

March 10, 2015

We can't get our eyes off the trainwreck that is the Hillary campaign. Ron Fournier is at it again.

"Follow the money." That apocryphal phrase, attributed to Watergate whistle-blower "Deep Throat," explains why the biggest threat to Hillary Rodham Clinton's presidential dreams is not her emails. It's her family foundation. That's where the money is: corporate money, foreign money, gobs of money sloshing around a vanity charity that could be renamed "Clinton Conflicts of Interest Foundation."

What about the emails? Hillary Clinton's secret communications cache is a bombshell deserving of full disclosure because of her assault on government transparency and electronic security. But its greatest relevancy is what the emails might reveal about any nexus between Clinton's work at State and donations to the Bill, Hillary & Chelsea Clinton Foundation from U.S. corporations and foreign nations.

Under fire, Bill Clinton said his namesake charity has "done a lot more good than harm"—hardly a ringing endorsement. One of his longest-serving advisers, a person who had worked directly for the foundation, told me the "longtime whispers of pay-to-play are going to become shouts." This person, a Clinton loyalist and credible source, has no evidence of wrongdoing but said the media's suspicions are warranted. "The emails are a related but secondary scandal," the source said. "Follow the foundation money." ...

... What did these companies and countries expect in return for their cash? Did the Clintons promise any favors? Those are fair questions—not partisan questions and not media "gotcha" questions. The Clintons are responsible for the management of their foundation. Hillary Clinton is responsible for stashing her emails in a secret server. She is running for president. The rest of us should follow the money.

NY Post OpEd follows the logic.

Here's the bottom line of the latest HillaryWorld scandals: Clinton Inc. embodies what's wrong with America.

It's about getting stinking rich from the inside connections forged in a life of public service.

It's about using your "charity" and your high government office as adjuncts of your political machine.

It's about refusing to play by the rules even as you want to set the rules for everyone else.

Start with the latest shocker, the email lunacy. You don't get to keep your government work a secret from the government.

Anyone with a regular job gets it: Your work product belongs to the folks who sign your paycheck. How can that not be even more obvious when the signature is Uncle Sam's?

That the question never occurred to Hillary is just one more sign of her overinflated sense of entitlement — as is the fact that she set the whole thing up right when she was taking the job.

And that none of her staff at State ever raised a question tells you what a pack of flunkies she gathered 'round herself.

(I mean, she installed the private email server in her home. Who, other than exiled Nigerian princes looking for our help, does that?) ...

Peter Wehner thinks one of the worst effects of Emailgate is the all the Clinton flacks that assault our senses.

Good grief.

Over the last few days we've seen one former Clinton aide and acolyte after another come out of the woodwork to defend yet another Clinton from yet another series of scandals.

It's like a tired, awful syndicated series that's been cancelled but just won't go away.

*In one corner, it was Lanny Davis being methodically taken apart by Fox News's Chris Wallace. In another corner was the Ragin' Cajun, James Carville, whining about "cockamamie right wing talking points" being responsible for this story. (The New York Times is well known, of course, for writing its stories based on right-wing talking points.) And what would Old Home Week be without the man Jon Stewart once pounded to dust, the always classy Paul Begala, insisting that voters "do not give a sh*t. They do not even give a fart" about the story that Mrs. Clinton set up a private email account while she was Secretary of State. If those three weren't enough, there was the right-wing-hit-man-turned-left-wing-hit-man, David Brock, appearing on MSNBC's Morning Joe to defend Mrs. Clinton.*

Watching these men react like trained seals is pathetic, causing a wave of Clinton Fatigue to once again wash over America. But it's also poignant, at least to this degree: The Clintons have a long history of pulling people, including some undoubtedly decent people, into their orbit—and once having done so, sending them out to defend the Clintons' various and sundry corruptions. And that, in turn, has a corrupting effect on the Clintons' defenders. ...

Ed Morrissey provides an example of Clinton defenders.

