

US Senators Are Even More Neoconservative than Are Trump's Appointees

By [Eric Zuesse](#)

Region: [USA](#)

Global Research, January 20, 2017

[Strategic Culture Foundation](#) 17 January
2017

The confirmation hearings for the members of incoming President Donald Trump's national-security team show that neoconservatism dominates the U.S. government today: neoconservatism didn't end after George W. Bush's alleged certainty that «Saddam's WMD» existed in 2002, turned out to have been merely [an excuse —not an authentic reason —](#) to invade Iraq, and so to spread death and mass-misery (as every invasion does). Today's confirmation hearings are, in fact, making clear that virtually all of Congress is neoconservative — at least as much as was the case back in 2002, when Congress authorized the President to invade Iraq before weapons inspectors finished their work (and so Bush was able to order them out, and to invade Iraq).

These hearings are displaying 100% neoconservative U.S. Senators — no Senator who isn't a neoconservative. These Senators, of both Parties, in their questioning and comments, are all far to the right of the incoming President, Donald Trump. (Democrats might be to the 'left' of Republicans on some domestic matters, but both Parties are neoconservative, which is a far-right foreign-affairs ideology.)

This fact is shown clearly, as the Senators probe each appointee with questions that challenge him (since all of these nominees are males) as being insufficiently hostile toward Russia, and also (though to a lesser extent) insufficiently hostile toward Iran, and toward other countries (especially Syria and China) that have friendly relations with Russia. This obsessive hatred of Russia is the standard neoconservative position — neoconservatism's *defining reality*, regardless of whether neoconservatives admit to being haters at all, of anything.



Each one of these nominees has, in turn, provided responses which indicate that he, too, is far to the right of Trump. The Senators are apparently satisfied with each one of the nominees, on that basis — a neoconservative basis.

Also, each one of the Senators is probing the nominee, in order to make certain that the interviewee favors steep increases in 'defense' spending (another essential mark of neoconservatism — unlimited military spending), even if other federal spending is required to stay the same or else be reduced. Even the Democratic Senators want 'defense' spending increased even if domestic spending gets reduced. Democratic Senators on the panel are showing themselves as being just as emphatically in favor of abolishing existing limits on 'defense' spending as the Republican ones are.

If what U.S. President Dwight Eisenhower in 1961 had referred to as «the military-industrial complex» owns all of Congress today, then the results of these interviews with nominees still couldn't be any more neoconservative than they have, in fact, *been*.

Great pressure is thus being placed, by the interviewers, upon each nominee, to increase greatly U.S. 'defense' spending, and to exhibit hostility toward Russia and the other countries that are the standard 'enemies' in the view of neoconservatives. Regardless of whether Trump wants unlimited 'defense' spending (and is merely pretending to want to cut programs like the scandalous F-35), Congress certainly does.

Neoconservatism can, very practically, be defined by the nations that it places unquestioningly as being America's 'friends' (Israel, Europe — especially the parts that were formerly communist — Japan, and all of the fundamentalist-Sunni Gulf Cooperation Council [Arab monarchy] nations); and as being America's 'enemies' (Russia, Iran, China, and any nation that's allied with one or more of those three). Nothing that either a 'friend' or an 'enemy' nation does is actually pertinent to a neoconservative's national favors or hatreds: each of these nations is permanently what it is; and, for example, Russia being no longer communist and no longer the Soviet Union, doesn't really affect a neoconservative's hatred of Russia. Neoconservatism is — in that sense — ethnic, tribal: rigidly loyal to labeled 'friends', and also rigidly hostile to labeled 'enemies'. It's permanent war for perpetual 'peace', because to stop trying to conquer the 'enemies' is viewed as 'immoral', actually shameful and maybe even 'cowardly' — no matter how few the aristocracy actually are who benefit from all this mass bloodshed, crippling, refugees, and destruction. It's an upside-down 'morality'.

America's Congress is at least 90 % neoconservative, not only in the Senate, but also in the House. To judge by these hearings, the Senators are virtually united, that Russia is America's #1 enemy (a key mark of neoconservatism is the demonization of Russia); and, while most seem to consider Iran to be enemy #2, some Senators and House members place China in that category (#2). North Korea is also mentioned by many.

Eliminating, or even reducing, jihadism, is definitely *well below the second national-security priority* (if it's an authentic concern at all), for members of the U.S. Congress, with Russia certainly being the #1 enemy in their eyes. Furthermore, no member of Congress considers the Saudi government — the government that is owned by the Saud family — to be an «enemy» at all, nor do they consider, to be an enemy, any other of the fundamentalist-Islamic Arab royal families (such as the ones who own Qatar, or who own UAE, or who own Kuwait), even though [the Saud family are the main funders of jihadist groups around the world](#), and those other royal Arabs provide most of the rest of the financing that makes jihadist terrorism possible. So, practically speaking, the U.S. Congress considers the chief financial backers of jihadist groups to be U.S. 'allies', not to be «enemies» of the U.S., at all.

For example: as one strong friend of the royal Arabs, Hillary Clinton has said in private:

[«Donors in Saudi Arabia constitute the most significant source of funding to Sunni terrorist groups worldwide».](#)

Saudi Arabia is owned by the Saud family; so, she knew that they are the main funders of Al Qaeda etcetera (or, like Osama bin Laden's former bagman said of Al Qaeda's financing, [«Without the money of the — of the Saudi, you will have nothing»](#)). That family

control the government, and all the rest of their aristocracy do whatever the Saud family tell them to do. Hillary wasn't naive.

