

March 9, 2015

Yesterday was Bibi's speech day. Today is Hillary's day. And luckily, it's beginning to look like we might not have many more of these. Mark Steyn goes first again.

Re; President-Designate Clinton not using a government email address for her entire tenure as Secretary of State, a reader from Oregon writes:

"When I got my security training at the State Department in 2012 using a private email account was considered to be a security risk. A Lack of public record is one thing but communicating Top Secret material without secure communication is a crime. Note that Petraeus is pleading guilty for less."

Well, as I said yesterday, to the Clintons rules are for the little people - like General Petraeus. I don't doubt that using your own email is a security risk, and I would bet that somewhere out there on the planet the Chinese, the Russians, the Norks and/or Isis have plenty of fascinating Hillary emails on Benghazi and a lot of other stuff US archivists will never see.

But she did it to evade public scrutiny. I wrote previously that what the Times calls a "personal" email account is, in fact, a secret account - and consciously created as such: The domain clintonemail.com was apparently registered on the first day of her Senate confirmation hearing.

Then we'll get a couple of comments from left/liberal/media types like Ron Fournier, who says maybe it's time for HRC to retire her White House idea. The email revelations have opened a flood gate of liberals who say they've had enough.

Perhaps Hillary Rodham Clinton shouldn't run for president.

Maybe she should stay at the Bill, Hillary & Chelsea Clinton Foundation, where the former secretary of State could continue her life's work of building stronger economies, health care systems, and families. Give paid speeches. Write best-selling books. Spend time with Charlotte, her beloved granddaughter.

Because she doesn't seem ready for 2016. Like a blast of wintry air in July, the worst of 1990s-style politics is intruding on what needs to be a new millennium campaign: Transparent, inspirational, innovative, and beyond ethical reproach.

Two weeks ago, we learned that the Clinton Foundation accepted contributions from foreign countries. Assurances from the Obama administration and Clinton aides that no donations were made during her tenure as secretary of State were proven false.

I called the actions sleazy and stupid. Sleazy because any fair-minded person would suspect the foreign countries of trying to buy Clinton's influence. Stupid because the affair plays into a decades-old knock on the Clintons: They'll cut any corner for campaign cash. In the 1990s, Bill Clinton and his top aides used the White House as a tool to court and reward big donors.

Now The New York Times is reporting that Clinton used a personal email account to conduct government business as secretary of State, an apparent violation of federal requirements that her records be retained. ...

The day after Ron Fournier wrote the above, Hillary tweeted she wanted everyone to read her email. **Fournier responded**;

A cornered Clinton is a craven Clinton, which is why we should view Hillary Rodham Clinton's latest public relations trick with practiced skepticism. "I want the public to see my email," she tweeted Wednesday night. "I asked State to release them. They said they will review them for release as soon as possible."

If she wants us to see her email, why did she create a secret account stored on a dark server registered at her home?

If she wants us to see her email, why didn't she give State all of her email rather than a self-censored fraction of the correspondence?

If she wants us to see her email, Clinton should turn over every word written on her dark account(s) for independent vetting. Let somebody the public trusts decide which emails are truly private and which ones belong to the public.

Like everything else about the response to this controversy, Clinton's tweet is reminiscent of the 1990s, when her husband's White House overcame its wrongdoing by denying the truth, blaming Republicans, and demonizing and bullying the media. It's a shameless script, unbecoming of a historic figure who could be our next president – and jarringly inappropriate for these times. ...

Next left/liberal/media type to column on the emails was **Maureen Dowd**.

... The Times's Michael Schmidt reported that, as secretary of state, Hillary did not preserve her official correspondence on a government server and exclusively used a private email account. She used a private server linked to her Chappaqua home, only turning over cherry-picked messages in December at the State Department's request.

Given the paranoid/legalese perspective that permeates Clintonland, this made sense: It's hard to request emails from an account you don't know exists. And your own server can shield you from subpoenas and other requests. If you want records from the Clinton server, you have to fight for them. Clinton Inc. can tough it out and even make stuff disappear. Instead of warning the secretary that she could be violating regulations, her aides fetishized her clintonemail.com account as a status symbol. Chelsea took on the pseudonym Diane Reynolds.