If people want a peek at the defense on the e-mail scandal that will come from Team Hillary will mount — sans Hillary Clinton, at least for a while — check out this exchange between Fox News Sunday host Chris Wallace and longtime Clintonland figure Lanny Davis. His very presence on FNS shows just how much Hillary wants to stand up for herself, and after watching this exchange, it's pretty clear why. Davis insists that Hillary didn't do anything illegal, but also that she did nothing wrong, and Wallace can't believe it: ...

Roger Simon says America is being tested.

... Okay, what's clear is the American public is being given a test. Are they going to elect Hillary Clinton, a serial liar who purposefully hides her communications from the public and the government she is supposed to be leading while making Foundation deals with Qatar and Algeria

in the middle of a war against militant Islam? If they do that, after everything that has been revealed and is going to be revealed, after Benghazi during which this deeply immoral woman was able to tell the father of a man who was just murdered in a now proven jihadi terror attack that "they would get that man who made that video," we are all screwed. I don't know what we can do. Head to Texas and help it secede? ...

And Seth Mandel says the "Hillary as champion of women" narrative is beginning to unravel.

Hillary Clinton's decision to base her 2016 presidential campaign on the fact that she's a she is running into some problems. DNC vice chairwoman Donna Brazile wrote last week that "This time, Hillary will run as a woman." Brazile said Hillary spent "much of her 2008 campaign seemingly running away from the fact that she is a woman," and that this time she's clearly made the decision to run toward her womanity. Whatever that means in practice, the recent Clinton Foundation scandals have converged with her unimpressive record as secretary of state to complicate the narrative.

Last week I wrote about Carly Fiorina's longshot candidacy for the Republican presidential nomination, highlighting her CPAC speech and her effective line of attack against Hillary Clinton. We're now seeing just how effective it is. Two of Fiorina's sound bites in particular stand out. Of Clinton, she said: "She tweets about women's rights in this country, and takes money from governments that deny women the most basic human rights." And: "Like Mrs. Clinton, I too have traveled the globe. Unlike Mrs. Clinton, I know that flying is an activity, not an accomplishment."

Those attacks have now found their way into a New York Times story on the hypocrisy of Hillary talking up women's rights while her foundation was accepting hefty donations from Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and other countries with poor records on women's rights. And it threatens to turn the Hillary campaign's entire raison d'être into a liability.

From the Times's Amy Chozick: ...

Apologies for this day of more Hillary stuff. We promise to follow some other stories tomorrow. It is interesting though, to see the left/media trying to move her out of the way. They know she's toxic and they need to sideline her before she's the nominee and they go down to sure defeat. For example there is no more reliable Dem clown in the media than Eugene Robinson. The title of his column yesterday was "Is Hillary Hiding Something?" A NY Times reporter has even started to hint about Hillary's drinking. They want her to go away.

National Journal

Emails May Be a Key to Addressing 'Pay-to-Play' Whispers at Clinton Foundation

There are not two Clinton controversies. There is one big, hairy deal.

by Ron Fournier

"Follow the money." That [apocryphal](#) phrase, attributed to Watergate whistle-blower "Deep Throat," explains why the biggest threat to Hillary Rodham Clinton's presidential dreams is not her emails. It's her family foundation. That's where the money is: corporate money, foreign money, gobs of money sloshing around a vanity charity that could be renamed "Clinton Conflicts of Interest Foundation."

What about the emails? Hillary Clinton's secret communications cache is a bombshell deserving of full disclosure because of her assault on government transparency and electronic security. But its greatest relevancy is what the emails might reveal about any nexus between Clinton's work at State and donations to the [Bill, Hillary & Chelsea Clinton Foundation](#) from U.S. corporations and foreign nations.

Under fire, Bill Clinton said his namesake charity has "done a lot more good than harm"—hardly a ringing endorsement. One of his longest-serving advisers, a person who had worked directly for the foundation, told me the "longtime whispers of pay-to-play are going to become shouts." This person, a Clinton loyalist and credible source, has no evidence of wrongdoing but said the media's suspicions are warranted. "The emails are a related but secondary scandal," the source said. "Follow the foundation money."

