

November 4, 2015 - Hillary

Hillary's emails show she likes sycophants. Matthew Continetti has some fun.

*... I am wading through a sea of flattery and am terrified I'll drown. It's a few days after the State Department released another batch of Hillary Clinton's emails from her time as secretary of state. And while there are no surprises as I read these latest documents, they are nonetheless revealing—not only of Clinton but also of her coterie of admirers, courtiers, supplicants, and mandarins.*

*The emails are also nausea-inducing. The FBI is investigating whether Clinton damaged national security by hosting classified information on her private server. What the FBI has no doubt learned—indeed, what anyone who spends a few minutes reading these emails is bound to discover—is that the former secretary of state loved to hear from lackeys, hangers-on, and loyalists who spent their days puffing up Clinton's already considerable ego.*

*What strikes you right away about the Hillary emails is how sycophants describe her in terms more fitting for a religious figure. "My name is Roy Spence," wrote a Texas Democrat to Clinton in April 2010. "And I love you and...I miss you a lot. I have no idea how you keep on keeping on doing whatever it takes to lift people—everywhere up—championing your Core Purpose of Fighting and digging deep for the opportunity for each person to be able to live up to the God Given Potential. Here and Around the world."*

*Spence went on like this for several more badly punctuated and ungrammatical paragraphs, riffing in a patois that's half campaign commercial and half fortune cookie. "The pursuit for opening doors of happiness for those who struggle with the unimaginable," he wrote. "The steady. The Steadfast." Lucky numbers 27, 8, 5, 16, 34.*

*Spence's conclusion: "So I say to a beloved and dear love one—that be you—I love you. I respect you. I miss you. I cherish every moment of our remarkable journey together. God Speed. Dear Sis. We shall cross paths soon. And until then. Onward in all things." Below Spence's initials are the mysterious words "Ride at dawn." I wonder what the Russian hackers made of that one.*

*Spence is a cheerleader, apologist, and promoter. The word stalker also comes to mind. Now, the average person who received such an email would be likely to grimace. He'd become uncomfortable. He wouldn't know how to respond. Not Hillary. She forwarded it to one of her aides with the demand, "Pls print." Maybe she wanted to frame it. ...*

*... Petty, silly, insular, back-scratching, backstabbing—the attributes of Clinton and her inner circle are comic when they aren't disheartening. America faces a dangerous world, slow economic growth, social discord, and cultural fragmentation. And guess what? We're possibly a little more than a year away from handing the White House to a group of people who make the conniving, selfish, vain, incompetent characters on HBO's *Veep* look like FDR's Brains Trust.*

Along the same line, WSJ has the following; [Hillary Clinton Emails Show Insiders Embracing flattery.](#)

*A common thread running through the tens of thousands of emails that landed in Hillary Clinton's in-box in her time as secretary of state is that aides and assorted advisers believe she is, well, awesome.*

*With a few exclamation points tacked on.*

*In notes sent to the private email account Mrs. Clinton used, various advisers routinely heap praise on the person who gave them their jobs or elevated them to her inner circle. Email flattery of this sort is a common tactic in the everyday workplace, but the Clinton emails show how it comes into play at the highest levels of government.*

*Employees tell Mrs. Clinton she is doing a “spectacular job,” that she has many admirers and that her remarks were “pitch perfect.” They assure her she looks “gorgeous” in photos and commend her clothing choices.*

*Mrs. Clinton often solicited the feedback, asking aides “How do you think it went?” and “What’s the verdict on the article?” Rare is the response that offered a whiff of constructive criticism.*

*A cache of 7,000 pages of Clinton emails released by the State Department Friday offered fresh examples of State department officials who adored the boss. State has been releasing the emails on a rolling basis at the end of each month, in response to Freedom of Information Act requests; it has now made public about half of the total. ...*

Perhaps her employees wish to worship Hillary, but [David Harsanyi](#) says she owns the chaos in Libya.

*Libya is in chaos. A festering pit of radicalism, anarchy, and death, epitomizing everything that can go wrong when Western intervention has no clear long-term purpose. And the woman who believes she should be president of the United States—ostensibly on the strength of her decision-making abilities as Secretary of State—believes what’s going on in Libya is a success.*

*This point seems pertinent. So beyond any facts surrounding the American deaths in Benghazi, the blatant lying about her computer servers, or whatever else Republicans may or may not uncover about Hillary, one of the most politically relevant topics examined by the Benghazi Committee is her insistence that Libya was not a “disaster.” Over and over, in fact, Hillary argued that Libyans had elected “moderates” and that democracy had thrived and that all things were peachy (though she does concede there were security risks). And she was still praising the Arab Spring, long after its collapse into violent radicalism across the Arab world.*

*At first I wondered, how could she maintain something so obviously contestable? Then I realized, how could she not? Rep. Peter Roskam spent his entire time attempting to push Hillary to own the Libya intervention. Democrats joked on Twitter that Roskam had now conclusively proven that, yes, Hillary was Secretary of State. But it was much more. She reiterated that she was the chief architect of the war in Libya. Hillary has to claim that the U.N.-authorized Libyan air campaign in 2011 was a model of successful foreign intervention because Hillary was the one who urged Barack Obama, over the strong misgivings of others, to intervene in that civil war. She brought the Arabs on board. She articulated many of the administration’s arguments.*

*Later, after the whole thing fell apart, she would falsely blame some obscure video for the whole thing. ...*

You must wonder what the president thought when he learned Hillary continued her attachment to Sid Blumenthal. Micah Morrison on why it matters that Clinton went rogue.

