

Hillary Clinton: Changing Positions At Every Election

By [Brandon Turbeville](#)

Global Research, February 08, 2016

[Brandon Turbeville](#) 7 February 2016

Region: [USA](#)

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

As the tide of public opinion goes, so goes Hillary Clinton's campaign rhetoric.

Note the term "campaign rhetoric" here since it is not Clinton's true positions that change, it is only her words that ride the political wind.

If America is sick of war, Hillary is sick of war (except for the new one). If America is angry at banks, Hillary is angry at banks (except when she votes to bail them out). If Americans are beginning to question vaccine safety, Hillary questions their safety. If trendies are afraid of getting sick and there is a temporary false consensus that vaccines work, Hillary is pro vaccine. The list goes on and on.

Below are only a few points on which Hillary Clinton has made an about-face in regards to her alleged positions on the campaign trail.

Vaccines – In stark contrast to candidate Clinton in 2008 when questions over the safety and effectiveness of vaccines were coming to the political consciousness of the American people, Hillary has now become a vocal cheerleader of Big Pharma and vaccinations.

While her opinion is odious enough on its face, it is quite the change from the opinion she held as a [candidate in 2008](#) when she stated that there was the possibility that vaccines were linked to autism.^[1] In fact, she wrote in a [campaign questionnaire](#) that she was committed to finding out the causes of autism, including "possible environmental causes like vaccines."^[2]

In 2015, however, when it became clear that questions surrounding vaccines was not going to remain a part of the "fringe" of society among both the right and the left and the propaganda campaign began full-steam ahead to cut off any mass movement against vaccination, Clinton began showing her true colors, [coming out in favor](#) of the pro-vaccine crowd and suggesting that anyone who question the safety or effectiveness of vaccines was a luddite and an anti-science crackpot.^[3] Clinton was one in a long line of presidential hopefuls who made sure to take part in the propaganda campaign against concerned parents, affected individuals, and informed citizens.

[Clinton then took to social media](#) to make [a jab at those](#) who consider toxic chemicals like mercury, aluminum, polysorbate-80, or even live viruses to be cause for concern when faced with the question of whether or not to inject them into their children.^[4] ^[5]

Her actual position? In favor of the pharmaceutical companies and banks that make up such a sizeable portion of her campaign donations.

Iran Nuclear Deal – While Hillary has come out publicly and endorsed the Iran nuclear deal

clenched by Barack Obama, Republicans were probably too busy calling for nuclear World War Three to have noticed. Likewise, Democrats were too busy kneeling at the feet of Obama to pay too much attention to Clinton's statement. However, for a few observers who were of the mistaken belief that Clinton's rhetoric is to be believed more than her behavior and track record, her statements came as a bit of a shock.

This is because Hillary's past statements were much more pro-war and hawkish than her tepid endorsement of the Obama deal, itself nothing more than theatre to set the Iranians up for an eventual US invasion once NATO is done with Syria.

[Michael Crowley of TIME writes,](#)

Clinton brought a hard-line background to the topic of Iran. In April 2008 she warned that the U.S. could "[totally obliterate](#)" Iran in retaliation for a nuclear attack on Israel—prompting Obama to chastise her for using "language that's reflective of George Bush."[\[6\]](#)

In Obama administration debates about Tehran's nuclear program, Clinton opposed talk of 'containment,' a policy option that plans for a world in which Iran possesses a nuclear weapon. Preparing for containment implies a decision not to use military force to prevent an Iranian bomb in the event that diplomacy fails.[\[7\]](#)

Indeed, Clinton's statements would (and probably did) make war-obsessed psychopaths like Lindsey Graham gleam with pride. In 2008, [she stated to Good Morning America,](#)

I want the Iranians to know that if I'm the president, we will attack Iran (if it attacks Israel).

In the next 10 years, during which they might foolishly consider launching an attack on Israel, we would be able to totally obliterate them.