Near midnight on Wednesday, Hillary tweeted that she had asked the State Department to release the emails she had coughed up when pressed, noting: "I want the public to see my email."

Less true words were never spoken. ...

Finally, **Kevin Williamson** lets it all hang out.

As secretary of state, Hillary Clinton schemed to subvert record-keeping and transparency rules for reasons that are probably more or less communicated by her surname: The Clintons are creeps and liars and scoundrels and misfits, always have been, always will be. They are the penicillin-resistant syphilis of American politics. The Democrats' response to Herself's trouble has taken three main forms: 1) What she did wasn't technically illegal, says David Brock and other slavish Clinton retainers, even hauling out that old Al Gore classic, "no controlling legal authority"; 2) What

about Scott Walker, huh? say the Democratic-party operators, pointing out that as a county executive Walker also used a private email system — and, to be honest, Walker's response to the terrorist assault on Milwaukee County's consulate in Benghazi has never been explained to my satisfaction; and 3) the president repeats his favorite mantra:

Wuddint me!

As *Politico* put it: "White House press secretary Josh Earnest took care to point out that Obama himself was unaware of any issues with Clinton's email." And that declaration from the president's wildly inaptronymic spokesweasel might very well be true: The president has minions for that sort of thing. But he is responsible for the conduct of his minions, and it is impossible to believe that none of them knew about Mrs. Clinton's "homebrew" email system, because that would require us to believe that nobody ever said, "Hey, CC the secretary of state personally on that internal memo," or "Email the secretary of state about that meeting." Oh, but the president, our national lightworker, he didn't know!

One of the unfortunate facets of our increasingly religious attitude toward the presidency is that we invest the question of whether the divine imperator himself was aware of a situation with great moral weight: Not a sparrow falls, etc. Still, we call it an "administration" for a reason, and Barack Obama is the chief administrator of the executive branch. But he sits in a lofty place, and the principle of fecal gravity must be intensely attractive when viewed from such a great height. ...

Steyn on Line

Re; President-Designate Clinton not using a government email address for her entire tenure as Secretary of State, a reader from Oregon writes:

When I got my security training at the State Department in 2012 using a private email account was considered to be a security risk. A Lack of public record is one thing but communicating Top Secret material without secure communication is a crime. Note that Petraeus is [pleading guilty for less](#).

Well, as I said [yesterday](#), to the Clintons rules are for the little people - like General Petraeus. I don't doubt that using your own email is a security risk, and I would bet that somewhere out there on the planet the Chinese, the Russians, the Norks and/or Isis have plenty of fascinating Hillary emails on Benghazi and a lot of other stuff US archivists will never see.

But she did it to evade public scrutiny. I wrote previously that what the *Times* calls a "personal" email account is, in fact, a secret account - and consciously created as such: The domain clintonemail.com was apparently [registered on the first day of her Senate confirmation hearing](#).

National Journal

[Maybe Hillary Clinton Should Retire Her White House Dreams](#)

Maybe she doesn't want to run in 2016, top Democrats wonder. Maybe she shouldn't.

by Ron Fournier

Perhaps Hillary Rodham Clinton shouldn't run for president.

Maybe she should stay at the [Bill, Hillary & Chelsea Clinton Foundation](#), where the former secretary of State could continue her life's work of building stronger economies, health care systems, and families. Give paid speeches. Write best-selling books. Spend time with [Charlotte](#), her beloved granddaughter.

Because she doesn't seem ready for 2016. Like a blast of wintry air in July, the worst of 1990s-style politics is intruding on what needs to be a new millennium campaign: Transparent, inspirational, innovative, and beyond ethical reproach.

Two weeks ago, [we learned that the Clinton Foundation accepted contributions from foreign countries](#). Assurances from the Obama administration and Clinton aides that no donations were made during her tenure as secretary of State were proven false.