*After the media inexplicably dubbed Hillary Rodham Clinton the “winner” of the Benghazi hearings, her apologists dismissed a line of questioning into her unofficial adviser, Sidney Blumenthal.*

*So he was sending her e-mail offering advice on Libya and other matters of state. In the immortal words of Clinton at an earlier Benghazi hearing, “What difference does it make?”*

*It matters because Clinton flouted President Obama’s authority, secretly employing a man the administration had banned — then Clinton and Blumenthal pursued a rogue agenda often motivated by political favors and payoffs for friends.*

*Blumenthal was an aide to President Bill Clinton from 1997 to 2001 and one of his most reliable hatchet men. Luca Brasi without the charm, Blumenthal had smeared Monica Lewinsky, Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr, Republicans — and, when the time came, presidential candidate Barack Obama himself. His nickname: “Sid Vicious.”*

*E-mails show Hillary Clinton wanted him hired at State. But still smarting from Blumenthal’s attacks during the campaign, the administration nixed the appointment.*

*Clinton was undeterred. Despite telling the Benghazi committee that Blumenthal was “not my adviser, official or unofficial,” records show the Clinton political machine paid him at least \$320,000 a year. ...*

*Morrison also provides examples of Blumenthal's undo influence in Libya affairs. ... In Libya, Blumenthal promoted a deal sought by US defense contractor Osprey Global Solutions. According to its Web site, Osprey offers a wide variety of services — including “security, training, armament” — as well as the sale of assault rifles.*

*In an Oct. 7 letter to Benghazi committee ranking minority member Elijah Cummings, the panel’s chair, Trey Gowdy, noted Blumenthal “acknowledged a personal stake in Osprey.”*

*In hundreds of pages of e-mails, Gowdy noted, Blumenthal served as Secretary Clinton’s “primary adviser on Libya” and pushed her hard “to intervene” as Khadafy was going down.*

*But Blumenthal’s real motivation, Gowdy claims, was “money.”*

*Specifically, a deal to bring Osprey together with the fledgling transitional government in Libya.*

*Gowdy wrote that “at the same time Blumenthal was pushing Secretary Clinton to war in Libya, he was privately pushing” the Osprey deal in Libya.*

*Blumenthal lobbied for more aggressive military action. In a March 2011 e-mail, he urged “another round or two of ferocious bombing” of Khadafy’s army. He also advised Clinton to take credit for Khadafy’s eventual fall.*

*"You must go on camera," he e-mailed her in August 2011, two months before the dictator's gruesome death. "You must establish yourself in the historical record."*

*Meanwhile, in a July 14, 2011, e-mail cited in the Gowdy letter, Blumenthal wrote Clinton that "Osprey will provide medical help, military training, organize supplies and logistics" to the post-Khadafy government.*

*He and his colleagues, Blumenthal wrote, "acted as honest brokers, putting this arrangement together through a series of connections, linking the Libyans to Osprey and keeping it moving."*

*"Got it," Clinton wrote Blumenthal. "Will follow up tomorrow. Anything else to convey?" Clinton forwarded the Blumenthal e-mail to a top aide, Jake Sullivan. ...*

**Noah Rothman** has more on the Blumenthal connection.

*... Blumenthal was a Clinton confidante long before Hillary Clinton went to work at Foggy Bottom. She appealed to the Obama administration to allow Blumenthal to join her staff as a speechwriter, but the request was declined. Blumenthal had developed a reputation as a partisan flamethrower – a fixer, of sorts, who was not above getting his hands dirty in order to protect the Clintons. Nevertheless, as Hillary Clinton's secretive emails revealed, Blumenthal continued to work closely with Hillary Clinton, sent her numerous communications related to the sensitive ongoing workings of the American government, and was compensated for his performance.*

*How many communications would that be? In the case of Libya, a conflict zone the committee established Clinton lost interest in after the Gaddafi government was overthrown, a lot. In an open letter to his Democratic counterpart on the committee, Gowdy revealed that approximately half of all the email messages Clinton received relating to Libya were sent from Blumenthal. Gowdy called him "Secretary Clinton's primary advisor" on that North African trouble spot.*

*Worse, one of those email communications from Clinton that was forwarded to Gowdy contained classified information – information that was apparently sensitive enough so that it was redacted when the committee received it. That email contained the name of a CIA operator, and its transmission on an unsecure cable could literally have put that person's life in danger. "She is exposing the name of a guy who has a clandestine relationship with the CIA on her private, unprotected server," former CIA Mideast officer John Maguire, who noted that the revelation should trigger the creation of a "crimes report" in the Department of Justice. ...*

