“Hell hath no fury like a woman scorned,” wrote the playwright, William Congreve in 1697. Though Congreve is long forgotten, his quote has been immortalized, surfacing over and over as gender-related issues continuously pop up in US politics. The presidency of Donald Trump, known for his crude comments and surrounded by accusations of sexual assault and misconduct, gave birth to “Women’s Marches” and huge efforts to promote the role of women in politics.

Many of Trump’s critics viewed his attacks and ultimate defeat of Hillary Clinton in the 2016 campaign as appealing to sexist tropes. A New York Times op-ed referred to Hillary Clinton as “The Bitch America Needs” and attempted to own the female-specific label often pinned on the former US Senator and First Lady.

As women become and more prominent in US politics, the public is becoming aware of the different personality types of politically-bent women. Elizabeth Warren’s path to fame involved a reputation as a financial regulator who stood up to corporate power. Sarah Palin’s following, now mostly eroded, centered on the image of tough “Hockey Mom” who was dedicated to her kids.

As more and more female political figures emerge, different images and personality types are being experimented with. One particular trope among female politicians and government officials that has emerged is clearly being embraced by certain forces. While other feminists may try to challenge stereotypes or break down misconceptions, what could be called a “wrecker” mentality that really doesn’t seek to avoid calling forth images Congreve’s words about a woman scorned seems to also be finding its place in the spotlight.

“That Little Girl Was Me!”

Kamala Harris is the daughter of a Jamaican-American Economics Professor and an Indian-American Cancer researcher. She grew up in Berkeley, California, a hotbed of left-wing activism in the 1960s. Her parents divorced when she was 7 years old.

Harris’ father remains a well-respected Marxist economist, and he has distanced himself from his daughter very significantly, saying she is “beholden to her donors.” While Harris has frequently praised her mother on social media and in speeches, she remains silent about her Marxist father who speaks critically of her.

Harris’ career as a prosecutor launched her into politics, however, the ugly details of what such a career entails ultimately ended her 2020 Presidential campaign. As a Prosecutor, Harris worked to keep innocent people on death row and withheld evidence that would have resulted in their exoneration. Harris broke the law, and engaged in prosecutorial misconduct.

Like many criminal prosecutors, Harris seemed very motivated by a desire to inflict suffering on people. This desire seems to have motivated Harris to go well beyond what was expected of her, and to violate California law. Tulsi Gabbard’s exposure of these facts at a Presidential debate and Harris’ inability to refute any of these charges ultimately resulted in her popularity decreasing.

One particular clip that circled the internet showed Harris describing how she had begun jailing the parents of children who did not attend school. Many found this policy particularly problematic, but the way Harris spoke of her policy also stood out. She said: “I would not be standing here if it was not for the education I received... I believe that a child going without an education is tantamount to a crime. So I decided to start prosecuting parents for
This odd invoking of her childhood experiences in order to justify her adult behavior was similar to when she confronted Joe Biden about his history of opposing school busing. She described being part of school integration in Berkeley, saying “That little girl was me!” It can be pretty clearly inferred that Harris’ sadistic and relentless prosecutorial efforts are rooted in some kind of desire for revenge. After her “that little girl was me!” comment, T-shirt portraying an elementary school-aged Kamala Harris were sold on her campaign website.

It should be noted that Kamala Harris, once the favored front-runner of the race, wasn’t the only female prosecutor politician to be a Presidential contender in 2020. Amy Klobuchar remains in the race, and she also has a career history of working hard to imprison low-income people in her home state of Minnesota. Klobuchar is responsible for a number of questionable convictions, and often used an unreliable “Gang Expert” to convince juries of how potentially dangerous African-American defendants were.

Klobuchar, like Harris, is also the product of a broken home, with her parents divorcing when she was 15. She describes her father as an alcoholic and domestic abuser who she did not speak to until he finally became sober decades later. It is likely that her desire to damage the lives of people she does not know is also rooted in some kind of childhood trauma and pathological desire for revenge.

Meet “The Genocide Chick”

Much like Kamala Harris and Amy Klobuchar, Samantha Power, who served in Hillary Clinton’s State Department and became US Ambassador to the United Nations, also has a strong desire to destroy and punish. Furthermore, much like Harris and Klobuchar, she also displays signs of narcissism, recalling: “I came home from school every day, as my mother can attest, my dad can attest, and I sat in front of the mirrors for hours, straining to drop my brogue so that I, too, could quickly speak and be American.” Fitting the pattern, Power came from a broken home, leaving her native Ireland to live with her mother in Pennsylvania at the age of 9. Her father, an alcoholic, who rarely interacted with her after she left Ireland, died of an alcohol-related illness when she was 14.

