

# Hillary: The Obama Stooge Bernie: The Bullshitter

by Gerry Rose

Feb. 1—Ever since Wall Street declared Democratic Party presidential candidate Martin O'Malley to be “Public Enemy No. 1,” the mainstream media has worked overtime to sell the illusion that the real race for the Democratic Party’s nomination is a two-way race between Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders.

The reality is that the Wall Street speculators who have destroyed the nation’s productive economy and driven tens of millions of American citizens into despair and drug addiction over the fifteen-year span of the Bush and Obama Presidencies, are engaged in an all-out effort to control the Presidential race and hoodwink the American people. To say that Wall Street is “comfortable” with Hillary Clinton would

be a dramatic understatement. Her repeated attacks on the proposal to re-enact Franklin Roosevelt’s Glass-Steagall legislation and her vocal backing for the fraudulent Dodd-Frank legislation, have made her a darling of the Wall Street crowd, as evidenced by the \$6 million donation given to Priorities USA Action, a leading “super PAC” for the Clinton campaign, by mega-speculator and drug pusher George Soros.

Meanwhile, despite the fact that many leftists and “millenials” have been dazzled by the rhetoric of Bernie Sanders—in the same way that their parents and older brothers and sisters were conned by the media hype surrounding Barack Obama in 2008—Sanders is under-



White House/Pete Souza



creative commons/Gage Skidmore

*Hillary Clinton: Obama owns her. Bernie Sanders: the Wall Street socialist.*

stood by Wall Street to be a non-serious buffoon, who poses no danger to their interests and has no chance of ever being elected. He is there merely to create the illusion of a tightly controlled two-way race. At the end of the day, Sanders is fodder for some of the better Saturday Night Live skits of this election season—and not a serious presidential candidate.

## Hillary

Hillary Clinton's biggest problem is that she was broken by President Obama and his inner circle of Valerie Jarrett, Susan Rice, Samantha Power, and Michelle Obama. As Obama's Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton was forced to do Obama's bidding, even when she knew it was wrong and would jeopardize her own political future. By serving in the Obama Administration for four brutal years, she became an accessory to most of the Obama crimes, and ultimately became responsible for Obama's "bodyguard of lies," to borrow the phrase of historian Anthony Cave-Brown.

Hillary Clinton was not always an Obama tool. During the first two years of the Obama presidency, Clinton, as Secretary of State, worked closely with then National Security Adviser Gen. James Jones and then Defense Secretary Robert Gates, to create a counterpole to the Obama inner circle at the White House and the National Security Council.

That containment alliance ultimately fell apart. First, Gen. Jones resigned as National Security Adviser, having discovered that his deputy, Thomas Donilon, was working to undermine his efforts. Robert Gates was adamant that he would have nothing to do with Donilon, whom he described as a vicious "political hatchet-man" with no background in national security.

In early 2011, Defense Secretary Gates and Clinton had a falling out over Libya. President Obama and his



rt/youtube

*The premeditated burning of the U.S. Mission in Benghazi, Libya on Sept. 11, 2012.*

inner circle of responsibility-to-protect (R2P) "humanitarian" interventionists, decided—along with the British and French—to oust Libyan leader Muammar Qaddafi. Gates adamantly opposed the scheme, warning that the proposed no-fly zone to protect "innocent" Benghazi citizens from government reprisals, would mean that the United States and its allies were committed to all-out regime change. Both Russia and China had been lied to by Obama's UN Ambassador Susan Rice, and were persuaded to abstain during the crucial UN Security Council vote on the authorization to use military force to protect the civilian population of eastern Libya. The goal, as Gates knew, was regime change. Rather than participate in such a colossal blunder, Gates resigned.<sup>1</sup>

Hillary, in contrast, went over to the dark side in the Qaddafi affair. She embraced her sworn enemies, led by Susan Rice and Samantha Power, and wholeheartedly backed the ouster of the Libyan leader. By no later than that capitulation, Hillary was owned by the Obama camp, despite all the personal animosities and resentments. For Hillary, this was a moral *punctum saliens*. When you cross that line psychologically, it is very hard

1. Gates had come into the George W. Bush Administration in the aftermath of the 2003 Iraq invasion and regime change swindle, and had witnessed the destabilization of the entire region, beginning at that time.

to turn back, especially when you are driven by political ambition.

After months of U.S., British, and French air and ground operations, Qadaffi was overthrown and was physically cornered. The choice fell to President Obama, British Prime Minister David Cameron, and French President Nicolas Sarkozy, whether to have Qadaffi assassinated or captured. They decided that Qadaffi was too dangerous alive and ordered him murdered in cold blood.

Hillary Clinton was all-in. In a gale of giddy laughter, she invoked the words of Julius Caesar in summarizing the U.S. role in the murder of Qadaffi in her widely-publicized quip: “We came, we saw, he died.”

The Qadaffi assassination was the prelude to Hillary Clinton’s darkest moment of capitulation to the Obama monster. On Sept. 11, 2012, less than a year after the Qadaffi “executive action,” U.S. Ambassador to Libya Christopher Stevens was murdered, along with three other American officials, at the U.S. mission in Benghazi and a CIA annex a mile away. The premeditated attack, on the anniversary of the original 9/11 attacks, was carried out by an al-Qaeda affiliate, Ansar al-Sharia.