**The Weekly Standard** has a short on the Secretary of State's availability to large Clinton Foundation donors.

*Hillary Clinton always makes time for friends at the State Department—especially those who have money.*

*In a newly released email from the State Department, an official sends Clinton her schedule. On that schedule, one sees the entry, "3:10 pm (t) PRIVATE DROP-BY — DANNY ABRAHAM (T)."*

Abraham isn't just an old friend, he's also founder of Slim Fast and a big donor to the Clintons. He has contributed between \$5 and \$10 million to the Clinton Foundation, and almost a million in hard and soft money to the Clintons.

In 2010, Clinton said, "I don't know how many times Danny called my husband in the 1990s ... or how many times he called and said he had to come see me in the Senate or come see me in the State Department."

But remember, Clinton says she'd support a constitutional amendment to get rid of money in politics.

"We have to end the flood of secret, unaccountable money that is distorting our elections, corrupting our political system, and drowning out the voices of too many everyday Americans ... Our democracy should be about expanding the franchise, not charging an entrance fee."

We'll leave it to Thomas Sowell to sum up Benghazi.

... Meanwhile, there was an American presidential election campaign in 2012, and Barack Obama was presenting himself to the voters as someone who had defeated Al Qaeda and suppressed the terrorist threat in the Middle East.

Obviously the truth about this attack could have totally undermined the image that Obama was trying to project during the election campaign, and perhaps cost him the White House. So a lie was concocted instead.

The lie was that the attack was not by terrorists — who supposedly had been suppressed by Obama — but was a spontaneous protest demonstration against an American video insulting Islam, and that protest just got out of control.

Now that Hillary Clinton's e-mails have finally been recovered and revealed, after three years of stalling and stonewalling, they showed explicitly that she knew from the outset that the attack that killed Ambassador Stevens and others was not a result of some video but was a coordinated terrorist operation.

Nevertheless, Hillary 2.0, along with President Obama and national security advisor Susan Rice, told the world in 2012 that the deaths in Benghazi were due to the video, not a terrorist organization that was now operating freely in Libya, thanks to the policy that got rid of the Qaddafi government.

Yet that key fact was treated by the media as old news, and what was exciting now was how well Hillary 2.0 outperformed the Congressional committee on television. If the corruption and undermining of the American system of Constitutional government eventually costs us our freedom, will the media say, "What difference does it make now?"

---

---

---

## Commentary

### Hillary Clinton's Circle of Jerks

by Matthew Continetti

#### Mediacracy

I am wading through a sea of flattery and am terrified I'll drown. It's a few days after the State Department released another batch of Hillary Clinton's emails from her time as secretary of state. And while there are no surprises as I read these latest documents, they are nonetheless revealing—not only of Clinton but also of her coterie of admirers, courtiers, supplicants, and mandarins.

The emails are also nausea-inducing. The FBI is investigating whether Clinton damaged national security by hosting classified information on her private server. What the FBI has no doubt learned—indeed, what anyone who spends a few minutes reading these emails is bound to discover—is that the former secretary of state loved to hear from lackeys, hangers-on, and loyalists who spent their days puffing up Clinton's already considerable ego.

What strikes you right away about the Hillary emails is how sycophants describe her in terms more fitting for a religious figure. "My name is Roy Spence," wrote a Texas Democrat to Clinton in April 2010. "And I love you and...I miss you a lot. I have no idea how you keep on keeping on doing whatever it takes to lift people—everywhere up—championing your Core Purpose of Fighting and digging deep for the opportunity for each person to be able to live up to the God Given Potential. Here and Around the world."

Spence went on like this for several more badly punctuated and ungrammatical paragraphs, riffing in a patois that's half campaign commercial and half fortune cookie. "The pursuit for opening doors of happiness for those who struggle with the unimaginable," he wrote. "The steady. The Steadfast." Lucky numbers 27, 8, 5, 16, 34.

Spence's conclusion: "So I say to a beloved and dear love one—that be you—I love you. I respect you. I miss you. I cherish every moment of our remarkable journey together. God Speed. Dear Sis. We shall cross paths soon. And until then. Onward in all things." Below Spence's initials are the mysterious words "Ride at dawn." I wonder what the Russian hackers made of that one.

Spence is a cheerleader, apologist, and promoter. The word *stalker* also comes to mind. Now, the average person who received such an email would be likely to grimace. He'd become uncomfortable. He wouldn't know how to respond. Not Hillary. She forwarded it to one of her aides with the demand, "Pls print." Maybe she wanted to frame it.

Washington attorney and gadfly Lanny Davis has known the Clintons since their days at Yale Law School. But he is the very opposite of the straight-talking confidant. His emails are like parodies of D.C. toadying.