Is the foundation clean? Is it corrupt? Or is the truth in the muddy middle, where we so often find the Clintons? Due to the fact that Hillary Clinton chose to skirt federal regulations and house her State Department emails on an off-the-books server, even the most loyal Democrat can't honestly answer those questions without an independent vetting of her electronic correspondence.

Without those emails, we may never be able to follow the money. Could that be why she hasn't coughed up the server?

Disclosure: I've known and respected the Clintons since the 1980s, when I covered state politics for the Arkansas Democrat (now the [Arkansas Democrat-Gazette](#)) and the Associated Press. Over the years, [they've been kind to my family](#), and my career obviously benefited from their rise. Of all the public servants I've covered since moving to Washington in 1993, none approach the Clintons in terms of both strengths and weaknesses. While I've never called them corrupt (the Whitewater land deal was legitimate), I can tell you almost 30 years of stories about their entitlement, outsized victimization, and an aggravating belief in the ends justifying the means.

Which is why I wasn't surprised when veteran Clinton chronicler Todd S. Purdum of Politico [compared Hillary Clinton to Richard Nixon](#).

"Not even Clinton's harshest critics could claim that Servergate (or Chappaquaddata, or whatever it may come to be called) constitutes a high crime or misdemeanor. But it does connote a reflexive wariness about her enemies—a wariness that sometimes seems to border on paranoia—that has long dogged Clinton, and that struck at least a few old Nixon hands as familiar ..."

"There is, of course," Purdum continued, "a bitter paradox in the fact that Clinton, as a young staffer on the House Judiciary Committee, actually worked on Nixon's impeachment."

I wonder what a young Hillary Clinton would think of a private charity run by a former U.S. president and a potential future president that collected hundreds of millions of dollars from countries and companies hoping to influence the pair. Actually, I don't wonder: She would think it smells.

And yet, a New York developer [donated \\$100,000 to](#) the foundation at about the same time Hillary Clinton helped secure millions of dollars in federal assistance for the businessman's mall project.

An aide close enough to Bill Clinton to be considered a surrogate son, Doug Band, set up Teneo, a company that New York Times columnist Maureen Dowd [calls](#) "a scammy blend of corporate consulting, public relations, and merchant banking." Band recruited clients from the foundation donor list while encouraging others to donate. "Its marketing materials highlighted Mr. Band's relationship with Mr. Clinton and the Clinton Global Initiative, where Mr. Band sat on the board of directors through 2011 and remains as an advisers," according to a 2013 New York Times exposé.

Money came in. Favors went out. While there is no direct evidence of quid pro quo, the foundation and its namesakes created this perception problem. They own it.

Bill Clinton noted Saturday that the foundation discloses most of its donations, a level of transparency beyond strict legal requirements. Nobody can argue that the foundation doesn't save lives and do other good deeds. "You've got to decide when you do this work, whether it will do more good than harm if someone helps you from another country," the former president said.

But there was a reason why the Obama White House asked the foundation to stop taking foreign donations while she served as secretary of State. It looks unethical. It may be corrupt. And yet, shortly after she left the State Department to begin presidential planning, the foundation opened up the foreign-money spigot.

It never stopped taking money from favored corporations, and recently it entered into partnerships with "at least six banks that were under investigation, involved in litigation, or had been fined by government agencies and regulators," according to a [CNN investigation](#).

What did these companies and countries expect in return for their cash? Did the Clintons promise any favors? Those are fair questions—not partisan questions and not media "gotcha" questions. The Clintons are responsible for the management of their foundation. Hillary Clinton is responsible for stashing her emails in a secret server. She is running for president. The rest of us should follow the money.

NY Post

[Clinton Inc. is what's wrong with America](#)

by Mark Cunningham

Here's the bottom line of the latest HillaryWorld scandals: Clinton Inc. embodies what's wrong with America.

