

Clinton and Sanders. “Nobody Likes Him” Says Hillary

By [Robert Fantina](#)

Global Research, March 08, 2020

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [History](#)

*Former First Lady, New York State Senator, Secretary of State and 2016 Democratic presidential nominee **Hillary Clinton** continues to criticize Vermont senator **Bernie Sanders** whenever the opportunity to do so presents itself. ‘Nobody likes him’, says she, despite the millions of people who voted for him in the current primary season alone. ‘No one wants to work with him’, she proclaims despite high-profile endorsements from prominent members of Congress. And she blames her electoral defeat in 2016, when the odious **Donald Trump** was elected, at least in part to Sanders’ delayed endorsement of her.*

We will elucidate some facts for the hapless Clinton.

- The Democratic National Committee (DNC) in 2016 was anything but democratic, for two main reasons. 1. It ‘leaked’ useful information to the Clinton campaign that it withheld from the Sanders campaign; when this was exposed, it resulted in the resignation of Debbie Wasserman-Schultz (Florida) as chair of the DNC. And 2, the ‘super-delegates’ were not bound by primary votes; they could, and did, vote to nominate whoever they chose, regardless of the wishes of the people of the state they represented.
- Clinton never met a war she didn’t like. For example, despite all evidence indicating that Iraq had no involvement in the attacks of September 11, 2001, and United Nations inspectors combing the country and finding no trace of the ‘weapons of mass destruction’ that then President George Bush and his corrupt Secretary of State, Colin Powell, told the world were threatening the very existence of the United States, she voted to give Bush broad powers to wage war.
- Clinton is also the darling of the very rich; her campaign, unlike that of Sanders, was funded by the super-wealthy, many of whom benefited during her work as secretary of state, by donating to the Clinton foundation. Conflict of interest, anyone?
- Zionism doesn’t sit well with the rank and file. Clinton said that Syria must be destroyed to protect Israel, and she supports without reservation the brutal, apartheid Israeli regime. This shows her complete disdain for international law and human rights. That alone should disqualify her from public office.

Pundits have said that the current battle for the Democratic nomination is a fight for the soul of the party. It seems it lost its soul some time ago, but that is a topic for another essay. Clinton must revel in the fact that former vice president Joe Biden did surprising well in the Super Tuesday primaries. He, like she, is happy with the status quo: benefits for the rich, with an occasional bone thrown to the poor and middle class. And the Democratic establishment would prefer to see another four years of Donald Trump, rather than rocking

their status-quo boat.

And what of Biden's endorsements? Establishment representatives (this writer uses that term only as a title; elected officials in the U.S. seldom 'represent' the people who elect them), and former representatives, including former Texas Representative Beto O'Rourke, Minnesota Senator Amy Klobuchar and former South Bend Indiana Mayor Pete Buttigieg, all former rivals for the nomination, all Zionists, all elitists, have climbed upon his bandwagon. Even billionaire and former New York City mayor Michael Bloomberg has endorsed him.

Sanders endorsements include the wildly popular Alexandra Ocasio-Cortez of New York and Illan Omar of Minnesota, among many others. These are not people beholden to wealthy corporations. They represent the people who voted for them. They do not take the positions the corporate elite wants. But the best way to get elected and re-elected in the United States is to bow to the corporate masters. Clinton is a world-wide champion in doing so. Sanders? Not so much.

The bitterness to which Clinton clings is understandable. She lost the presidential election to a dishonest, misogynist, racist, homophobic, Islamophobic reality television performer. It is no wonder she will lash out at Sanders, who was her chief rival for the nomination in 2016, and anyone else who might get in her line of fire. One would think that almost anyone could have defeated Trump, but Clinton couldn't do it. And because of the way the Democratic Party cooked the books to assure Clinton's coronation, the U.S. now has a conservative Supreme Court; children in cages at the Mexican border; a plan to establish Palestine as a series of Bantustans; a shrinking middle class, and the threat of war with Iran. In addition, U.S. citizens are told by their president, when white-supremacists are confronted by counter-protesters, that there are 'good people' on all sides; that national security operations are wrong when they say that Russia interfered in the U.S. election of 2016, and that they are also wrong in assigning blame to Saudi Prince Mohammad Bin Salman for the murder of Jamal Khashoggi.

Some things under Trump would be no different under Clinton. Support for terrorists in Syria, Venezuela, Palestine and Iraq would continue. CIA overthrows of governments would not end, and people would still be tortured by the United States government and military in Guantanamo and various rendition sites around the world. International law would only need to be followed by nations that are not U.S. allies, and U.S. alliances would be based on power and profits. The already grotesquely-bloated military budget would continue to grow.

What would a Joe Biden presidency bring? Change? Hardly! He has said that he loves the racist Israeli Prime Minister, supports war over diplomacy and is nearly as beholden to special interests as Clinton (it would be difficult to match her status in that category).

Would a Sanders presidency bring change?

While many of his proposals would need to be watered down (sadly) to get through Congress, we could at least hope for better and less expensive medical care for everyone; an end to unlimited, no-questions-asked foreign aid to Israel; affordable college tuition and some relief from the crippling student debt so many citizens carry. Taxes on the very rich might possibly increase, and the so-called 'safety net' for the poor, which most presidents are happy to shred to finance military expense increases, might actually be strengthened.

But let us not be too optimistic; the Democratic Party is democratic in name only (similar to

elected 'representatives' being representative in name only), so Sanders' road to the nomination is littered with the Party's schemes to keep it from him. Who are the little people to decide who the nominee should be? Such decisions are better left to the power-brokers, those who hobnob with corporate titans, military leaders and foreign dictators. What does the 'common' man or woman, working daily or attending school, struggling to make a life for him/herself and his/her family, know about it? They need to attend to their own business: paying taxes so those in charge can stay exactly where they are.

It has been said that if nothing changes, nothing changes. Welcome to the United States.

*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons above or below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

Featured image is from CodePink

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Robert Fantina](#), Global Research, 2020

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Robert Fantina](#)

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