Associates of Clinton knew that the surest way for her to read your email was to have it contain egregious amounts of unwarranted praise. For example, when Israeli anti-settlement activist

Daniel Seidemann sent Democrat Sara Ehrman a note of "Thanks from your groupie," Ehrman forwarded it to Hillary capo Huma Abedin with the subject line "A Love Letter to HRC."

This was May 2011. President Obama had recently called for an Israeli–Palestinian peace deal based on a return to Israel's insecure pre-1967 borders. There was speculation over just how much of Obama's policy Secretary Clinton actually endorsed. Seidemann was certain. "EVERYTHING I have heard," he gushed, "and I have heard from people who really know—that your friend HRC did not merely come down on the side of the angels but was, herself the quintessential avenging angel."

When she forwarded the letter to Abedin, Ehrman added the following note: "HRC would get a kick [out] of this fan mail." But what does it say about our potential president that she might have gotten "a kick" out of being dubbed the "avenging angel" against America's lone democratic ally in the Middle East?

We like to think that the closer an adviser is to a government official, the more honest he is with that person. Familiarity and intimacy should allow for openness and directness. We assume that longtime friends can tell a decision-maker that he is wrong or that things are going badly. The Hillary emails reveal this to be a false assumption. Men and women who have known Clinton for decades are as likely to shower her with compliments and applause as is a random peacenik from Israel.

Washington attorney and gadfly Lanny Davis, for instance, has known the Clintons since their days at Yale Law School. But he is the very opposite of the straight-talking confidant: His emails are like parodies of D.C. toadying. He began an October 2010 email to Hillary with a quotation from his "soul-mate who, like me, agreed with every word of your speech."

Then he proposed inserting himself in the Middle East peace process because George Mitchell (who was handling the matter) "was my first 'boss' in 1971 in a presidential campaign—Ed Muskie's." Finally, he ended with more over-the-top laurels for Clinton: "My heart truly was filled with gratitude and admiration for the courage you showed last night—courage because your words were tough love equally for both sides. Tough love for both sides. Isn't that what you have done all your political life—fact-based policies and positions, whether offending purists on either side—or both?"

The month before, Davis had written what has to be one of the most unintentionally hilarious and pathetic emails in history. Addressed to "my dear friend Hillary," the letter goes on: "The *American Lawyer* is doing a Cover Story (ugh!) about my new law firm." He'd asked "a variety of people from Ds and Rs and in between to talk to the reporter about me." Ted Olsen, Mike McCurry, John McCain, and Karl Rove all gave comments. "Even President Clinton and President Bush, I am told, may weigh in with nice written statements about their old friend from Yale days."

Might Hillary talk to the *American Lawyer*, Davis asked? And if not, might she have one of her underlings issue a pro-Davis statement to the magazine? "Please please please—note there are three pleases—:Do not be bashful or concerned about saying no to my request." He wasn't even going to bother her with the invitation, Davis said. It's just that, "aside from Carolyn, my four children, and my immediate family, I consider you to be the best friend and the best person I have met in my long life."

Imagine: Davis wrote all of this *just for two sentences in a trade publication*. The saddest part is, despite being "the best friend and the best person" Lanny Davis has ever met, Hillary Clinton

didn't immediately respond. Instead she forwarded the email to her adviser Cheryl Mills and said, "Pls advise." I guess she was too busy coming up with fact-based policies and positions that offend purists on both sides to handle Davis herself.

Petty, silly, insular, back-scratching, backstabbing—the attributes of Clinton and her inner circle are comic when they aren't disheartening. America faces a dangerous world, slow economic growth, social discord, and cultural fragmentation. And guess what? We're possibly a little more than a year away from handing the White House to a group of people who make the conniving, selfish, vain, incompetent characters on HBO's *Veep* look like FDR's Brains Trust.

**WSJ**

### **[Hillary Clinton Emails Show Insiders Embracing Flattery](#)**

by Peter Nicholas and Colleen McCain Nelson

A common thread running through the tens of thousands of emails that landed in Hillary Clinton's in-box in her time as secretary of state is that aides and assorted advisers believe she is, well, awesome.

With a few exclamation points tacked on.

In notes sent to the private email account Mrs. Clinton used, various advisers routinely heap praise on the person who gave them their jobs or elevated them to her inner circle. Email flattery of this sort is a common tactic in the everyday workplace, but the Clinton emails show how it comes into play at the highest levels of government.

Employees tell Mrs. Clinton she is doing a "spectacular job," that she has many admirers and that her remarks were "pitch perfect." They assure her she looks "gorgeous" in photos and commend her clothing choices.

Mrs. Clinton often solicited the feedback, asking aides "How do you think it went?" and "What's the verdict on the article?" Rare is the response that offered a whiff of constructive criticism.

A cache of 7,000 pages of Clinton emails released by the State Department Friday offered fresh examples of State department officials who adored the boss. State has been releasing the emails on a rolling basis at the end of each month, in response to Freedom of Information Act requests; it has now made public about half of the total.