I called the actions [sleazy and stupid](#). Sleazy because any fair-minded person would suspect the foreign countries of trying to buy Clinton's influence. Stupid because the affair plays into a decades-old knock on the Clintons: They'll cut any corner for campaign cash. In the 1990s, Bill Clinton and his top aides [used](#) the White House as a tool to court and reward big donors.

Now The New York Times is [reporting](#) that Clinton used a [personal email account to conduct government business](#) as secretary of State, an apparent violation of federal requirements that her records be retained.

Exposed by a House committee investigating the Benghazi Consulate attack, Clinton brazenly dug in her heels. Advisers reviewed tens of thousands of pages of her personal email and decided which ones to release: Just 55,000 emails were given to the State Department. Those are our emails, not hers. What is she hiding?

Transparency isn't the only issue. Clinton exposed confidential and potentially dangerous information to a nonsecure, commercial email system. She gave Chinese spies a better shot at reading her emails than U.S. taxpayers.

The Times quoted a former director of litigation at the National Archives and Records Administration who said there is only one scenario under which it's proper for Cabinet-level officials to use private rather than government email: "nuclear winter."

The rest of us are required to play by the rules. Why does Clinton think she's above them?

Clinton aides quickly funneled through friendly media channels examples of Republicans who used private emails, such as former Secretary of State Colin Powell and former Florida Gov. Jeb Bush. Powell operated under a different set of federal rules than Clinton. Bush was not a federal employee (yes, he should release all of his Florida emails, and not just self-selected documents).

This is another Clinton trope: Deflect attention from their wrongdoing by pointing fingers at others—as if two wrongs make a right and they had never promised to set a higher standard.

Clinton spokesman Nick Merrill told The Times that she has been complying with the "letter and spirit of the rules." No, she hasn't. But here again is a reminder of the 1990s: When cornered, the Clintons denied facts and demonized detractors.

The most obvious example is Bill Clinton's lying about his affair with a White House intern. "It depends on what the meaning of the word 'is' is," he said. Less remembered is an independent counsel's [finding](#) of "substantial evidence" that then-first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton lied under oath about her role in the 1993 White House travel office firings.

Many senior Democrats are angry, though not yet mad enough to publicly confront the Clintons. "This story has legs as long as the election," said a Democrat who has worked on Capitol Hill and as a presidential campaign manager. "She will be tripping over this crap until the cows come home."

Another presidential campaign veteran who held a Cabinet-level post in Bill Clinton's White House fretted out loud about the fact that the former first lady is breezing toward the Democratic nomination.

"We can't have a coronation when she's handing Republicans an inquisition," the Democrat said.

Put me in the same category. Like these two Democrats, I've known both Clintons for years. I admire their intelligence and passion and empathy. They've been good to [my family](#). I've actually long thought that she has the potential to be a better president than he was.

But now I wonder whether there is a part of her that doesn't want to be president. She seems to be placing obstacles in her lane before the race begins. Is this sabotage or something else?

We've had sleazy and stupid—and, now, with these emails, suspicious. If she runs, are we going to have a full Seven Dwarfs?

Seedy.

Sanctimonious.

Self-important.

Slick.

My concern is that Clinton does not see this controversy as a personal failing. Rather, she sees it as a political problem that can be fixed with more polls, more money, and more attacks. In a Politico [story](#) about the push to assemble a presidential campaign staff, a former senior Clinton aide said, "We have had our head up our ass. This stuff isn't going to kill us, but it puts us behind the eight ball."

Due respect, Clinton's problem isn't a lack of staff. It's a lack of shame about money, personal accountability, and transparency.

National Journal

[Hillary Clinton Still Doesn't Get It](#)

Nice tweet, but she still seems trapped on the wrong side of the bridge to the 21st century.

by Ron Fournier

A cornered Clinton is a [craven Clinton](#), which is why we should view Hillary Rodham Clinton's latest public relations trick with practiced skepticism. "I want the public to see my email," she tweeted Wednesday night. "I asked State to release them. They said they will review them for release as soon as possible."

If she wants us to see her email, why did she create a secret account stored on a dark server registered at her home?

