

Hillary Clinton's 'Freudian Slip': "The Nuclear Option Should Not at All Be Taken off the Table"

By [Timothy Alexander Guzman](#)

Global Research, December 08, 2015

[Silent Crow News](#) 7 December 2015

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [Nuclear War](#)

Merriam-Webster dictionary defines "Freudian slip" in simple terms as "a mistake in speech that shows what the speaker is truly thinking." According to ABC news, Hillary Clinton was at the 'Brookings Institution's Saban Forum 2015' giving a speech with prominent Israeli's and Secretary of State John Kerry present and made a comment on Iran's nuclear program:

While responding to a question about comments she made about keeping military action against Iran on the table should they violate the terms of the nuclear agreement, which Clinton said "is not perfect," She warned: "What I said and what I mean is that there will have to be consequences for any violation by Iran and that **the nuclear option should not at all be taken off the table.** That has been my position consistently." The crowd erupted into gasps and chatter regarding what appeared to be Clinton suggesting a nuclear weapon could be used against Iran if they fail to comply. Moments later, a lone, muffled voice rose from the front row with a loud, but inaudible, interjection. "What? The military option," Clinton said, correcting herself.

"Thank you, Justice Breyer," she added, revealing the identity of the lone voice as none other than the Supreme Court Justice's. "He's a careful listener, that Justice Breyer — we like that about him," Clinton said with a chuckle

Hillary "*We Came, We Saw, He Died*" Clinton sure loves to laugh at death and destruction. Clinton's use of the "*nuclear option*" in her speech on Iran is a dangerous game. The former first lady and Secretary of State is a Democratic front runner for the White House. Clinton's hawkish stance is troublesome knowing what her true intentions are. Zero Hedge published an article in May of this year which focused on an investigative report by the *International Business Times* (IBTimes) on Hillary Clinton and her foundation's relationship with the arms industry:

Now, the IBTimes is out with a new investigative piece that looks at the relationship between foreign government and corporate donors to Clinton charities and weapons deals negotiated under Hillary Clinton's State Department which, as it turns out, approved \$165 billion in arms deals to nations who had previously given money to the Clinton Foundation.

Via *IBTimes*:

In the years before Hillary Clinton became secretary of state, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia contributed at least \$10 million to the Clinton Foundation, the philanthropic enterprise she has overseen with her husband, former president Bill Clinton. Just two months before the deal was finalized, Boeing — the

defense contractor that manufactures one of the fighter jets the Saudis were especially keen to acquire, the F-15 — contributed \$900,000 to the Clinton Foundation, according to a company press release.

The Saudi deal was one of dozens of arms sales approved by Hillary Clinton's State Department that placed weapons in the hands of governments that had also donated money to the Clinton family philanthropic empire, an International Business Times investigation has found. Under Clinton's leadership, the State Department approved \$165 billion worth of commercial arms sales to 20 nations whose governments have given money to the Clinton Foundation, according to an IBTimes analysis of State Department and foundation data. That figure — derived from the three full fiscal years of Clinton's term as Secretary of State (from October 2010 to September 2012) — represented nearly double the value of American arms sales made to those countries and approved by the State Department during the same period of President George W. Bush's second term...

The Clinton-led State Department also authorized \$151 billion of separate Pentagon-brokered deals for 16 of the countries that donated to the Clinton Foundation, resulting in a 143 percent increase in completed sales to those nations over the same time frame during the Bush administration. These extra sales were part of a broad increase in American military exports that accompanied Obama's arrival in the White House

Hillary Clinton is as hawkish as the Bush neo-cons. Remember she was the first "Democrat" to vote for the invasion of Iraq in 2003. As President of the United States, she will target Iran and others who oppose "America's Democracy." Will she become the first female U.S. President? There was Barack Obama, the first African-American President. What card the political and financial elite have this time? A woman in the White House would make sense for the elites who donated mass sums of money to her campaign including her son-in-law's firm Goldman Sachs (a powerful financial institution). The first African-American was elected; now the real possibility of a woman president can be a reality. It will satisfy women's rights advocates and organizations as well as feminist activists. Who could argue against a woman who is as tough as a man in the White House?

Many in Israel support Hillary and so does the Saudi's who donated millions of dollars to her foundation. All of the candidates including Donald Trump who calls the Iran Nuclear Deal, a bad deal will be a pro-war president. Trump was quoted as saying "Never, ever ever in my life have I seen any transaction so incompetently negotiated as our deal with Iran," Trump said. "And I mean never" at a rally with another war hawk Ted Cruz to Stop the Iran nuclear deal this past September. Trump also said "We lose everywhere," Trump continued. "We lose militarily. We can't beat ISIS. Give me a break...We will have so much winning if I get elected you might get bored with winning." Every President of the United States since 1776 has been about war, "peace" on the other hand has only existed for a mere 21 years since its inception according to a 2011 article by www.loonwatch.com titled 'We're at War! And We Have Been Since 1776: 214 Years of American War Making' which lists every war the U.S. has been involved in.

Why would Clinton, Trump, Rubio or any of the presidential candidates ask for anything less except for more wars? Peace and prosperity is not on the agenda, war is. Hillary Clinton fits the job description as a war hawk and as a woman; she might be a little more hawkish than any of her political rivals. Let's see, a woman who is out to prove that she is tougher than her male counterparts is a dangerous recipe for a nuclear war especially against Iran. Hillary Clinton is as dangerous as you can get.

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: **[Timothy Alexander Guzman](#)**

About the author:

Timothy Alexander Guzman is an independent researcher and writer with a focus on political, economic, media and historical spheres. He has been published in Global Research, The Progressive Mind, European Union Examiner, News Beacon Ireland, WhatReallyHappened.com, EIN News and a number of other alternative news sites. He is a graduate of Hunter College in New York City.

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