And, elsewhere (also in private), she referred to [«the governments of Qatar and Saudi Arabia, which are providing clandestine financial and logistic support to ISIL and other radical Sunni groups in the region»](#).

And she also devoted a lengthy cable to U.S. Embassies, to the desirability of dealing with this problem (their aristocracies' funding of jihadist groups around the world) [also in Kuwait, and UAE](#) — two more U.S. 'allies'.

And so, former U.S. Senator Clinton was simply a normal member of the U.S. Senate which is under display even now, as being even more neoconservative than President-elect Trump's national-security appointees are.

For example, during the [hearing](#) on Thursday, January 12th, in which Trump's choice to head the U.S. 'Defense' Department, James Mattis, was grilled by each member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the retired Marine General Mattis was pressed on whether he supports eliminating the 'defense' spending-cap that Congress in late 2012 imposed to begin on 1 January 2013, as the 2013 Budget Control Act, or «sequestration». General Mattis replied by calling the 2013 Budget Control Act a «self-inflicted wound». (He had already told this very same Senate Committee, on [27 January 2015](#), «The Senate Armed Services Committee should lead the effort to repeal the sequestration that is costing military readiness and long term capability while sapping troop morale». So, they already knew that he's a hard-liner about lifting the spending-cap on the military — just not on the rest of the budget, because he had also said on 27 January 2015, «If we refuse to reduce our debt or pay down our deficit — ...No nation in history has maintained its military power while failing to keep its fiscal house in order». So, these Senators are clear about removing the limit only on 'defense' spending.)

Mattis said in this January 12th confirmation-hearing, that Russia «has chosen to be both a strategic competitor and an adversary» and «we still engage with the soviet union». (It's common for high U.S. military, and even diplomatic, officials, to slip back into calling Russia «the Soviet Union», still 25+ years after the Soviet Union ended, and its Warsaw Pact of military allies ended, and their communism ended. This insanity is normal for America's leaders.)

He was asked about Donald Trump's having questioned whether [NATO \(the anti-Russia military alliance\)](#) needs to be continued, and Mattis said «If we did not have NATO today, we would have to create it. NATO is vital to our national interest».

He was questioned regarding whether he agrees with Trump's having challenged President Obama's campaign to overthrow Syria's President Bashar al-Assad, and Mattis said that the real issue is only about the speed with which Assad must be removed. He said that what is needed is »a more accelerated campaign than the President-elect has called for« — in other words, he said that not only was President Obama too slow in this matter, but that Mattis will be advising Trump to reverse position on this and to out-do Obama on it. (A Democratic Senator, Bill Nelson of Florida, had asked those questions, and he seemed to be pleased with Mattis's super-hawkish responses.)

Responding to another Senator, Mattis said that there's «an increasing number of areas in

which we'll have to confront Russia». We're not doing it enough, he thinks.

He was asked whether he shares President-elect Trump's distrust of the U.S. intelligence-services, and he replied, «I have a very very high degree of confidence in our intelligence community». The CIA and other people who were united in saying that Saddam Hussein had WMD in 2002 and that they needed to be immediately eliminated, are trusted by Mattis as much as they were trusted by Bush.

He was asked about Israel and said that it is eternally an 'ally' of America, and that Israel is «the only democratic nation in the Middle East». No Senator asked him whether apartheid South Africa was also a 'democratic' nation. On 13 January 2017, Brandon Turbeville headlined about the only secular nation in the Middle East, [«Grand Mufti Of Syria Discusses Secularism In Syria – Human Beings Live In States, No Countries Based On Religion»](#); and, previously I have [pointed out](#) that even Western polling in Syria has consistently shown that the vast majority of Syrians want Assad to continue as the country's leader, and that it was Barack Obama who was criticized by U.N. Secretary General Ban ki-Moon for *refusing* to let the Syrian people determine, in a free and internationally monitored democratic election, whom the nation's leader should be. (Obama knows that they would elect Assad; so, he doesn't want democracy, there.)

Perhaps a lot of false 'facts' are in Mattis's head, but he maintains them with consistency — and any falsehoods that he believes are of the type that would make his nomination to become the U.S. Secretary of 'Defense' all the more attractive to the members of the U.S. Congress.

In my previous article, [«Trump Team Targets Iran»](#), I documented that:

All four of the persons selected by U.S. President-Elect Donald Trump for the top U.S. national-security posts are committed to replacing the outgoing U.S. President Barack Obama's #1 military target, Russia, by a different #1 military target, Iran. Iran has long been the #1 military target in the view of Michael Flynn, the chosen Trump National Security Advisor; and of James Mattis, the chosen Trump Secretary of Defense; and of Dan Coats, the chosen Trump Director of National Intelligence; and of Mike Pompeo, the chosen CIA Director.

So, although Trump's appointees might be less neoconservative than the Senators, and less neoconservative than was Trump's predecessor, Obama — and Trump is far less neoconservative than is Hillary Clinton — Trump still could turn out to be a neoconservative President. This isn't because the American public are neoconservative (they definitely aren't), but because [the American aristocracy](#) is. The U.S. government represents [them — not the American public](#).

The original source of this article is [Strategic Culture Foundation](#)

Copyright © [Eric Zuesse](#), [Strategic Culture Foundation](#), 2017

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

Become a Member of Global Research

Articles by: [Eric Zuesse](#)

About the author:

Investigative historian Eric Zuesse is the author, most recently, of *They're Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010*, and of *CHRIST'S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity*.

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