If she wants us to see her email, why didn't she give State all of her email rather than a self-censored fraction of the correspondence?

If she wants us to see her email, Clinton [should turn over every word](#) written on her dark account(s) for independent vetting. Let somebody the public trusts decide which emails are truly private and which ones belong to the public.

Like [everything else about the response to this controversy](#), Clinton's tweet is reminiscent of the 1990s, when her husband's White House overcame its wrongdoing by denying the truth, blaming Republicans, and demonizing and bullying the media. It's a shameless script, unbecoming of a historic figure who could be our next president – and jarringly inappropriate for these times.

In the 15 years since Bill Clinton left office, the internet has made almost everybody a researcher and a journalist—equipped to judge wrongdoing for themselves and insist upon accountability. We can now spot the lies ourselves, stand up to bullies, and remind our leaders that two wrongs don't make a right. The actions of Hillary Clinton and her team raise the question: Is she trapped on the wrong side of the bridge to the 21st century?

This is part of a pattern of bad behavior. My former employer, The Associated Press said Wednesday that it was considering legal action [over years of stonewalling its requests](#) for government documents covering Clinton's tenure as secretary of state. The AP has sought her full schedules and calendars and for details on the State Department's decision to grant a special position to a longtime Clinton aide, Huma Abedin, among other documents, the New York Times, reported. The oldest AP request was made in March 2010.

"We believe it's critically important that government officials and agencies be held accountable to the voters," said AP's general counsel, Karen Kaiser. "In this instance, we've exhausted our administrative remedies in pursuit of important documents and are considering legal action."

This is the problem: If she wants us to see her emails, Clinton would show us her emails. If she wants to be transparent, she'd be transparent. If she wants to be a modern, forward-looking leader who earns the trust of a disillusioned public, she'd call off her attack dogs, stop spinning, and do the right thing.

She would return the unseemly foreign donations to the Bill, Hillary & Chelsea Foundation.

She wouldn't call them "my email." She would know that the emails of a public official belongs to the public. They're ours. Cough 'em up.

NY Times

[With the Clintons, Only the Shadow Knows](#)

by Maureen Dowd

WASHINGTON — SOMEWHERE in Smithsonian storage sits a portrait of Bill Clinton with two odd features: He is standing next to a shadow meant to conjure Monica Lewinsky's blue dress, and he is not wearing his gold wedding ring.

As we have been reminded by a recent wild cascade of stories, everything about the Clintons is convoluted. Nothing is simple, even a celebratory portrait.

Nelson Shanks, picked by Clinton to do his portrait for the National Portrait Gallery, revealed to the Philadelphia Daily News that he had used a blue dress on a mannequin to evoke the shadow of the Lewinsky scandal in the portrait.

I called the 77-year-old artist to ask about his devilish punking.

"It's an extra little kick going on in the painting," he said. "It was a bit humorous, but there was also a sort of authenticity to it. To do a Pollyanna, basically meaningless, symbolically neutral painting of somebody that has had a powerful influence on society is really copping out." He said that Clinton's lack of a wedding band has no ulterior meaning, noting: "I just forgot the ring." But Clinton aides weren't buying it.

He said when the omission first made news after the portrait was unveiled in 2006, Hillary Clinton sent him "a lovely little note saying don't worry about it, this is just a tempest in a teapot."

[In a blog post last week](#), Eugénie Bisulco, a Clinton administration staffer who led the search team for a White House portrait artist, said it wasn't Shanks's attempt to put in "a moral compass" that grated. (The Clintons didn't even know about that.) Bisulco said that it was that the portrait made Clinton look like "a disheveled Ted Koppel."

Other Clintonistas dismissed the allegorical shadow as "put-a-bunny-in-the-pot crazy."

Shanks said it was "like an ice pick going through my back" when he learned that his portrait was "exiled to the dark recesses" in 2009. On a visit to the museum a year and a half ago, he heard a docent telling a tour group that the Clintons put the kibosh on the painting.