It's about getting stinking rich from the inside connections forged in a life of public service.

It's about using your "charity" *and* your high government office as adjuncts of your political machine.

It's about refusing to play by the rules even as you want to set the rules for everyone else.

Start with the latest shocker, the email lunacy. You don't get to keep your government work a secret *from the government*.

Anyone with a regular job gets it: Your work product belongs to the folks who sign your paycheck. How can that not be even more obvious when the signature is Uncle Sam's?

That the question never occurred to Hillary is just one more sign of her overinflated sense of entitlement — as is the fact that she set the whole thing up *right* when she was taking the job.

And that none of her staff at State ever raised a question tells you what a pack of flunkies she gathered 'round herself.

(I mean, she installed the private email server in her *home*. Who, other than exiled Nigerian princes looking for our help, does that?)

Nor was that the only rule-for-everyone-else that Hillary blew through at State.

The email revelation came atop the news that, despite previous denials, the Clinton Foundation took in countless millions from foreign sources *while she ran the State Department*.

No one's even bothered to ask yet about the cash the foundation raised while she served in the Senate.

What, indeed, to make of the entire nonstop flow of corporate and foreign money over all the years since her better half left office, when she's plainly been the single person in America most likely to someday become president?

The Clinton Foundation doubtless does much good work — but it also serves to shield from public view the transfer of endless cash from around the world to the Clintons' control.

Fine, plenty of politicians, especially here in New York, use nonprofits to advance their careers. But "legal" nonprofit abuse remains one of the great ongoing scandals of New York government.

And the Clinton Foundation reeks of the same insider dealing — operating on a global scale.

The New York Times, to its credit, outlined more than a year ago how the Clintons have used the foundation to pay their operatives between campaigns — all without any need for those awkward Federal Election Commission filings.

The Times and others have also noted how the foundation blurs with Bill Clinton's murky business work — the consulting jobs that have made Bill and Hillary rich despite leaving the White House "dead broke."

Look, the Clintons were going to do fine no matter what after Bill left the White House: Book deals, speaking fees, a few beyond-reproach corporate-board memberships would be enough to cover their legal bills and leave them comfortably in the 1 percent.

They could've even set up a charity — Jimmy Carter did great work through Habitat for Humanity after his presidency.

Instead, they just had to set up something new and messy — something that would let them leverage their connections into a whole new machinery of power and influence.

And they couldn't even be bothered to cut off some of the cash flow to avoid blatant conflicts of interest with her ongoing "public service."

And we're still not done with Hillary's rule-shredding at State. She also selflessly ensured that her protégés didn't leave their government service dead broke.

Secretary Hillary granted waivers so her top State councilors could work on the side as consultants.

Her closest aide, Huma Abedin, apparently pulled down \$135,000 from Uncle Sam for her work at State while "earning" \$355,000 as a consultant for outside interests.

Actually, half the 355 grand was paid to *Mr. Abedin*, a k a Anthony Wiener, a k a Carlos Danger, who was himself making big bucks as a consultant.

Now, maybe some of those payments were "investments" in case Tony recovered from his (first) pervert-Twitter scandal and became New York's mayor. But "work" sent his way would also help out Huma, and so earn points with Hillary.

Huma, incidentally, was one of the select few also granted a clintonemail.com account. Which means the only official records of Hillary's on-the-job correspondence with her closest aide are those emails that HillaryWorld now chooses to share.

It's all just a big, stinking ball of *taking care of yourselves while you do the people's business*.

The great irony here is last month's news from the Washington Post: Hillary's consultants are busy working out her themes for 2016. Apparently, a big one is going to be "pushing for economic fairness."

Henhouse, meet fox.

Contentions

[Hillary Clinton's Trained Seals and Their Tiresome Act](#)

by Peter Wehner

Good grief.

Over the last few days we've seen one former Clinton aide and acolyte after another come out of the woodwork to defend yet another Clinton from yet another series of scandals.

It's like a tired, awful syndicated series that's been cancelled but just won't go away.