According to author Edward Klein, whose book *Blood Feud* recounts the Obama-Clinton family wars, Hillary Clinton was receiving hourly reports from the U.S. Deputy Chief of Mission in Libya, Gregory Hicks, who was in Tripoli running the embassy on the day of the attacks. Hicks conveyed reports received from the scene in Benghazi directly to Clinton, as well as to the White House Situation Room. For Hicks and for the people on the ground in Benghazi, there was no doubt that al-Qaeda had carried out a heavily armed terrorist attack. There never was a demonstration outside the U.S. mission, supposedly protesting a virtually unknown video slandering the Prophet Mohammed. It simply didn’t happen.

Klein recounts what happened next, drawing upon interviews with eyewitnesses, including close Clinton aides:

By 10 p.m. on Sept. 11, 2012, when Hillary Clinton received a call from President Obama, she was one of the most thoroughly briefed officials in Washington on the unfolding disaster in Benghazi, Libya.

She knew that Ambassador Christopher Stevens and a communications operator were dead, and that the attackers had launched a well-coordinated mortar assault on the CIA annex, which would cost the lives of two more Americans.

She had no doubt that a terrorist attack had been launched against America on the anniversary of 9/11. However, when Hillary picked up the phone and heard Obama’s voice, she learned the president had other ideas in mind. With less than two months before Election Day, he was still boasting that he had al-Qaeda on the run.

If the truth about Benghazi became known, it would blow that argument out of the water.

“Hillary was stunned when she heard the president talk about the Benghazi attack,” one of her top legal advisers said in an interview. “Obama wanted her to say that the attack had been a spontaneous demonstration triggered by an obscure video on the Internet that demeaned the Prophet Mohammed.”

According to Klein’s account, Clinton conferred with her husband, former President Bill Clinton, and they concluded that if Hillary balked at Obama’s order, she would have to resign, and would likely be held to blame for an Obama re-election defeat. Hillary Clinton, at that moment, completed her ultimate capitulation to Barack Obama. She put out the press release that Obama demanded of her, linking the attack to “spontaneous protests” over the scurrilous video.

Hillary Clinton’s presidential ambitions so clouded her judgment that she became complicit in a crime that remains the subject of intense Congressional scrutiny. Whether the full truth about Benghazi ever comes out or not, it was yet another breaking point for Hillary Clinton. Her capitulation to Obama was complete. He owned her.

## **Bernie**

Contrary to the mainstream media myth, it was not Bernie Sanders who put the issue of Wall Street and the urgent need for Glass-Steagall and a new Pecora Commission on the table for the 2016 presidential elections. It was Gov. Martin O’Malley. Sanders’ johnny-come-lately endorsement of Glass-Steagall was designed to do one thing and one thing only—to take attention away

from the serious attacks on Wall Street emanating from O'Malley.

Sanders has a media "rep," stemming from his long-time claim of being a socialist, of being some sort of a leftist "progressive." The reality is, as born out in the *Congressional Record*, that since being elected to the U.S. Senate, Sanders has voted 98% of the time with the Senate Democratic leadership.

Sanders is no Jeremy Corbyn. Corbyn, the British Labour Party leader, is not only hated by the establishment for his support of Glass-Steagall; he has also refused to support any sanctions against Russia and China, and wants to take down Great Britain's entire nuclear weapons program. He has also—and most importantly—refused to bow before the Queen. By contrast, Sanders has voted for every single sanctions bill against Putin, against whom he has a stated visceral hatred. Sanders also hates Iran and has repeatedly voted for sanctions against that nation. Sanders has supported every authorization of military force (AUMF) and every trade-war measure against China. Not quite a "peacenik."

One progressive has this to say about Sanders:

Even so, while Bernie may come across as sincere about class politics, make no mistake, he is a militarist that isn't about to challenge U.S. supremacy. He supported the ugly war on Kosovo, the invasion of Afghanistan, funding for the endless Iraq disaster as well as the losing and misguided War on Terror. He voted in favor of Clinton's 1996 Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act, which expanded the federal death penalty and acted as the precursor to the PATRIOT Act.<sup>2</sup>



U.S. Air Force/Tech Sgt. Joseph Swafford

*Bernie supported the war on Kosovo, the invasion of Afghanistan, and funding for the endless Iraq disaster and the so-called War on Terror. Here, U.S. soldiers enter a U.S. Army CH-47 Chinook helicopter at an Afghan combat outpost.*

In fact, Sanders comes out of a wing of the American "left," that went from Socialist to Social Democrat to neoconservative in foreign policy, defense, and national security.

It was with good reason that these types, during the 1950s and 1960s, were known as "State Department socialists." Because of their zeal to dodge the bullets of McCarthyism, they became hardcore advocates of the Cold War.

Sanders is a complete fraud, an empty shell, without any moral convictions. The only issue for which his sincerity can not be doubted is that he is the most radically green candidate on either slate. He proposes ten million green jobs, which would wipe out what is left of actual science and industry in the United States and destroy what is left of the productive labor force.

Most "insiders" believe that the promotion of Bernie and the "mainstream media" love affair with him, have been done with the knowledge that, for the most part, he is unelectable. His candidacy serves one function, and that is to draw public attention and money away from O'Malley, who is, in the eyes of Wall Street, dangerously electable, and whose anti-Wall Street policy goes far beyond Bernie's mere rhetoric.

2. [www.counterpunch.org/2015/06/03/why-bernie-sanders-is-a-dead-end/](http://www.counterpunch.org/2015/06/03/why-bernie-sanders-is-a-dead-end/)