

Clinton Warhawk for Global Liberal Agenda Trump Agent of Reconciliation and Peace

REPUBLICAN SUPPORT FOR interventionist foreign policy is so common place it is assumed that any Neocon Republican candidate for president must be a war hawk and for good reason: Following the demise of the Soviet Union, Republican think tanks, such as the American Enterprise Institute, crafted the “Project for the New American Century” to spread America’s economic-political-social agenda around the globe as if a victory over the Soviet Union signaled the moment for American hegemony even if it was unwanted by many third world countries in Africa and Asia and newly developing nations in Eastern Europe.

Since that time things have changed considerably. Surprise, it is not Trump, but the Democratic candidate and former Secretary of State Hilary Clinton who has the support of Republican Neocons from the Enterprise Institute (*et al*) who relish her hawkish foreign policy, her ideas of American exceptionalism, and her desire to spread liberalism (esp. political and moral liberalism and American economic interests) abroad while opposing any nation that stands in the way.

The real problem facing the world today is the “Neoconservative desire to make sure the United States is the lone guarantor of the geopolitical order. This is about Pax Americana. This is about resurrecting the faded dream of a new American century” and it is being spearheaded *not* by the Republican candidate but by Hilary Clinton who is using it to “advance” her liberal agenda around the globe. Quite simply, Hilary is on the Neocon team. According to [CNN](#), National

Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft has already endorsed Clinton and it is strongly rumored that even [George H.W. Bush is voting for her](#). The [Neocon war hawks want Hilary](#).

Barbara Nuland, the Assistant Secretary of State suffering from a severe case of “Hawk Fever”, recently told the European Union to “F**k off” because it was seeking a peaceful resolution to the Ukrainian crisis.

According to BBC diplomatic correspondent Jonathan Marcus:

“The EU is divided and to some extent hesitant about picking a fight with Moscow. It certainly cannot win a short-term battle for Ukraine’s affections with Moscow – it just does not have the cash inducements available. The EU has sought to play a longer game; banking on its attraction over time. But the US clearly is determined to take a much more activist role.” So [“F**k the EU”](#)

Nuland’s husband, the leading Neocon [Robert Kagan, along with a host of other Republican Neocons, is backing Hilary](#). Speaking at a [“foreign policy professionals fundraiser for Hillary”](#) Kagan (co-founder of the neoconservative think tank Project for the New American Century) stated:

“I would say all Republican foreign policy professionals are anti-Trump....I would say that a majority of people in my circle will vote for Hillary.”

Nothing shouts Secretary Clinton’s status as an extreme war hawk more than the neoconservative propaganda periodical, *Weekly Standard*, which celebrated Clinton’s appointment as secretary of state as a victory, *not for the left*, but for the right, lauding her metamorphosis from “First

Feminist” to “[Warrior Queen](#) who has become the “[Great Right Hope.](#)”

“As for the conservatives, many of those who began 2008 willing to do anything to defeat her tended to end it feeling sorry she lost (to Obama in the Democratic Primary). They began to tell themselves and each other they would sleep better at night if she were the nominee of her party” ([CBS News](#)).

According to [conservative correspondent Noemie Emery](#), Clinton, had “begun the campaign as the former First Feminist” and “ended it as the Warrior Queen, more Margaret Thatcher than Gloria Steinem.”

In short, Ms. Hilary is speaking Neocon babble while Donald Trump appears to be the candidate that will promote global peace and “bring the boys home”.

Speaking ahead of a major foreign policy address in front of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee earlier this year, Trump stated,

“I do think it’s a different world today, and [I don’t think we should be nation-building anymore](#),” Trump said. “I think it’s proven not to work, and we have a different country than we did then. We have \$19 trillion in debt. We’re sitting, probably, on a bubble. And it’s a bubble that if it breaks, it’s going to be very nasty. I just think we have to rebuild our country.”

Donald Trump has also spoken of the Iraqi War as a mistake and accused George W. Bush of prevarication necessary for him to drag the US into the Iraqi conflict.

Trump is also “harshly critical” of John F. Kerry the current Secretary of State and has “questioned the United States’ continued involvement in NATO.” Along these lines, Mr. Trump has indicated that he seeks to remain neutral in relations with Israel. He also [told the Washington Post editorial board that he would reduce expenditures on NATO](#), consider closing American bases abroad and adopt an “unabashedly non-interventionist approach to world affairs.”

According to the Post:

In spite of unrest abroad, Trump advocates a light footprint in the world, especially in the Middle East. Trump said the [United States must look inward and steer its resources toward rebuilding domestic infrastructure.](#)”

Trump opposes the current American Foreign Policy of global intervention, while Clinton supports it with a fury:

Thus, according to the [CBS News](#):

“For the moment, Hillary Clinton will be the conservatives’ Woman in Washington, more attuned to their concerns on these issues than to those of the get-the-troops-home-now wing of her party, a strange turn of events.”

Branko Marcetic writing for “These Times” summed the situation up well:

It’s not just Neocons specifically. War hawks of all stripes have been happy to shower praise on Clinton’s foreign policy. In 2011, Lindsey Graham [told](#) the Council on Foreign Relations: “This is an outstanding national security team put together by President Obama. I hope he will listen to them. Secretary Clinton is a great choice to be our secretary of state.”