That's a terrible thing to say but those people who run Iran need to understand that because that perhaps will deter them from doing something that would be reckless, foolish and tragic.[\[8\]](#)

In an interview with Jeffrey Goldberg of The Atlantic, [she stated brashly,](#)

I've always been in the camp that held that they did not have a right to enrichment. Contrary to their claim, there is no such thing as a right to enrich. This is absolutely unfounded. There is no such right. I am well aware that I am not at the negotiating table anymore, but I think it's important to send a signal to everybody who is there that there cannot be a deal unless there is a clear set of restrictions on Iran. The preference would be no enrichment. The potential fallback position would be such little enrichment that they could not break out."[\[9\]](#)

Of course, [there is a right to enrich.](#)[\[10\]](#) There is a right to enrich up to the levels that would indeed allow for the capability to create a nuclear weapon but stopping short of actually doing so. In other words, since Iran is a signatory to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, it is

entitled all avenues of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes, including uranium enrichment.

Obviously, judging by her track record, Clinton is anything but anti-war. Going from “totally obliterate” to “willing to work with” is quite the turnaround. Indeed, only last year, Clinton was boasting that “I voted for every sanction that came down the pike against Iran.”

[As a Senator in 2007](#), she backed a resolution to designate the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps as a terrorist organization.[\[11\]](#)

In February, 2007 Clinton had proclaimed, that “You don’t refuse to talk to bad people. I think life is filled with uncomfortable situations where you have to deal with people you might not like. I’m sort of an expert on that. I have consistently urged the president to talk to Iran and talk to Syria. I think it’s a sign of strength, not weakness.”

However, after Obama proclaimed that he would do just that if elected President, Clinton responded “I thought that was irresponsible and frankly naïve.”

[When asked in a later debate](#) if she would do the same, Clinton responded negatively stating that “I don’t want to be used for propaganda purposes.” [\[12\]](#)

Clinton has shifted back and forth on the Iranian issue but only in the directions in which the winds tend to be blowing. Overall, considering her track record with Syria, Iraq, Libya, and any other possible war she can support, it’s doubtful that her endorsement of the recent deal is genuine in any way.

Her real position? Undoubtedly Pro war.

Gay Marriage – Hillary Clinton has always supported equal rights for same-sex couples, except when she hasn’t. In 2016, Clinton is known as someone who supports gay marriage on practical and conceptual basis. However, that hasn’t always been the case.

To get a brief overview of Clinton 2016, read the beginning of the piece by [Sam Frizell of TIME magazine on June 27, 2015](#), where he writes,

Hillary Clinton praised the Supreme Court decision to guarantee same-sex marriages on Friday night and forcefully condemned the Republicans’ response to the ruling, warning the GOP presidential field not to turn LGBT issues into a “political football for this 2016 campaign.”

“It was an emotional roller coaster of a day, Clinton said. “This morning, love triumphed in the highest court in our land. Equality triumphed, and America triumphed.”

“Instead of trying to turn back the clock,” Clinton continued, Republicans “should be joining us in saying no to discrimination once and for all.”

Clinton’s comments on Friday evening were her first public remarks in the wake of Friday’s Supreme Court ruling that the Constitution guarantees the right for same-sex couples to marry. Her campaign issued a statement Friday in support of the decision and touted it on social media.[\[13\]](#)

Clinton's comments were indeed her first since the Supreme Court decision but they were not her first regarding the issue.

In 1996, when Bill Clinton signed the Defense of Marriage Act, Hillary was right there at his side. Indeed, his position and hers were the same.

In 2000, when she was running for NY Senate, Clinton stated that "Marriage has got historic, religious and moral content that goes back to the beginning of time, and I think a marriage is as a marriage has always been, between a man and a woman."

[In 2004, after winning her Senate campaign](#), Hillary took to the Senate floor and stated clearly that she believed marriage was only between a man and a woman.^[14] She stated "I believe marriage is not just a bond but a sacred bond between a man and a woman." She continued by stating "...the fundamental bedrock principle that [marriage] exists between a man and a woman, going back into the midst of history as one of the founding, foundational institutions of history and humanity and civilization, and that its primary, principal role during those millennia has been the raising and socializing of children for the society into which they are to become adults."