Anne-Marie Slaughter, a former top official at State, wrote Mrs. Clinton in 2011 to relay that former Singapore Prime Minister Lee Kwan Yew had listed Bill Clinton as one of the "greatest leaders" he had met. When Mrs. Clinton pressed her for details about another leader Mr. Yew had listed, Ms. Slaughter responded: "Lee Kwan Yew admires transformative leadership under very tough conditions...all the more of a compliment to WJC (although, in my humble opinion, an HRC presidency would be even greater :-))."

Not that Mrs. Clinton would doubt Ms. Slaughter's admiration.

In an email sent the year before she wrote to Mrs. Clinton: "You are the world's best boss!"

Academics and experts who've studied the issue said that a fawning tone is a proven way of winning favor with the boss. Yet, if excessive, it can also backfire. Too many gushing emails about Mrs. Clinton's looks could cause her to wonder what her staffers are doing with their time or whether they are being sincere, according to workplace etiquette experts.

"People see through that very quickly," said Bruce Mayhew, a corporate trainer based in Toronto. "I would suggest that if people are giving a lot of flattery to Hillary, then she would have noticed that pretty quickly. Hillary's not an idiot."

When aides sent emails to Mrs. Clinton about articles that made her the focus, they often emphasized the photos and told her the pictures were what mattered.

When Mrs. Clinton appeared on the cover of Newsweek in 2011, longtime aide Huma Abedin emailed twice to say how much she loved the photo. When Mrs. Clinton did a joint interview with former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger in 2009, adviser Philippe Reines emailed to offer his thoughts about a "fascinating meeting of two eras."

"Most importantly, the photos look great," he wrote.

While both friends and aides complimented the secretary of state on both her intellect and her appearance, "gorgeous" is a preferred descriptor. That was subject line when Maria Otero, a State Department official, emailed Mrs. Clinton in 2011.

"From Baghdad I'm watching you dine with the Queen—you look just gorgeous," Ms. Otero wrote.

Ms. Slaughter sent an email to Mrs. Clinton in 2011 to note her "gorgeous pic on the front page of the [NYT NYT 0.23 %!](#)"

"One for the wall," Ms. Slaughter added. A couple of weeks later, Ms. Slaughter emailed again to tell Mrs. Clinton that her speech had been "particularly eloquent."

In 2009, Mr. Reines noted that whenever Mrs. Clinton appeared on television, many people said she did great. But this time was "noticeably different," Mr. Reines said in an email.

"You were definitely on your game," he wrote. "You either threw a perfect game—or at least a no-hitter."

As a workplace strategy, ingratiation is a winner, some experts said.

Beth Livingston, an assistant professor of human resource studies at Cornell University, says research shows that employees who compliment their bosses are more likely to be rewarded and even promoted, she said.

"The person who is doing the flattering tends to be more in the good graces of their boss, which gives them more career success," Ms. Livingston said. "We often say, 'I want to hear the truth,' but we don't really want to hear that those pants make us look fat. Make your boss feel good. Make them happy, and they will be happy with you."

Most people welcome constructive criticism from only a handful of trusted confidantes, Ms. Livingston said. So, there probably are very few people who could give Mrs. Clinton honest feedback.

In general, “we want to believe the best of ourselves,” Ms. Livingston said. “Hillary Clinton definitely wants to believe that she rocked that interview.”

Both female and male friends and colleagues felt free to weigh in on Mrs. Clinton’s wardrobe and appearance. When Philip Crowley, who served as assistant secretary of state for public affairs, spotted a photo of Mrs. Clinton in Kabul, he emailed to say “love the coat.”

It is trickier for male employees to compliment a female boss on her appearance, experts said. Depending on the relationship they have, the flattery can be taken the wrong way.

It should not be inappropriate, said Diane Gottsman, an etiquette expert. “If a man is telling a woman, ‘You look fabulous in that suit,’ you have to think about the message that you’re sending.”

It may be no accident that Mrs. Clinton uniformly received fulsome praise. Employees generally feel comfortable offering well-intentioned criticism only if the boss creates a culture in which it is OK to do so, experts said.

“In order to give constructive criticism you have to ask permission to do so. You have to ask permission and she has to give permission before they’ll do it, or their heads could be on the chopping block,” said Cynthia Lett, executive director of the international society of protocol and etiquette professionals.

Absent such permission, the safest strategy is to stick to flattery.

Occasionally, those emailing Mrs. Clinton would make a point of comparing her favorably to her ultimate boss, President Barack Obama.

Sidney Blumenthal, a confidante of Mrs. Clinton who didn’t work at the State Department but kept in close touch with her, sent her an email citing a poll showing her with a high favorability rating.

“You are credited by Americans as the one above all who represents the U.S. in the world,” Mr. Blumenthal wrote. “Obama is now seen as a more political, contentious, partisan figure. Your rating is much higher among Republicans than his. You’ve achieved supra-political status, not anti-political or apolitical (they know who you are), but supra.”