Power came of age in the United States, and fell in love with the “human rights” foreign policy coverage in US media. She eventually became a war correspondent, and admitted that her journalism was done with the intent of promoting US military interventionism. She was essentially was a literal “war monger.” Just as a “fish monger” sells fish, Power’s journalism was intended to sell war. In her book, “Problem From Hell: America and the Age of Genocide” she said that the US government: “needed help from American reporters, editorial boards, and advocacy groups” in order to convince the world about the need to ruthlessly bomb and destabilize former Yugoslavia.

Samantha Power is known to jokingly refer to herself as ‘the genocide chick.’ She worked hard to get “Responsibility to Protect” added to the UN Charter in order to legalize US-led regime change operations and meddle in the internal affairs of sovereign states deemed to violate human rights. Power, in line with US foreign policy, coddled the Saudi Monarchy and even eulogized the torturing, beheading Saudi King at the United Nations, while directing her “human rights” outrage selectively at Wall Street’s international competitors.

Much like Kamala Harris’ imprisonment of low income parents did not really help their truant children, the bombing campaign in the former Yugoslavia did not really help the people it claimed to be rescuing, but made their conditions worse. Samantha Power was a key supporter of the NATO bombing campaign and regime change operation in Libya, pushing within the Obama White House for the US to become increasingly more and more involved. The result for the people of Libya has been mass death and destruction of their country. Prior to 2011 Libya had the highest life expectancy on the African continent.

But Power is satisfied. She wanted to punish Milosevic, she wanted to punish Gadhafi, she wanted to see bombs explode and cities wrecked as “punishment” or “revenge.” It wasn’t about helping people, it was about releasing pent up rage at men she perceived as powerful. Most likely, the parts of Samantha Power’s narcissistic psyche that want wars so badly, are deeply longing to punish her absent, alcoholic father. The same desire to punish is likely at fault in Kamala Harris and Amy Klobuchar.

Destruction Serves Wall Street

In this age when Wall Street and London sit atop a global financial system, and dominate the global markets, their enemies are very easily defined. The enemies are any nation that emerges as a solid competitor. Russia emerged from the chaos of the 1990s as a huge oil and gas exporter, competing with the 4 supermajors. China is a huge manufacturing hub, producing half the world’s steel, and ousting US corporations in smartphone technology.
Venezuela and Iran are independent oil producing states that export in competition with western energy monopolies. What is the goal in all of these countries? Reducing them to rubble and chaos, so they can become US client states rather than exporting competitors. Libya, once an oil rich exploiter, is now a mess of chaos and poverty. Iraq, which was a prosperous Arab socialist state in the 1980s, financing its economic growth with oil exports, has been equally reduced to chaos. Since the 2001 invasion, Afghanistan sits as a strategic epicenter of chaos, with drug gangs and terrorism spilling over into Iran, China and Russia. Western capitalism seeks destruction and chaos in order to ensure its monopoly, and maintain unipolarity. The world must remain a poor, captive market for the western financial powers. Instability and destruction are essential for making it happen, and women with a pathological longing to unleash such suffering can be quite useful to serve these foreign policy objectives. But who have been the major opponents of these efforts by western leaders? Strongmen. Populists. Figures like Vladimir Putin, Xi Jinping, Nicolas Maduro, and Ali Seyyed Khamenei. Men who exude strength and kind of fatherly wisdom and authority. The countries targeted by the west, accused of “human rights violations” and subject to destabilization tend to maintain more traditional family structures. Populist leaders are seen as the “Father of the Nation” mobilizing economic growth and beating back western destabilization. Not surprisingly, Kamala Harris loves to rail against Putin from the Senate floor, and accuse Trump of being “soft on dictators.” Amy Klobuchar and Samantha Power also see fighting anti-imperialist leaders who preside over independent economies as one of their primary foreign policy goals. This makes perfect sense when looking into their personal histories. These are women scorned by abusive fathers, grow to prosecutors, politicians, “feminists” seeking to unleash hells fury against anti-imperialist leaders deemed to be “patriarchal.” They don’t care about the “collateral damage” that piles up as a result. The point isn’t to make the world a better place, but rather, to get the world to understand “that little girl was me” and make Amy, Samantha, and Kamala feel like their childhood trauma has been atoned for. This psychological profile of a prosecutor politician, a narcissistic woman with a traumatic past, who seeks revenge and destruction; a liberal feminist war-monger with “daddy issues” seems to be very key in understanding a number of the women emerging in power and popularity among the US political elite. Their underlying motivations are driven by deep inner pain and are quite useful for those who rule the world. Robert Smith is an independent American researcher and analyst that specializes in social psychology and conflict resolution. He writes especially for the online magazine “New Eastern Outlook.”