In one corner, it was Lanny Davis being [methodically taken apart](#) by Fox News's Chris Wallace. In another corner was the Ragin' Cajun, James Carville, [whining](#) about "cockamamie right wing talking points" being responsible for this story. (The *New York Times* is well known, of course, for writing its stories based on right-wing talking points.) And what would Old Home Week be without

the man Jon Stewart [once pounded to dust](#), the always classy Paul Begala, [insisting](#) that voters “do not give a sh*t. They do not even give a fart” about the story that Mrs. Clinton set up a private email account while she was Secretary of State. If those three weren’t enough, there was the right-wing-hit-man-turned-left-wing-hit-man, David Brock, [appearing on MSNBC’s Morning Joe](#) to defend Mrs. Clinton.

Watching these men react like trained seals is pathetic, causing a wave of Clinton Fatigue to once again wash over America. But it’s also poignant, at least to this degree: The Clintons have a long history of pulling people, including some undoubtedly decent people, into their orbit—and once having done so, sending them out to defend the Clintons’ various and sundry corruptions. And that, in turn, has a corrupting effect on the Clintons’ defenders. By that I don’t mean they become personally corrupt. But they often do become intellectually corrupt. If you think that judgment is too harsh, I’d urge you to watch Mr. Davis, an intelligent man, get all tripped up in his effort to defend what Mrs. Clinton did. (His inability to explain why setting up a personal email account would be preferable to having a government email account is almost painful.)

Messrs. Davis, Carville, Begala, and Brock begin with a supposition: The Clintons must be defended at all costs, regardless of the facts, come what may. Doing that for some people would be easy; doing it for Hillary and Bill Clinton is impossible. Their entire political lives have involved crossing ethical lines and destroying their opponents. Eventually, though, they end up destroying their defenders as well.

Hot Air

[Wallace to Davis: Do you ever get tired of cleaning up Clinton messes?](#)

by Ed Morrissey

If people want a peek at the defense on the e-mail scandal that will come from Team Hillary will mount — *sans* Hillary Clinton, at least for a while — [check out this exchange](#) between *Fox News Sunday* host Chris Wallace and longtime Clintonland figure Lanny Davis. His very presence on FNS shows just how much Hillary wants to stand up for herself, and after watching this exchange, it’s pretty clear why. Davis insists that Hillary didn’t do anything illegal, but also that she did nothing *wrong*, and [Wallace can’t believe it](#):

Davis at one point argues that nothing can be deleted from a hard drive, which is either breathtakingly insincere or completely ignorant:

WALLACE: I want to ask you about preserved. Because when the government said preserved — do you think they had in mind someone who never turned over any records during the entire four years that she was secretary of state, never turned over any records when she left as secretary of state, did not, in fact, turn over any records until almost two years after she left as secretary of state? Do you think that’s what the rules meant when President Obama, when the Federal Records Act, when the foreign manual all talked about preserving records?

DAVIS: The answer is yes, and you —

WALLACE: Two years after, that’s what they meant?

DAVIS: And you, Chris Wallace, may have a subjective belief of what might have been the case, I hear the word “may”. I’m talking about what is the case. Those records are preserved. Governor Huckabee said, well, maybe they were deleted. Last time I looked you cannot delete on a hard drive.

Yes, you actually *can* delete files on a hard drive. That’s been true since hard drives first hit the market, and it’s true to this day. Many people do not know how to *effectively* delete data from hard drives, which is why forensic analysts from law enforcement can often recover data — and why places like the IRS destroy hard drives rather than just throw them out in the trash. Files *can* be deleted, though, and it’s a safe bet that Hillary’s IT team has tried to ensure that they’ve covered those tracks. Maybe Davis should look again.

Davis then tries to play the Jeb Bush card:

DAVIS: For the same reason Jeb Bush had 3 million —

WALLACE: No, no, no. You’re talking about Jeb Bush and I’ve heard you play this game before.

DAVIS: You don’t know.