Clinton continued her opposition to gay marriage through her 2008 Presidential campaign and even all the way up until 2013, when the tide of public opinion had shifted enough that such a stance was politically safe to do so.

Her real position? Most likely that Gay marriage is a political football. It is only as important as the gay population's value on the political chessboard.

Iraq - Hillary Clinton was one of the most vociferous Democratic supporters of the illegal and immoral invasion of the sovereign nation of Iraq. Hillary Clinton not only supported the push for war in Iraq, she voted for invasion. In fact, she was fervent in her support for the war, delivering impassioned speeches on the Senate floor in order to convince members of Congress who might have been on the fence, as well as the general American population and a handful of Democrats and liberals who valued her opinion on the topic. Indeed, Hillary's speech promoting war in Iraq rivaled in George W. Bush who was campaigning night and day on American television.

[Hillary stated on the floor of the Senate:](#)

"I believe the facts that have brought us to this fateful vote are not in doubt. Saddam Hussein is a tyrant who has tortured and killed his own people, even his own family members, to maintain his iron grip on power. He used chemical weapons on Iraqi Kurds and on Iranians, killing over 20,000 people."^[15]

Clinton then began to detail not only why she believed the United States should begin their invasion, but also insinuated that the operation, if the first Gulf war was anything to go by, would not result in a long drawn out conflict but one more like the first. Although Clinton did not state this directly, the implication was that it was time go in and finish the job but also that much of the work was already done.

She also rushed to point out that international community ("everyone") knew that Saddam did have weapons of mass destruction. She stated that

“The [U.N.] inspectors found and destroyed far more weapons of mass destruction capability than were destroyed in the Gulf War, including thousands of chemical weapons, large volumes of chemical and biological stocks, a number of missiles and warheads, a major lab equipped to produce anthrax and other bioweapons, as well as substantial nuclear facilities.”

Although Clinton now attempts to brush off her treasonous assistance to drum up an illegal and immoral war in Iraq as a mistake, the truth is that anyone with any political judgement knew that the war itself was based on lies and would be a tragic adventure. They knew all of this at the time. Although she also attempts to blame the “faulty intelligence” of the Bush administration, it was Hillary Clinton herself who once referred to the intelligence as “undisputed.”

Her real position? As always, pro-war.

The above issues are merely three examples of Hillary Clinton’s epic flip-flopping. Any examination of her prior positions – particularly when they are stated just before an election – reveal that, like the weather, Hillary is constantly changing and, like the wind, she is always shifting from one direction to the other. That is, she is always shifting her position in terms of her public stances. For her genuine positions, however, one need only look [to the banks](#), [corporations](#), [foundations](#), [and related organizations](#) that fund and support her.

Brandon Turbeville – [article archive here](#) – is the author of seven books, [Codex Alimentarius – The End of Health Freedom](#), [7 Real Conspiracies](#), [Five Sense Solutions](#) and [Dispatches From a Dissident, volume 1](#) and [volume 2](#), [The Road to Damascus: The Anglo-American Assault on Syria](#), and [The Difference it Makes: 36 Reasons Why Hillary Clinton Should Never Be President](#). Turbeville has published over 650 articles dealing on a wide variety of subjects including health, economics, government corruption, and civil liberties. Brandon Turbeville’s radio show *Truth on The Tracks* can be found every Monday night 9 pm EST at [UCYTV](#). His website is [BrandonTurbeville.com](#). He is available for radio and TV interviews. Please contact [activistpost](#) (at) [gmail.com](#).

Notes:

[1] Cohen, Rebecca. “Hillary Clinton Says All Kids Should Get Vaccinated – But She Wasn’t Always So Certain.” *Mother Jones*. February 3, 2015. <http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2015/02/hillary-clinton-vaccine-tweet> Accessed on September 4, 2015.

