

Evaluate Hillary Clinton by Her Results, Not Her Words

By [Eric Zuesse](#)
Global Research, April 25, 2016

Region: [Latin America & Caribbean, USA](#)
Theme: [Law and Justice](#), [Police State & Civil Rights](#)

Hillary Clinton's major result was produced while she was the U.S. Secretary of State, her refusing at that time to call the coup in Honduras on 28 June 2009, a "coup." By her refusing to call it a coup, the U.S. Government, under Barack Obama, was enabled to continue financial aid to the Honduran Government, and this financial aid, in turn, enabled the coup-installed regime to become stabilized and to remain in place, despite the rest of the world's government's having condemned it.

Here is one recent result of her action regarding Honduras:

<https://theintercept.com/2016/03/11/drugs-dams-and-power-the-murder-of-honduran-activist-berta-caceres/>

This is how she did it — how she (with follow-through by the U.S. President) produced it:

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/hillary-clintons-six-foreign-policy-catastrophes/5509543?print=1>

And this is what she says about it, in retrospect:

http://www.salon.com/2016/04/15/hillary_clinton_is_lying_about_the_criminal_u_s_backed_coup_in_honduras_it_should_be_as_scandalous_as_libya/

In other words: She's not apologetic about what she did and what its disastrous consequences were — she ignores them.

However, even if she were apologetic about it (as she *is* apologetic about her having voted for the 2003 invasion of Iraq), that wouldn't really make any difference, because — again — what's actually important isn't her lying words; it's not her lying that it wasn't a coup, or her saying that she regrets having voted to invade Iraq, or her saying that she opposes Obama's proposed 'trade' deals, or other lies from her — it's her record of decisions and actions that made a real difference, proving what her actual intentions are. (And, for example: if she really regrets having voted in 2002 to invade Iraq, then why was she [so ecstatic about her and Obama's 2011 invasion of Libya](#), and why is she so insistent now on eliminating Assad in Syria?) She has a rather [consistent record of catastrophes](#), and it speaks louder than any of her mere lies.

If the Democratic Party, for which I have voted throughout my life, nominates Hillary Clinton for President, then I (because I am neither ignorant, nor stupid, nor psychopathic) will consider the Democratic Party, and the people who vote for it, as being now run by

psychopaths, and as relying upon votes from individuals who are ignoramuses (ignorant of what the person they've voted for has done) and/or idiots (incapable of reasoning from those consequences, and incapable of understanding that without her actions those consequences would have been vastly better than they are) — I'll never again support the national Democratic Party.

I haven't been, and will not be, a Republican (and anyone who is, after Bush's 2003 invasion of Iraq, is beneath even basic decency), but if Hillary becomes the Party's nominee, then the Democratic Party is just as rotten, from its top on down, as the Republican Party is — and, with Hillary as its Presidential nominee, anyone who would be denying the fact of its rottenness, under such a circumstance as this, would necessarily be either ignorant, stupid, or psychopathic (as I have just explained here what those terms mean).

That's an undeniable scientific fact about the Party, if it runs a person such as that, *as its Presidential nominee*. She is [the Democratic Party's Richard Nixon](#), and this is clear about her even before she wins her Party's Presidential nomination — so, it will be unforgivable, if she does win it.

After the Nazi Party ran Adolf Hitler as its nominee in Germany's 1933 election, is there anyone today who would vote Nazi who isn't ignorant, stupid, and/or psychopathic? Of course not. For the masses of people in Honduras — the murder capital of the world after Hillary stanchd up and defended and kept in power its fascist coup-regime in 2009 — their country is approximately as terrifying as Hitler's Germany was terrifying to Jews.

All decent people will feel aversion at the very thought of Hillary Clinton becoming the Democratic Party's nominee, and no intelligent person will trust anything she says, because her record shows her true character, which is plain repulsive.

For example, she recently said

["The Legislature—or the national Legislature in Honduras and the national judiciary actually followed the law in removing President Zelaya",](#)

but even her own U.S. Ambassador in Honduras, Hugo Llorens, right after the coup, [wrote to her the contrary](#) (and she ignored what he and all decent persons were saying), and here is what he said to her:

The actions of June 28 can only be considered a coup d'état by the legislative branch, with the support of the judicial branch and the military, against the executive branch. It bears mentioning that, whereas the resolution adopted June 28 refers only to Zelaya, its effect was to remove the entire executive branch. Both of these actions clearly exceeded Congress's authority. ... No matter what the merits of the case against Zelaya, his forced removal by the military was clearly illegal, and [puppet-leader Roberto] Micheletti's ascendance as 'interim president' was totally illegitimate.

Furthermore, even [the highly compromised Honduran Truth Commission](#) (set up by the U.S. because of the international condemnation of the deteriorating situation in Honduras) [concluded that it had been a "coup"](#). She still brazenly lies through her teeth. And 'Democratic' suckers and psychopaths still take seriously what she says, and vote for her, after [such a record as this](#). If that's not repulsive, then what *is*?

As Jonathan Watts [recently noted](#), in Britain's *Guardian*:

Environmental activists are more likely to be killed in Honduras than any other country, [according to a study by the NGO Global Witness](#). More than 80% of murders go unpunished. Part of the problem, according to the InterIACHR, is that the military has taken on roles that should be left to a civilian police. They tend to work in conjunction with powerful interests, while human rights activists are criminalised.

Due to the widespread condemnation of the Honduran Government for the murder of Berta Cáceres, the Honduran Government is allegedly now trying to build a case against someone else within her own environmental organization to prosecute for it.

Without the Obama Administration's support, the coup-regime wouldn't even have lasted out the year. Hillary went so far as to try to block the democratically elected President, Manuel Zelaya, from being returned to the country so that he could be restored. Elections in Honduras since that time have been purely for show, and no candidates who oppose the aristocracy are allowed: the 'news' media are owned by the aristocracy. It's clear where Hillary Clinton's heart is: it's [with the money, not with the people](#).

She should be [in prison, not in the White House](#).

Investigative historian **Eric Zuesse** is the author, most recently, of [They're Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010](#), and of [CHRIST'S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity](#).

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Eric Zuesse](#), Global Research, 2016

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Eric Zuesse](#)

About the author:

Investigative historian Eric Zuesse is the author, most recently, of [They're Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010](#), and of [CHRIST'S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity](#).

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