



You've been warned, America: Hillary Clinton has never met a war she didn't like

By: Jason Pye
June 19, 2014

A war weary American public may not be aware of what they're in for if Hillary Clinton wins the 2016 presidential race. But Gene Healy, vice president of the Cato Institute and a columnist at the *Washington Examiner*, is shining some light on the former Secretary of State's terrible foreign policy record.

Healy joined the [Cato Daily Podcast](#) on Wednesday to [discuss Clinton's approach to foreign affairs](#) as it relates to her new book, *Hard Choices*, telling host Caleb Brown that she's never met a war she didn't like.

"[Clinton] has been getting a lot of questions about Iraq recently," said Healy, "and that is as it should be, because her role in helping perpetuate the worst foreign policy disaster since Vietnam is certainly something that ought to be looked at in terms of her fitness for higher office."

Clinton, he explains, was one of the most vocal cheerleaders for the war in Iraq, pointing to her comments from the floor of the Senate, in which she said parroted talking points used by supporters to make the case for military intervention.

"She apparently says something very strange in the memoir. She says that, 'I thought I had acted in good faith and made the best decision I could with the information I had,'" Healy notes. "It's pretty clear she didn't. She gave a floor speech in 2002 explaining that 'the facts are not in doubt.'" And among those facts, Saddam Hussein's robust nuclear program, the idea that he'd harbored al-Qaeda operatives."

The truth is Hussein [wasn't directly cooperating with al-Qaeda](#). In fact, the militant Islamic terrorist group [loathed the Iraqi regime](#) because it was a secular government. Unfortunately, [this part of the narrative persisted](#), as untrue as it was, in the run up to and immediately after the war began.

"What she didn't do much due diligence to find out whether those particular claims were true," Healy explains. "There was a national intelligence estimate available to any senator that was willing to walk across the Capitol grounds and sit in a secure room and read about 90 pages, spend an hour, hour and a half trying to find out what the intelligence community's best estimates were on Iraq. And even that document cast a lot of doubt on those claims."

Healy surmised that Clinton “didn’t seem particularly interested in getting the information to make that hard choice.”

But Iraq is only an example of Clinton’s willingness to support military intervention, though it’s the biggest one. Healy also pointed out that the then-First Lady, urged her husband, President Bill Clinton, to intervene in Serbia in 1999. This pattern continued when she became Secretary of State under President Barack Obama.

“When she became Secretary of State, she urged Barack Obama to bomb Libya, which he did. And she urged him to bomb Syria, which he didn’t. And after that, she urged him to arm the moderates in Syria, wherever they are,” said Healy. “So she has rarely met a war that she didn’t like or a constitutional limit that she thought was worth respecting.”

While Healy noted that Clinton has been mostly quiet on the crisis in Iraq, her overall record should make hesitant Americans already weary of the United States chaotic and misguided foreign policy.

“I think when you look at the totality of her record, it’s very concerning,” he said. “And if she realizes her lifelong dream in 2016 to become commander-in-chief of the U.S. Armed Forces, she won’t have to urge anyone to bomb. She’ll be able to give those orders herself.”