[2] Ross, Chuck. “Hillary Clinton Wanted To Investigate Link Between Autism and Vaccinations.” *Daily Caller*. February 2, 2015. <http://dailycaller.com/2015/02/02/hillary-clinton-wanted-to-investigate-link-between-autism-and-vaccinations/> Accessed on September 4, 2015.

[3] Merica, Dan. “Hillary Clinton Hits GOP With Pro-Vaccine Tweet.” *CNN*. February 3, 2015. <http://www.cnn.com/2015/02/02/politics/hillary-clinton-vaccines/> Accessed on September 4, 2015.

[4] Turbeville, Brandon. “Left-Right Paradigm Warps Vaccine Debate: Yes, Parents DO Have The Right To Opt-Out.” *Activist Post*. February 4, 2015. <http://www.activistpost.com/2015/02/left-right-paradigm-warps-vaccine-debate-yes-parents-do-have-the-right-to-opt-out/> Accessed on September 4, 2015.

- [5] Camia, Catalina. "Hillary Clinton: The Earth Is Round And Vaccines Work." USA Today. February 3, 2015. <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation-now/2015/02/03/hillary-clinton-vaccines-work-tweet-christie/22783761/> Accessed on September 4, 2015.
- [6] Morgan, David. "Clinton Says U.S. Could 'Totally Obliterate' Iran." Reuters. April 22, 2008. <http://www.reuters.com/article/2008/04/22/us-usa-politics-iran-idUSN2224332720080422> Accessed on September 4, 2015.
- [7] Crowley, Michael. "Hillary Clinton's Unapologetically Hawkish Record Faces 2016 Test." TIME. January 14, 2014. <http://swampland.time.com/2014/01/14/hillary-clintons-unapologetically-hawkish-record-faces-2016-test/> Accessed on September 4, 2015.
- [8] Morgan, David. "Clinton Says U.S. Could 'Totally Obliterate' Iran." Reuters. April 22, 2008. <http://www.reuters.com/article/2008/04/22/us-usa-politics-iran-idUSN2224332720080422> Accessed on September 4, 2015.
- [9] Goldberg, Jeffrey. "Hillary Clinton: 'Failure' To Help Syrian Rebels Led To The Rise Of ISIS." The Atlantic. August 10, 2014. <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2014/08/hillary-clinton-failure-to-help-syrian-rebels-led-to-the-rise-of-isis/375832/> Accessed on September 4, 2015.
- [10] Sahimi, Muhammad. "Iran Has A Right To Enrich - And America Already Recognized It." The National Interest. November 19, 2013. <http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/iran-has-right-enrich%E2%80%9494-america-already-recognized-it-9425> Accessed on September 4, 2015.
- [11] Crowley, Michael. "Hillary Endorses Nuclear Deal." Politico. July 14, 2015. <http://www.politico.com/story/2015/07/hillary-clinton-iran-nuclear-deal-120078> Accessed on September 4, 2015.
- [12] "Clinton: Obama Is 'Naïve' On Foreign Policy." NBC. July 24, 2007. http://www.nbcnews.com/id/19933710/ns/politics-the_debates/t/clinton-obama-naive-foreign-policy/#.VeneQBFVikp Accessed on September 4, 2015.
- [13] Frizell, Sam. "Hillary Clinton Praises Gay Marriage Decision And Hounds GOP." TIME. June 27, 2015. <http://time.com/3938898/hillary-clinton-gay-marriage/> Accessed on September 4, 2015.
- [14] Biddle, Sam. "Remember When Hillary Clinton Was Against Gay Marriage?" Gawker. June 26, 2015. <http://gawker.com/remember-when-hillary-clinton-was-against-gay-marriage-1714147439> Accessed on September 4, 2015.
- [15] Curl, Joseph. "Hillary Clinton Supported Iraq War - Before She Opposed It." Washington Times. May 17, 2015. <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2015/may/17/joseph-curl-hillary-clinton-supported-iraq-war-bef/?page=all> Accessed on September 4, 2015.

The original source of this article is [Brandon Turbeville](#)
Copyright © [Brandon Turbeville](#), [Brandon Turbeville](#), 2016

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Brandon Turbeville](#)

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