## The Federalist

### Hillary Owns The War In Libya (And Its Horrible Aftermath)

*Clinton, according to her own admission, voted for one foreign policy disaster and instigated another one.*

by David Harsanyi

Libya is in chaos. A festering pit of radicalism, anarchy, and death, epitomizing everything that can go wrong when Western intervention has no clear long-term purpose. And the woman who believes she should be president of the United States—ostensibly on the strength of her decision-making abilities as Secretary of State—believes what’s going on in Libya is a success.

This point seems pertinent. So beyond any facts surrounding the American deaths in Benghazi, the blatant lying about her computer servers, or whatever else Republicans may or may not uncover about Hillary, one of the most politically relevant topics examined by the Benghazi Committee is her insistence that Libya was not a “disaster.” Over and over, in fact, Hillary argued that Libyans had elected “moderates” and that democracy had thrived and that all things were peachy (though she does concede there were security risks). And she was still praising the Arab Spring, long after its collapse into violent radicalism across the Arab world.

At first I wondered, how could she maintain something so obviously contestable? Then I realized, how could she not? Rep. Peter Roskam spent his entire time attempting to push Hillary to own the Libya intervention. Democrats joked on Twitter that Roskam had now conclusively proven that, yes, Hillary was Secretary of State. But it was much more. She reiterated that she was the chief architect of the war in Libya. Hillary has to claim that the U.N.-authorized Libyan air campaign in 2011 was *a model* of successful foreign intervention because Hillary was the one who urged Barack Obama, over the strong [misgivings of others](#), to intervene in that civil war. She brought the Arabs on board. She articulated many of the administration’s arguments.

Later, after the whole thing fell apart, she would [falsely](#) blame some obscure video for the whole thing.

Since then, Libya has fragmented into two rival factions that have erased any pretense that democracy or freedom exists in the country. There are mass collective punishments as tens of thousands of political prisoners are thrown into camps. Violence is up. Proliferation of weapons has increased. Casualties have spiked since the war. Ansar al-Sharia, the group accused of murdering American diplomats, is more powerful now than it was before the U.S. got involved. One estimate says that militias have grown from an [estimated](#) 40,000 fighters in 2011, to 160,000 today. This is now the place to which Coptic Christians are marched out onto beaches [and beheaded](#). The war has created a refugee crisis.

Now, Hillary isn’t responsible for all the awful things people do, but she certainly is responsible for America’s role in the whole mess. If voters are supposed to judge Hillary’s asserted foreign policy expertise based on what she did while in power, they should take this into account: Hillary, according to her own admission, voted for one foreign policy disaster and instigated another one. Her fans might concede that Iraq was merely a vote of political expediency, or perhaps one made on bad information (a stretch), but there is no such comfort with Libya. Hillary can’t blame this one on Bush.

Republicans were generally quiet about the Obama administration’s unauthorized war in Libya—even though it circumvented congressional authority—because intervention generally matches their own foreign policy objectives. Americans didn’t die, at least at the beginning, so it was

forgotten. But if President John McCain, [who supported the Libyan intervention](#), would have been in charge, we would never heard the end of it.

Instead, people would be asking: Please explain how the Libya intervention was success? And should Chris Stevens have been in Benghazi, at all?

## NY Post

### [Hillary Clinton's rogue agenda: Why Sid Blumenthal Matters](#)

by Micah Morrison

After the media inexplicably dubbed Hillary Rodham Clinton the “winner” of the Benghazi hearings, her apologists dismissed a line of questioning into her unofficial adviser, Sidney Blumenthal.

So he was sending her e-mail offering advice on Libya and other matters of state. In the immortal words of Clinton at an earlier Benghazi hearing, “What difference does it make?”

It matters because Clinton flouted President Obama's authority, secretly employing a man the administration had banned — then Clinton and Blumenthal pursued a rogue agenda often motivated by political favors and payoffs for friends.

Blumenthal was an aide to President Bill Clinton from 1997 to 2001 and one of his most reliable hatchet men. Luca Brasi without the charm, Blumenthal had smeared Monica Lewinsky, Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr, Republicans — and, when the time came, presidential candidate Barack Obama himself. His nickname: “Sid Vicious.”

E-mails show Hillary Clinton wanted him hired at State. But still smarting from Blumenthal's attacks during the campaign, the administration nixed the appointment.

Clinton was undeterred. Despite telling the Benghazi committee that Blumenthal was “not my adviser, official or unofficial,” records show the Clinton political machine paid him at least \$320,000 a year.

Just after his rejection by the State Department, and through March 2015, the Clinton Foundation paid Blumenthal \$10,000 a month. Blumenthal's job, [according to Politico](#), was “highlighting the legacy” of President Bill Clinton.

From the summer of 2009 to the present day, according to Fox News, Blumenthal was paid \$200,000 a year by Media Matters, an aggressive pro-Clinton information outlet led by David Brock. Blumenthal provides “high-level strategy and messaging advice” to Brock and others.

