movements have happened only a handful of times over the last century, each movement or candidate usually getting snuffed out, either by assassination, imprisonment (as in the case of Eugene Debs), smear campaigns or other political intrigue.

History tells us about the brief appearances of past progressive movements that promised to benefit the “common man”, like “Fighting Bob” LaFollete's Progressive Party era, Eugene Debs's persecuted Socialist Party, FDR's New Deal era, the antiwar, liberal efforts of JFK, RFK and MLK, Eugene McCarthy's anti-Vietnam War candidacy, Paul Wellstone's people's campaign, Ralph Nader's Green Party candidacy, Occupy Wall Street's efforts, the disappearing democratic wing of the Democratic Party and, most importantly, all those millions of eager progressive-minded college-age activists who so clearly see the dire need for a true political revolution.

Those clear-headed American youth know that there must be a sea-change – and soon – in American politics and economics before they and their planet are “disappeared” down the rat hole of hopelessness and enslavement by amoral multinational corporations and their entrenched wealthy elites (and their predatory lending machine) who are refusing to give them a break or a hand up because such merciful actions might endanger their personal investment portfolios.

Neo-Liberals are just Neo-Conservatives Without the Smirk

The neo-conservatives in the (far right) Republican Party are being increasingly recognized as dangerous out-of-the-closet “technofascists” and they are being increasingly rejected by aware American voters who are capable of “keeping their eyes on the prize”.

But there has also been an increasing recognition of the similarities between the equally dangerous ideologues in the mainline (center-right) Democratic Party that increasingly exhibit their neo-liberal credentials and their more closeted, less vehement, more friendly-faced technofascism.

The website at <http://vermontrepublic.org/neoliberalism-neoconservatism-without-a-smirk/>, writes that “neo-liberals and neo-conservatives both march to the beat of the same drummer – the largest, wealthiest, most powerful, most materialistic, most racist, most militaristic, most violent empire of all time.”

Because of the confusion that most of us experience in understanding the differences between neo-conservatism and neo-liberalism, I submit below extended excerpts from the pen of the courageous founder of Consortium News, Robert Parry, who many regard as one of the best and most informed investigative journalists of our era. The two articles from which I excerpted the items below deal with the evidence that “Hillary is a NeoCon”.

Hillary Clinton Is a Neocon

By Robert Parry

April 16, 2016

Excerpts are taken from two Consortium News articles that were written by Robert Parry:

<https://www.transcend.org/tms/2016/05/neocons-and-neolibs-how-dead-ideas-kill/>

and

[Yes, Hillary Clinton Is a Neocon](#)

Hillary Clinton addressing the AIPAC conference in Washington D.C. on March 21, 2016. (Photo credit: AIPAC)

“...the “regime change” obsession blinds the neocons from recognizing that not only are these operations violations of basic international law regarding sovereignty of other nations but the invasions unleash powerful internal rivalries that neocons, who know little about the inner workings of these

countries, soon find they can't control...America's neocons are so arrogant and so influential that they simply move from one catastrophe the next like a swarm of locusts spreading chaos and death around the globe." — Robert Parry

"...neo-conservatism and its close ally neo-liberalism...are concepts that have organized American foreign policy and economics, respectively, over the past several decades – and they have failed miserably, at least from the perspective of average Americans and people of the nations on the receiving end of these ideologies.

"Neither approach (neo-liberalism or neo-conservatism) has benefited mankind; both have led to untold death and destruction; yet the twin "neos" have built such a powerful propaganda and political apparatus, especially in Official Washington, that they will surely continue to wreak havoc for years to come. They are zombie ideas and they kill.

"Yet, the Democratic Party is poised to nominate an adherent to both 'neos' in the person of Hillary Clinton. Rather than move forward from President Barack Obama's unease with what he calls the Washington 'playbook', the Democrats are retreating into its perceived safety.

"After all, the Washington Establishment remains enthralled to both 'neos', favoring the 'regime change' interventionism of neo-conservatism and the "free trade" globalism of neo-liberalism. So, Clinton has emerged as the clear favorite of the elites, at least since the field of alternatives has narrowed to populist billionaire Donald Trump and democratic socialist Bernie Sanders.

"Democratic Party insiders appear to be counting on the mainstream news media and prominent opinion-leaders to marginalize Trump, the presumptive Republican nominee, and to finish off Sanders, who faces long odds against Clinton's delegate lead for the Democratic nomination, especially among the party regulars known as 'super-delegates'.