“Any time Lindsey Graham, who eagerly supported the Iraq War

and has [repeatedly called](#) for a [war with Iran](#), endorses your national security team, it should stop and give you pause. Then again, given that Clinton [threatened](#) to “totally obliterate” Iran in 2008, perhaps it shouldn’t be surprising.”

Earlier this year, Clinton demonstrated why such a broad array of Neocons and Republican war hawks have been quick to support her. In a carefully planned speech before the American Israel Public Affairs Committee’s (AIPAC), Clinton affirmed her adamant loyalty to the Zionist state of Israel and promised military intervention in Iran if necessary.

“Palestinian and human rights advocates were appalled by her remarks to AIPAC (March, 2016) saying that her speech represented [‘everything that is bad’ with U.S. imperialism and policy in the Middle East.’](#)”

Clinton loves to rattle her saber and enhance that of Israel.

“As president, I will make a firm commitment to ensure Israel maintains its qualitative military edge... “The United States should provide Israel with the most sophisticated defense technology so it can deter and stop any threats. That includes bolstering Israeli missile defenses with new systems like the Arrow Three and David’s Sling. And we should work together to develop better tunnel detection, technology to prevent armed smuggling, kidnapping and terrorist attacks.”

[Rebecca Vilkomerson](#), Executive Director of Jewish Voice for Peace, said the AIPAC convention “is a reminder of the current limits of the mainstream discourse on Israel, which rely on racist and Islamophobic tropes to justify unquestioning support for Israel.”

“From Democrats to Republicans, the message is the same: “More arms for Israel, a stronger relationship between Israel

and the U.S., no mention of Palestinian rights, and no recognition of the impossible contradiction of being both democratic and Jewish when the state is predicated on maintaining systems of unequal rights and rule by military occupation.”

View full Clinton Speech before AIPAC

Donald Trump Going in a Different Direction than the Neocons

Donald Trump does not appear to be a member of the Neocon-Neoliberal establishment that created the Taliban, Al Qaeda and ISIS in the first place. Strangely, neither Bush Clinton, nor Obama have been willing to team up with Russia to destroy the terrorists. The Neocons have flouted international law by waging unauthorized wars for decade after decade and have achieved very little in the way of positive results. Russia, on the other hand, was invited by Syria to assist it against the terrorists. Russia has achieved in a few months what NATO and the US have been unable to achieve in years. Their presence in Syria has sent the terrorists fleeing; they are now trapped inside of Aleppo. Unless NATO assists them, overtly or covertly, they will soon fall in Syria.

It seems to make sense that the United States and Russia would ally to defeat terrorism around the globe, but Obama, Clinton and the Neocon crowd seem bent against it to the chagrin of candidate Trump who cannot understand their reluctance to team up with Russia to defeat terrorism.

Forced to think about it, Trump, it appears is getting closer to figuring it out. In August (2016) he unleashed charges that [President Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton permitted the rise of the Islamic State](#). Trump then rationally proposed alliances with Russia, in a campaign to destroy the terror group.

“In many respects, you know, they (Muslims) honor President Obama,” Trump said. [“He is the founder of ISIS.”](#)”

Trump often speaks off of the cuff and is later forced to clarify his statements. Given an opportunity to clarify the above statement Trump instead amplified it:

“[He \(Obama\) was the founder, absolutely the founder,](#)” Trump said on CNBC. “In fact he gets the – in sports, they have awards. He gets the most valuable player award.” (See also the [Washington Post](#) – [CBS News](#) – and [The Huffington Post](#)).

Trump drew a loud round of applause at Youngstown State University when he bellowed that U.S. “nation building” in the Mideast and elsewhere would come to an end in a Trump administration.

“It is now time for a new approach. Our current strategy of nation-building and regime change have been a total disaster – Instead, all we got from Iraq and our ventures in the Middle East, was death, destruction and tremendous financial loss. But it’s time to put the mistakes of the past behind us and chart a new course...If I become president, the era of nation-building will be brought to a swift close” ([CNN Transcripts](#))

“Our new approach must be to halt the spread of radical Islam...All actions should be oriented around this goal and any country which shares this goal will be our ally. We cannot always choose our friends but we can never fail to recognize our enemies.”

The neoliberal global agenda has not made the world a safer place but a much more dangerous one. Prior to Obama’s taking office in 2009, Trump pointed out,

“Libya was stable, Syria was under control, Egypt was ruled by a secular president and ally to the U.S., Iraq was experiencing a decrease in violence and Iran was being choked off by economic sanctions.”

American foreign policy is in disarray – nothing seems to be working. As Trump says, “It’s time to put the mistakes of the past behind us and chart a new course.” If the United States and Russia form a genuine alliance against terrorism, the terrorists will be defeated and the world can know peace. New Era forecasts that this will happen: A Trump victory and reconciliation with Russia to help usher in an Era of Peace or a Clinton victory and humiliation for the United States if it continues to advance a liberal agenda in defiance of God’s laws.