WALLACE: I’ve heard you play this Jeb Bush game before. It’s like the Republicans doing Watergate saying, well, Lyndon Johnson wiretapped people, too. It’s completely irrelevant, and, please, let’s not play that game.

DAVIS: Well, let’s not interrupt me and let me explain. What Jeb Bush —

WALLACE: I’m not asking about Jeb Bush. I’m asking why it was that Hillary Clinton in 2011 told all State Department officials use government e-mails and she continued to refuse to do it?

It’s worth noting two things about Bush. First, as governor of Florida, he had no obligation to comply with the *Federal Records Act*, and second, the only reason Davis is bringing him up is because Bush *voluntarily* released his e-mails.

Davis then plays Hillary’s own words from 2007 declaring that “secret White House e-mail accounts” were “shredding the Constitution,” at which point Davis is reduced to parsing out the meaning of the words “secret,” “volunteer,” and “outrageous”:

WALLACE: Lanny, she certainly thought private e-mails were a problem then. She said the Constitution was being shredded.

DAVIS: She listed a number of secrecy acts —

WALLACE: Including private e-mails.

DAVIS: And she has now done the unprecedented, maybe we should — White House did the same unprecedented, no secretary of state has ever volunteered to turn over all her e-mails —

WALLACE: She didn’t volunteer. She had to negotiate for four months with the State Department lawyers, lawyer to lawyer, before she turned them over, from August of last year until December. Why was it so outrageous for the Bush White House to use private e-mails, but for her it’s OK?

DAVIS: So, I keep answering your question. There were other things she just listed that she said were outrageous.

Boy, if *this* doesn't bring back Clinton nostalgia ... I wonder when Davis plans to expound again on the meaning of "is"?

All this leads an exasperated Wallace to ask how long Davis plans to make Clintonian spin his career:

WALLACE: Finally, as we said at the beginning, you served in the Clinton White House handling legal matters like campaign finance, like impeachment. Do you ever get tired of cleaning up after the Clintons?

DAVIS: No, you say cleaning up because you have a certain perspective. I am proud, given the public career and the public good of Bill and Hillary Clinton, as reflected by the popular goodwill they have across the country. Unlike Chris Wallace, I don't regard it as –

WALLACE: When you say unlike Chris Wallace, unlike me in what way?

DAVIS: Well, you call it cleaning up. You're entitled to your viewpoint. I am proud to defend a great public servant.

WALLACE: Proud?

DAVIS: Hillary Clinton and Bill Clinton –

WALLACE: Proud of Monica Lewinsky? Proud of campaign finance? Proud of the private e-mails? So, those are moments of pride for the Clintons?

DAVIS: There've been mistakes.

No kidding. Wallace, clearly annoyed, signs off with Davis by saying, "Whatever you call it, you've been doing it for a long time." Hey, it pays the mortgage.

Roger L. Simon

Email Eruption: Hillary Hidden Emails Multiply By Ten



When Hillary Clinton tweeted yesterday in the midst of her latest scandal “I want the public to see my email,” did she mean *all ten hidden accounts*, or just `hdr22@clintonmail.com`, the only account to be outed before that tweet? Now, thanks to a hacker, who seems not to have done anything illegal but use a piece of software, things have gone, shall we say, [a little haywire](#):

A prominent hacker tells Fox News’ James Rosen that Hillary Clinton appears to have established multiple email addresses for private use.

Aides to the former secretary of state say she only used one private email while in office — `hdr22@clintonemail.com`. That domain name has been traced to a private Internet server in Clinton’s hometown of Chappaqua, N.Y. The server was registered in the name of Clinton’s former aide Eric Hothem a week before the Obama administration assumed office.

Rosen’s hacker source employed a tool called “The Harvester” to search a number of data sources to look for references to the domain name `Clintonemail.com`. The source says it appears Clinton established multiple email addresses, including `hdr@clintonemail.com`, `hdr18@clintonemail.com`, `hdr19@clintonemail.com`, `hdr20@clintonemail.com`, and `hdr21@clintonemail.com`.