"But the Democratic hierarchy is placing this bet on Clinton in a year when much of the American electorate has risen up against the twin 'neos', exhausted by the perpetual wars demanded by the neoconservatives and impoverished by the export of decent-paying manufacturing jobs driven by the neoliberals.

"Though much of the popular resistance to the 'neos' remains poorly defined in the minds of rebellious voters, the common denominator of the contrasting appeals of Trump and Sanders is that millions of Americans are rejecting the 'neos' and repudiating the establishment institutions that insist on sustaining these ideologies.

"Thus, the pressing question for Campaign 2016 is whether America will escape from the zombies of the twin 'neos' or spend the next four years surrounded by these undead ideas as the world lurches closer to an existential crisis.

"The main thing that the zombie 'neos' have going for them is that the vast majority of Very Important People in Official Washington have embraced these concepts and have achieved money and fame as a result. These VIPs are no more likely to renounce their fat salaries and overblown influence than the favored courtiers of a King or Queen would side with the unwashed rabble.

"The 'neo' adherents are also very skilled at framing issues to their benefit, made easier by the fact that they face almost no opposition or resistance from the mainstream media or the major think tanks.

"The neo-conservatives have become Washington's foreign policy establishment, driving the old-time 'realists' who favored more judicious use of American power to the sidelines.

"Meanwhile, the neo-liberals dominate economic policy debates, treating the 'markets' as some new-age god and the 'privatization' of public assets as scripture. They have pushed aside the old New Dealers who called for a robust government role to protect the people from the excesses of capitalism and to build public infrastructure to benefit the nation as a whole.

"If there were any doubts that Hillary Clinton favors a neo-conservative foreign policy, her performance at (a recent) debate should have laid them to rest. In every meaningful sense, she is a neocon and – if she becomes President – Americans should expect more global tensions and conflicts in pursuit of the 'neocons' signature goal of 'regime change' in countries that get in their way.

"Beyond sharing this neocon 'regime change' obsession, former Secretary of State Clinton also talks like a neocon. One of their trademark skills is to use propaganda or 'perception management' to demonize their targets and to romanticize their allies, what is called 'gluing white hats' on their side and 'gluing black hats' on the other.

"So, in defending her role in the Libyan 'regime change', Clinton called the slain Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi 'genocidal' though that is a gross exaggeration of Gaddafi's efforts to beat back Islamic militants in 2011. But her approach fits with what the neocons do. They realize that almost no one will dare challenge such a characterization because to do so opens you to accusations of being a 'Gaddafi apologist'.

"Similarly, before the Iraq War, the neocons knew that they could level pretty much any charge against Saddam Hussein no matter how false or absurd, knowing that it would go uncontested in mainstream political and media circles. No one wanted to be a 'Saddam apologist'.

"Clinton, like the neocons, also shows selective humanitarian outrage. For instance, she laments the suffering of Israelis under crude (almost never lethal) rocket fire from Gaza but shows next to no sympathy for Palestinians being slaughtered by sophisticated (highly lethal) Israeli missiles and bombs.

"She talks about the need for 'safe zones' or 'no-fly zones' for Syrians...but not for the people of Gaza who face the wrath of Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu.

"...In Clinton's (and the neocons) worldview, the Israelis are the aggrieved victims and the Palestinians the heartless aggressors.

"...Clinton ignored the history of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which dates back to the 1940s when Israeli terrorist organizations engaged in massacres to drive Palestinians from their ancestral lands and murdered British officials who were responsible for governing the territory. Israeli encroachment on Palestinian lands has continued to the present day.

"...So, Clinton made clear – both at the debate and in her recent AIPAC speech – that she is fully in line with the neocon reverence for Israel and eager to take out any government or group that Israel puts on its enemies list.

"...Clinton promised to put her future administration at the service of the Israeli government. She said, 'One of the first things I'll do in office is invite the Israeli prime minister to visit the White House. And I will send a delegation from the Pentagon and the Joint Chiefs to Israel for early consultations. Let's also

expand our collaboration beyond security’.

“...On April 2, 2011 [Clinton was informed that] Gaddafi’s government had accumulated 143 tons of gold and a similar amount of silver that ‘was intended to be used to establish a pan-African currency’ that would be an alternative to the French franc. [This was] one of the factors that influenced President Nicolas Sarkozy’s decision to commit France to the attack on Libya. Sarkozy also wanted a greater share of Libya’s oil production and to increase French influence in North Africa...

