

Opinion

# **UNITED STATES - Hillary Clinton, Interventionist in Latin America**

Ilka Oliva Corado

Wednesday 22 June 2016, posted by [Ilka Oliva Corado](#)

It's now that Hillary Clinton is contemplating the fruits of her decision not to have divorced when her husband committed the baseness to which the media and patriarchy have referred as "having a little fling". They are the same media and the same patriarchy who stoned and re-victimized the girl involved in the affair; when the married man, the one who had a family, and promised fidelity, and failed, was he. "He is the president of the United States, he is allowed to do it," so their washed their hands.

Hillary Clinton, with this decision of double standards and extremely submissive to the patriarchy, sent the wrong message to young women, since she is a public figure and claims to be a feminist. No woman at all, without needing to be a feminist, who respects herself, does tolerates disrespect and humiliation of such magnitude. The personal is political. I don't make this comment as a judge, because the private life of anyone is none of my business, it is not my desire to judge, but you have to respect your own word, and if anyone is going to argue that she is a feminist, it has to be proven with facts.

Clinton introduces herself in social networks as wife, mother and grandmother, in that order, demonstrating with it her role akin to patriarchy. What kind of feminist is Clinton? What kind of feminist can give her vote for a woman who disrespects so many ancestresses who gave their lives in defense of the rights of women? Although of course, there is the Anglo feminist type, which defends only the rights of Caucasian women and keeps silent and feign when a woman from another ethnic group suffers the oppression of patriarchy, sexism and misogyny. A clear example: the abuse suffered by the Afro descendant community in the United States, as well as the Latin American and Muslim communities.

Starting from there, the context of feminism that Clinton manages is bourgeois, from whatever point of view. Bourgeois akin to patriarchy. I am not a feminist, but neither do I consent to the shamelessness, much less when this has to do with oppressing other women. The interventionist role played by Clinton in Latin America (and the world) is not that of a feminist who respects human rights. No honest feminist would approve wars, interference, and invasions against other nations. No feminist would call "collateral damage" the children, adolescents and women raped by the invading troops. No feminist would tolerate torture centers like Guantanamo. Hillary Clinton defends them.

Playing the role of a condescending wife that forgives her husband's infidelities has allowed her to be where she is, and that will increase her power when she is elected, in a few months, as the first US woman president. Of course, following the age-old established rule: first, it had to be a black man loyal to capitalism, a disgrace to his ethnicity; and second, a white woman, loyal to capitalism, and a shame to her gender. Both inhuman, interventionists and pawns of corporate capital.

What human being who is sensitive, honest and wholesome, cover up and leads interferences in other countries and allows oppression in her own? Why she hasn't spoken out against the coup to Dilma in Brazil the way she has denounced the "dictatorship" of Maduro in Venezuela? I mean, because she is a feminist.

No, you are not a woman because you were born with vagina and uterus. The woman is a construction and one doesn't have to read volumes of books to understand it, it is common sense, instinct. Hillary Clinton is

thus a prototype of the US capital, using gender for her own benefit, and making it available to the global business sector and interventionist elites. And what is worse, she manipulates the minds of women who in their desire for fairness believe that what she embodies is feminism.

Hillary Clinton speaks about Cuba, but won't authorize the lifting of the blockade, she also talks about Venezuela and agitates for military invasion, she also supports (and as president will authorize) the mass deportations of undocumented Latin American immigrants. She also had to do with the coup to Zelaya in Honduras. During his tenure, Honduras will be the base where they will handle any manipulation and interventionist attack to Latin America. In this way is shaping up, and we can see it without double filter.

Zelaya's ouster was not only the effort of the local oligarchy. South Border Plan and Maya-Chortí was not the pure desire to assault and murder migrants in transit; the main objective was the militarization from Mexico to Honduras. The Plan of the Alliance for Prosperity is not a humanitarian donation from the US to the Northern Triangle in Central America. The established neoliberalism in the region gives way to the advancement of US interference under a different plan. Peru with Keiko Fujimori was option "B" to transform the country into a base, at least there Clinton doesn't have the table served as she imagined, the election results give a respite, not a long lasting one, but a respite anyway.

Wall Street has achieved what it set out for at the beginning of the race for the presidency: to mobilize the masses toward Hillary Clinton. For that end they created the archetype of an opponent that would arouse racial hatred, that has always existed in the country, and would rant as much as he could against ethnic groups, continents and countries. The media coverage gave prominence to every performance and emphasized every previously planned speech so that Trump became the hated antagonist. Sanders who represents a change of direction for the country was left in the shadows, without a microphone and a platform. Because like it or not, this upside down world is not moved by the masses, it is moved by the media coverage and the power of capitalist elites.

With that same attitude the media have begun to celebrate big what already seems to be Hillary Clinton presidency. Magazine covers, idolize and place her as a demigod of politics in this country of massive amnesia, xenophobia and racial hatred. Documentaries are released, tons of essays get published, anthologies and photographic series that tell her life.

Indeed Hillary Clinton will be the first US president. That does not guarantee a change in human rights in domestic politics, and women's labor rights regardless of ethnicity or immigration status. It doesn't guarantee anything at all other than the intensifying of the existing levels of oppression. But not only that; she will be the first Anglo American woman who from the antipode of feminism will mark a new era in American interference not only in Latin America but throughout the world.

It seems that the main objective of Hillary Clinton is to outpace the tragic mark left in the world by Margaret Thatcher.

---

@ilkaolivacorado

[contacto at cronicasdeunainquilina.com](mailto:contacto@cronicasdeunainquilina.com)

[Crónicas de una Inquilina](#)

Translated by **Marvin Najarro**.