Little exists in the public record showing work by Blumenthal for the Clinton Foundation or Media Matters, and both organizations did not respond to requests for clarification.

But there is plenty on Blumenthal's labors for Clinton — hundreds of private e-mails.

Blumenthal's unusual work arrangement was a triple play fraught with potential conflicts of interest: He simultaneously advised the secretary of state and possible future president; promoted the interests of her husband as the former president scoured the globe seeking millions of dollars in speech fees and donations to the Clinton Foundation; and provided advice to an organization devoted to destroying their enemies.

Blumenthal cast a wide net as a defacto Clinton ambassador, promoting dubious business deals and political schemes.

The e-mails reveal at least three examples:

## **A LIBYAN CONTRACT**

In Libya, Blumenthal promoted a deal sought by US defense contractor Osprey Global Solutions. According to its Web site, Osprey offers a wide variety of services — including “security, training, armament” — as well as the sale of assault rifles.

[In an Oct. 7 letter to Benghazi committee ranking minority member Elijah Cummings](#), the panel's chair, Trey Gowdy, noted Blumenthal “acknowledged a personal stake in Osprey.”

In hundreds of pages of e-mails, Gowdy noted, Blumenthal served as Secretary Clinton's “primary adviser on Libya” and pushed her hard “to intervene” as Khadafy was going down.

But Blumenthal's real motivation, Gowdy claims, was “money.”

Specifically, a deal to bring Osprey together with the fledgling transitional government in Libya.

Gowdy wrote that “at the same time Blumenthal was pushing Secretary Clinton to war in Libya, he was privately pushing” the Osprey deal in Libya.

Blumenthal lobbied for more aggressive military action. In a March 2011 e-mail, he urged “another round or two of ferocious bombing” of Khadafy's army. He also advised Clinton to take credit for Khadafy's eventual fall.

“You must go on camera,” he e-mailed her in August 2011, two months before the dictator's gruesome death. “You must establish yourself in the historical record.”

Meanwhile, in a July 14, 2011, e-mail cited in the Gowdy letter, Blumenthal wrote Clinton that “Osprey will provide medical help, military training, organize supplies and logistics” to the post-Khadafy government.

He and his colleagues, Blumenthal wrote, “acted as honest brokers, putting this arrangement together through a series of connections, linking the Libyans to Osprey and keeping it moving.”

“Got it,” Clinton wrote Blumenthal. “Will follow up tomorrow. Anything else to convey?” Clinton forwarded the Blumenthal e-mail to a top aide, Jake Sullivan.

## **AN AFRICAN DEAL**

In June 2009, Blumenthal began promoting Joseph Wilson, the former US ambassador who rose to fame challenging intelligence claims that Saddam Hussein had sought uranium “yellowcake” in Niger. Wilson was a fierce Bush administration critic and longtime Clinton supporter who had criticized candidate Barack Obama for “timid” views.

Now Wilson was in business as an Africa consultant and deal-maker.

“You’re addressing a group on Africa on Thursday,” Blumenthal e-mailed Clinton in September 2009. “Joe Wilson will be there and . . . wants to say hello. Please look out for him.”

“Pls be sure I see Joe,” Clinton e-mailed aides Huma Abedin and Lona Valmore a minute later, copying Blumenthal.

“Will do,” Valmore replied.

“Blumenthal cast a wide net as a de facto Clinton ambassador, promoting dubious business deals and political schemes.”

Wilson wanted to do more than just say hello. He was looking for business.

Blumenthal became the go-between for Clinton and Wilson. In an e-mail passed to Clinton by Blumenthal a week later, Wilson pitched his new client, Symbion Power.

Symbion was seeking millions of dollars in contracts from an obscure government agency chaired by the secretary of state, the Millennium Challenge Corp. (MCC).

Symbion, an electrical-power developer, had been “hugely successful” in Iraq and Afghanistan, Wilson wrote Clinton. Symbion was now setting up shop in Tanzania, Wilson noted, “where we will be bidding on all of the upcoming MCC-financed power generation and distribution projects. I have asked Sid to pass a memory stick with a four-minute video that explains what Symbion does and how it does it.”

More e-mails followed, including one the State Department later classified as containing “confidential” information. The November 2009 e-mail was sent by Wilson to Blumenthal, who passed it on to Clinton. Most of Clinton’s reply to Blumenthal is redacted as classified.

In the e-mail, Wilson noted Symbion’s “competitive advantage,” saying he was “very enthusiastic” about the company. Wilson wrote that he was a “director of Symbion Power” and that he “may soon assume direct responsibility for all of Africa as Symbion expands there — claims the company later disputed when its relationship with Wilson fell apart in contentious litigation.

In September 2010, MCC awarded Symbion \$47 million in US taxpayer money for power projects in Tanzania.

## **AN EU ELECTION**

In October 2009, Blumenthal promoted a scheme to make former UK Prime Minister Tony Blair president of the European Council, an influential arm of the European Union.