He asked Kim Sajet, now director of the National Portrait Gallery, and she confirmed his darkest fears in an email, saying that they took it down because the Clintons disliked it. But, in response to a query, Sajet admitted that she was "repeating unfounded gossip," according to a spokeswoman, and insisted that the painting is merely in rotation.

Shortly after the art imbroglio broke, an email imbroglio broke. The Times's Michael Schmidt reported that, as secretary of state, Hillary did not preserve her official correspondence on a government server and exclusively used a private email account. She used a private server linked to her Chappaqua home, only turning over cherry-picked messages in December at the State Department's request.

Given the paranoid/legalese perspective that permeates Clintonland, this made sense: It's hard to request emails from an account you don't know exists. And your own server can shield you from subpoenas and other requests. If you want records from the Clinton server, you have to fight for them. Clinton Inc. can tough it out and even make stuff disappear. Instead of warning the secretary that she could be violating regulations, her aides fetishized her clintonemail.com account as a status symbol. Chelsea took on the pseudonym Diane Reynolds.

Near midnight on Wednesday, Hillary tweeted that she had asked the State Department to release the emails she had coughed up when pressed, noting: "I want the public to see my email."

Less true words were never spoken.

Schmidt's scoop followed The Wall Street Journal revelation that at least 60 companies that lobbied the State Department when Hillary was in charge had funneled more than \$26 million to the Clinton Foundation.

Certainly, Hillary wants a lot of control. She has spent a lifetime cleaning up messes sparked by her overweening desire for control and her often out-of-control mate. She always feared that her emails could become fodder for critics, and now they have.

Everyone is looking for signs in how Hillary approaches 2016 to see if she's learned lessons from past trouble. But the minute this story broke, she went back to the bunker, even though she had known for months that the Republicans knew about the account. The usual hatchets — Philippe Reines, David Brock, Lanny Davis and Sidney Blumenthal — got busy.

The Clintons don't sparkle with honesty and openness. Between his lordly appetites and her queenly prerogatives, you always feel as if there's something afoot.

Everything needs to be a secret, from the Rose Law Firm records that popped up in a White House closet two years after they were subpoenaed to the formulation of her health care plan.

Yet the Clintons always act as though it's bad form when you bring up their rule-bending. They want us to compartmentalize, just as they do, to connect the dots that form a pretty picture and leave the other dots alone.

If you're aspiring to be the second president in the family, why is it so hard to be straight and direct and stand for something? Why can't you just be upright and steady and good?

Given all the mistakes they've made, why do they keep making them? Why do they somehow never do anything that doesn't involve shadows?

National Review

[Next?](#)

Can we finally—finally!—be done with the Clintons?

by Kevin D. Williamson

As secretary of state, Hillary Clinton schemed to subvert record-keeping and transparency rules for reasons that are probably more or less communicated by her surname: The Clintons are creeps and liars and scoundrels and misfits, always have been, always will be. They are the penicillin-resistant syphilis of American politics. The Democrats' response to Herself's trouble has taken

three main forms: 1) *What she did wasn't technically illegal*, says David Brock and other slavish Clinton retainers, even hauling out that old Al Gore classic, “no controlling legal authority”; 2) *What about Scott Walker, huh?* say the Democratic-party operators, pointing out that as a county executive Walker also used a private email system — and, to be honest, Walker’s response to the terrorist assault on Milwaukee County’s consulate in Benghazi has never been explained to my satisfaction; and 3) the president repeats his favorite mantra:

Wuddint me!

As [Politico](#) put it: “White House press secretary Josh Earnest took care to point out that Obama himself was unaware of any issues with Clinton’s email.” And that declaration from the president’s wildly inaptronymic spokesweasel might very well be true: The president has minions for that sort of thing. But he is responsible for the conduct of his minions, and it is impossible to believe that none of them knew about Mrs. Clinton’s “homebrew” email system, because that would require us to believe that nobody ever said, “Hey, CC the secretary of state personally on that internal memo,” or “Email the secretary of state about that meeting.” Oh, but the president, [our national lightworker](#), he didn’t know!