Other email addresses include `h.clinton@clintonemail.com`, `Hillary@clintonemail.com`, `contact@clintonemail.com`, and `mau_suit@clintonemail.com`.

It’s not clear whether Clinton used any or all of these email addresses. It’s also unclear whether her aides used them.

Fox News reached out to the Clinton team for comment and has not heard back.

I’ll bet. I wonder just who was using `mau_suit@clintonmail.com`. Was that a special address for their [Chinese donors](#)? Badda-bing, badda-boom. Oh, never mind.

Jokes aside, this is rather an impressive array. And a huge amount of digging for Trey Gowdy, Judicial Watch, et al. Might be a smart idea to get the Republican congress to pass new FOIA legislation mandating speedy reaction to subpoenas because the normal stonewalling process could make this take well into the 22nd century, well past the Chelsea administration.

Okay, what’s clear is the American public is being given a test. Are they going to elect Hillary Clinton, a serial liar who purposefully hides her communications from the public and the government she is supposed to be leading while making Foundation deals with Qatar and Algeria in the middle of a war against militant Islam? If they do that, after everything that has been revealed and is going to be revealed, after Benghazi during which this deeply immoral woman was able to tell the father of a man who was just murdered in a now proven jihadi terror attack that “they would get that man who made that video,” we are all screwed. I don’t know what we can do. Head to Texas and help it secede?

But apropos of the incredible paranoia of having not one, but ten hidden email accounts, I have been thinking of Ed Klein’s [Blood Feud: The Clintons versus the Obamas](#), which I read some months ago. It was a pretty lurid account of some pretty lurid people but it strikes me that it might be the key to this email paranoia. Sure, no Clinton wants to be subject to a FOIA request, nowhere, nohow. But they would also want the hated Obamas as far out of their business as possible with the server safely ensconced in Chappaqua, far, far from Valerie Jarrett. (It’s not by accident Obama man David Axelrod cast aspersions on the emails today.) Anyway, we’ll all find out — or we won’t.

And whatever the case, fair's fair. Bill has his "[bimbo eruptions](#)." Now Hillary has her "email eruptions."

Contentions

[Hillary's Undeserved Reputation as a Champion of Women Is Imploding](#)

by Seth Mandel

Hillary Clinton's decision to base her 2016 presidential campaign on the fact that she's a she is running into some problems. DNC vice chairwoman Donna Brazile [wrote](#) last week that "This time, Hillary will run as a woman." Brazile said Hillary spent "much of her 2008 campaign seemingly running away from the fact that she is a woman," and that this time she's clearly made the decision to run toward her womanity. Whatever that means in practice, the recent Clinton Foundation scandals have converged with her unimpressive record as secretary of state to complicate the narrative.

Last week I [wrote](#) about Carly Fiorina's longshot candidacy for the Republican presidential nomination, highlighting her CPAC speech and her effective line of attack against Hillary Clinton. We're now seeing just how effective it is. Two of Fiorina's sound bites in particular stand out. Of Clinton, she said: "She tweets about women's rights in this country, and takes money from governments that deny women the most basic human rights." And: "Like Mrs. Clinton, I too have traveled the globe. Unlike Mrs. Clinton, I know that flying is an activity, not an accomplishment."

Those attacks have now found their way into a *New York Times* [story](#) on the hypocrisy of Hillary talking up women's rights while her foundation was accepting hefty donations from Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and other countries with poor records on women's rights. And it threatens to turn the Hillary campaign's entire raison d'être into a liability.

From the *Times*'s Amy Chozick:

And for someone who has so long been lampooned, and demonized on the right, as overly calculating, playing up her gender as a strength would also allow her to demonstrate her nurturing, maternal — and newly grandmotherly — side to voters whom she may have left cold in the past.

Even her most strident critics could not have predicted that Mrs. Clinton would prove vulnerable on the subject.