“But few Americans would rally to a war fought to keep North Africa under France’s thumb. So, the winning approach was to demonize Gaddafi with salacious rumors about him giving Viagra to his troops so they could rape more, a ludicrous allegation that was raised by then-U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Susan Rice, who also claimed that Gaddafi’s snipers were intentionally shooting children.

“With Americans fed a steady diet of such crude propaganda, there was little serious debate about the wisdom of Clinton’s Libyan ‘regime change’...

“On Oct. 20, 2011, when U.S.-backed rebels captured Gaddafi, sodomized him with a knife and then murdered him, Secretary of State Clinton couldn’t contain her glee. Paraphrasing a famous Julius Caesar quote, Clinton declared: ‘we came, we saw, he died’.

“But this U.S.-organized ‘regime change’ quickly turned sour as old tribal rivalries, which Gaddafi had contained, were unleashed. Plus, it turned out that Gaddafi’s warnings that many of the rebels were Islamic militants turned out to be true. On Sept. 11, 2012, one extremist militia overran the U.S. consulate in Benghazi killing U.S. Ambassador Christopher Stevens and three other Americans.

“...Soon, Libya slid into anarchy and Western nations abandoned their embassies in Tripoli. President Obama now terms the Libyan fiasco the biggest mistake of his presidency. But Clinton refuses to be chastened by the debacle, much as she appeared to learn nothing from her support for the Iraq invasion in 2003.

“...Like the earlier neocon-driven ‘regime change’ in Iraq, the ‘regime change’ obsession blinds the neocons from recognizing that not only are these operations violations of basic international law regarding sovereignty of other nations but the invasions unleash powerful internal rivalries that neocons, who know little about the inner workings of these countries, soon find they can’t control.

“...America’s neocons are so arrogant and so influential that they simply move from one catastrophe to the next like a swarm of locust spreading chaos and death around the globe.

A Neocon True-Believer

“In (a recent) debate, Hillary Clinton showed how much she has become a neocon true-believer. Despite the catastrophic ‘regime changes’ in Iraq and Libya, she vowed to invade Syria, although she dresses up that reality in pretty phrases like ‘safe zones’ and ‘no-fly zones’. She also revived the idea of increasing the flow of weapons to ‘moderate’ rebels although they, in reality, mostly fight under the command umbrella of Al Qaeda’s Nusra Front.

“...After the violent coup, when the people of Crimea voted by 96 percent to

secede from Ukraine and rejoin Russia, the U.S. government and Western media deemed that a 'Russian invasion' and when ethnic Russians in eastern Ukraine rose up in resistance to the new authorities in Kiev that became 'Russian aggression'.

NATO on the Move

"Though President Obama should know better – and I'm told that he does know better – he has succumbed this time to pressure to go along with what he calls the Washington 'playbook' of saber-rattling and militarism. NATO is moving more and more combat troops up to the Russian border while Washington has organized punishing economic sanctions aimed at disrupting the Russian economy.

"...Though Clinton's anti-Russian delusions are shared by many powerful people in Official Washington, they are no more accurate than the other claims about Iraq's WMD, Gaddafi passing out Viagra to his troops, the humanitarian need to invade Syria, the craziness about Iran being the principal source of terrorism (when it is the Saudis, the Qataris, the Turks and other Sunni powers that have bred Al Qaeda and the Islamic State), and the notion that the Palestinians are the ones picking on the Israelis, not the other way around.

"However, Clinton's buying into the neocon propaganda about Russia may be the most dangerous – arguably existential – threat that a Clinton presidency would present to the world. Yes, she may launch U.S. military strikes against the Syrian government (which could open the gates of Damascus to Al Qaeda and the Islamic State); yes, she might push Iran into renouncing the nuclear agreement (and putting the Israeli/neocon goal to bomb-bomb-bomb-Iran back on the table); yes, she might make Obama's progressive critics long for his more temperate presidency.

"But Clinton's potential escalation of the new Cold War with Russia could be both the most costly and conceivably the most suicidal feature of a Clinton-45 presidency. Unlike her times as Secretary of State, when Obama could block her militaristic schemes, there will be no one to stop her if she is elected President, surrounded by likeminded neocon advisers."

Investigative reporter Robert Parry broke many of the Iran-Contra stories for The Associated Press and Newsweek in the 1980s. His latest book, America's Stolen Narrative, can be purchased at: https://org.salsalabs.com/o/1868/t/12126/shop/shop.jsp?storefront_KEY=1037 or as an e-book from Amazon or barnesandnoble.com.

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Robert Parry](#), Global Research, 2016

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Robert Parry](#)

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