One of the unfortunate facets of our increasingly religious attitude toward the presidency is that we invest the question of whether the divine imperator himself was aware of a situation with great moral weight: Not a sparrow falls, etc. Still, we call it an “administration” for a reason, and Barack Obama is the chief administrator of the executive branch. But he sits in a lofty place, and the principle of fecal gravity must be intensely attractive when viewed from such a great height.

The White House has in fact known about this for some time, since August at least. And it may be the case that Barack Obama is getting the hang of this presidency thing: His team says it learned about the problem when House Republicans requested information related to the Benghazi attack, which is a step up from learning about the IRS’s campaign of political persecution and the horrific mistreatment of American veterans and the cover-up of same — and the Justice Department’s going all Gestapo on The Associated Press, and the Fast and Furious scandal, and the NSA’s snooping on Angela Merkel — [on the evening news](#).

“The expectation of the president is that everybody throughout his administration is acting in compliance with the Federal Records Act,” Earnest said. Not that the president or any of his minions would do anything so radical as take proactive steps to ensure that the nation’s chief diplomat is following the law.

The law does not really apply at the top — Lois Lerner and the rest of the [criminals at the IRS](#) aren’t going to jail, [they’re cashing six-figure checks](#), with *bonuses*, for pity’s sake. When Obamacare hits the skids, the president just makes up new law as he goes along. Hillary Clinton runs amok with no real consequence. On the larger scale, the federal government spends a generation failing to enforce its immigration laws and, once the problem has become large enough, simply decides — presto-change-o! — that that which was a serious crime is retroactively hunky-dory.

Your life probably is not very much like that. Mine isn’t. I bought a car not long ago, and I probably had to fill out 30 different forms and get three or four kinds of government permission before I was permitted to legally operate my own vehicle. There was no “the expectation of the DMV is that everybody driving a car is acting in compliance with our rules” — they wanted proof of insurance beforehand. Get caught without it and there’s no drawn-out year-long process of the government waiting for you to get around to sorting out your affairs — they just take your car, seize your assets, or haul you off to jail, depending on the seriousness of the transgression. Exercise your

constitutional right to own a firearm — it's right there in the Bill of Rights — and there is no "expectation" that you're legally clear to do so: You have to prove it.

It's easy to enforce the law on people who are inclined to be law-abiding, which means those of us in the middle, mainly: We have enough to lose that there's a real cost to breaking the rules, but we don't have so much that we can conduct our personal and professional lives as though we had sovereign immunity. The people in the middle cannot go about their ordinary business — working at a job, driving a car, renting or owning a home, traveling — without preemptively complying with all manner of government mandates. But millions of illegals can flout the law with impunity — and their well-off enablers in Washington can flout the law with impunity, too. When the law does not apply to the lawmakers and law-enforcers, you are not being *governed*: You are being *ruled*. And we are ruled by criminals.

If you treat IRS rules the way the IRS treats IRS rules, you go to prison; if you treat federal law the way the secretary of state does, you go to prison. If you treat immigration controls the way our immigration authorities do, you go to prison. If you're as careless in your handling of firearms as the ATF is, you go to prison. You cook your business's books the way the federal government cooks its books, you go to prison.

Hillary Clinton is not going to prison. She's going to release whatever emails she feels like releasing and dare any of you peons or your elected representatives to try to make her do otherwise. You'll take what she offers, and you'll like it.

The perverse thing is: Some do like it. The Clinton name remains golden among Democrats.

A self-respecting people would have sent this clan of scrofulous grifters and po-faced con artists into whatever passes for exile ([comfortable exile, of course](#)) in the 21st century. Instead, we are giving them a serious shot at a return to the White House.

At least this time, we'll know to [keep an eye on the silver](#).



© 2015 THE WALL STREET JOURNAL
DAILY CARTOONS.COM
R. M. F. E. ...



© 2015 INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY
DAILY CARTOONS.COM
R. M. F. E. ...



Lisa @ 2015 35 [Art by Wash Post/Editors Group]



Somewhere, deep inside the *Clinton Machine*...