But the Bill, Hillary & Chelsea Clinton Foundation has accepted tens of millions of dollars in donations from Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Algeria and Brunei — all of which the State Department has faulted over their records on sex discrimination and other human-rights issues.

The department's 2011 human rights report on Saudi Arabia, the last such yearly review prepared during Mrs. Clinton's tenure, [tersely faulted the kingdom](#) for "a lack of equal rights for women and children," and said violence against women, human trafficking and gender discrimination, among other abuses, were all "common" there.

Saudi Arabia has been a particularly generous benefactor to the Clinton Foundation, giving at least \$10 million since 2001, according to foundation disclosures. At least \$1 million more was donated by Friends of Saudi Arabia, co-founded by a Saudi prince.

I don't really understand the editorializing comment "Even her most strident critics could not have predicted that Mrs. Clinton would prove vulnerable on the subject," which doesn't really sound plausible at all, but everything else is about right. It's the collision of two critiques of Clinton that make this such a complicated story for Hillary. First, there has been the ongoing (and at times unintentionally comical) attempt by Hillary's partisans to name any serious accomplishment in her time at Foggy Bottom and coming up emptyhanded. And the second is the rank hypocrisy and influence peddling at the Clinton Foundation.

The first critique makes the second harder to deflect. If Hillary had been able to accomplish anything besides logging lots of miles, she could balance the fact that her foundation was taking cash from the subjugators of women worldwide. At the same time, it's a problem of Hillary's own creation, not only because of her role in the scandals but also because she's apparently chosen to make women's rights the central plank in her campaign.

That, in its own weird way, makes a great deal of sense. The actual reason Hillary is running for president is because she believes it's her turn and she's entitled to it. That's it, but it's not a very compelling personal story. Running as the potential first woman president is a way of projecting that entitlement onto half the electorate. She's entitled to it because *you're* entitled to it, or so goes the logic. She's running as Oprah; look under your seat, ladies: there's a presidency for each of you.

This would be the moment for Hillary and her defenders to point to all her major accomplishments in the world of women's rights. But they don't exist. And the *Times* story makes this abundantly clear. Here is how the story begins:

It was supposed to be a carefully planned anniversary to mark one of the most important and widely praised moments in Hillary Rodham Clinton's political career — and to remind the country, ahead of a likely 2016 presidential campaign, about her long record as a champion for the rights of women and girls.

Instead, as Mrs. Clinton commemorates her 1995 women's rights speech in Beijing in back-to-back events in New York, she finds herself under attack for her family foundation's acceptance of millions of dollars in donations from Middle Eastern countries known for violence against women and for denying them many basic freedoms.

Hillary Clinton is going on tour to remind voters that she made what she considers a great speech in 1995. And instead of unadulterated adulation, she's dealing with the dawning realization on the voting public that an old speech promoting women's rights is all she's got. Once she attained power on the world stage she became not a liberator of women but the beneficiary of largesse from some of the world's worst oppressors of women.

All Hillary Clinton's been able to change in the last twenty years is her address. And dredging up an old speech will only serve as a reminder of that fact.

PHILIP



AS I RAN UNDER FIRE from the
HELICOPTER, a BOSNIAN SNIPER
who despised SIR EDMUND HILLARY
and was FIRED from the WHITE HOUSE
TRAVEL OFFICE for LOSING all his
MONEY from CATTLE FUTURES TOOK
OUT my GOVERNMENT
EMAIL...



www.investors.com/cartoons

YES, I DID IT
TO AVOID PUBLIC
SCRUTINY AND I
PROMISE TO
CONTINUE WITH
PRESIDENT OBAMA'S
"POLICY OF
TRANSPARENCY."™




ERIC ALLIE
CAGLE CARTOONS
FURIOUS DIAPER

The Justice Dept reports
that the unfair targeting
of people in Ferguson was
motivated by revenue
generation.



In other words, Government
blames Government for acting
like Government.

 NEWS

Glenn
Reynolds
BND.com/uc/146