The Clintons were intrigued. “I’m copying Doug [Band] and Justin [Cooper] who are traveling” with Bill Clinton “and may have some ideas,” Secretary Clinton e-mailed Blumenthal on Oct. 28. She added, “If I have any other ideas I will let you know.”

Band and Cooper at the time were key members of Bill Clinton’s personal office and the Clinton Foundation.

The White House was staying out of the EU election. No one in the Blumenthal scheme appears to have given any thought to the shoddy ethics of having the secretary of state secretly lobbying for a result in a foreign election.

In the end, Blair was passed over for a center-right candidate.

Within two years, however, Blair would receive another plum post. Blair — along with Band, Cooper, Bill Clinton himself and many outgoing senior State Department officials — were put on the payroll of another Clinton-affiliated entity, Teneo Holdings.

## **STAY TUNED**

The Blumenthal saga is not over.

On Friday, the State Department released more than 7,000 pages of Hillary Clinton e-mails under a court order. Among them were dozens of e-mails to and from Blumenthal. And there is more to come from the State Department, the Benghazi committee and lawsuits from watchdog groups such as Judicial Watch.

More troubling for the Clinton presidential campaign: The FBI is investigating security issues related to Clinton’s e-mail server.

Whether any crimes were committed remains to be seen. But despite the dismissal of the e-mail scandal in liberal circles, the recovered messages have already established a clear record of Clinton’s underhanded and unethical actions in office.

On Jan. 9, 2009, Hillary Clinton signed [a letter pledging to stay out of Clinton Foundation business](#). In a document first disclosed by Judicial Watch, Clinton had promised State Department officials that she would keep to the “highest standards of ethical conduct” and “not participate” in foundation matters.

Yet she went behind the president’s back to keep a friend in the fold, then mixed the nation’s business with the interests of Blumenthal and her private foundation, giving government contracts to people like Joseph Wilson and pushing behind the scenes for EU elections.

Hillary Clinton violated her own pledge and the government’s rules. “What difference does it make?” A big difference.

*Micah Morrison is chief investigative reporter for the watchdog group [Judicial Watch](#).*

## Contentions

### Hillary's Sidney Blumenthal Problem

by Noah Rothman

There is a wave of deep concern for the Republicans' political position overtaking the press. As the Benghazi Select Committee's interview of former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton began to litigate her relationship with former Clinton fixer Sidney Blumenthal, a few reporters helpfully advised the GOP's members to back off.

"Gowdy going down Sid rabbit hole, starting to sound like he's chasing conspiracy theories," The *New Yorker's* Ryan Lizza [opined](#). "Imagine if 9/11 Commission had operated like this."

"Genuinely surprised Gowdy spent all his time asking about Blumenthal," The Huffington Post's Sam Stein [remarked](#). "Looks like a tactical mistake too: invited the blowup at the end."

The "blowup" to which Stein referred related to the committee's ranking member, Representative Elijah Cummings, who raised his voice with theatrical indignation over the line of questioning that focused on Blumenthal. Cummings demanded that the transcripts from the former Clinton's advisor's private interview with the committee be released to the public. How compelling Cummings to engage in this dramatic display was a mistake by the committee's chairman, Representative Trey Gowdy, remains elusive. The committee's ranking Democrat was showing his hand; Gowdy was right over the target.

While that row is almost certain to lead television news coverage of this hearing – dramatic moments, however inconsequential, always do – what was discovered before that passionate interchange is far more revelatory regarding Clinton's conduct as secretary of state.

Blumenthal was a Clinton confidante long before Hillary Clinton went to work at Foggy Bottom. She appealed to the Obama administration to allow Blumenthal to join her staff as a speechwriter, but the request was declined. Blumenthal had developed a reputation as a partisan flamethrower – a fixer, of sorts, who was not above getting his hands dirty in order to protect the Clintons. Nevertheless, as Hillary Clinton's secretive emails revealed, Blumenthal continued to work closely with Hillary Clinton, sent her numerous communications related to the sensitive ongoing workings of the American government, and was [compensated](#) for his performance.

How many communications would that be? In the case of Libya, a conflict zone the committee established Clinton lost interest in after the Gaddafi government was overthrown, a lot. In an open letter to his Democratic counterpart on the committee, Gowdy [revealed](#) that approximately half of all the email messages Clinton received relating to Libya were sent from Blumenthal. Gowdy called him "Secretary Clinton's primary advisor" on that North African trouble spot.

Worse, one of those email communications from Clinton that was forwarded to Gowdy contained classified information – information that was apparently sensitive enough so that it was redacted when the committee received it. That email contained the name of a CIA operator, and its transmission on an unsecure cable could literally have put that person's life in danger. "She is exposing the name of a guy who has a clandestine relationship with the CIA on her private, unprotected server," former CIA Mideast officer John Maguire, [who noted](#) that the revelation should trigger the creation of a "crimes report" in the Department of Justice.

Moreover, as it was alleged in this hearing and confirmed by Hillary Clinton, there were emails she received from Blumenthal related to intelligence matters that she forwarded to the president's team for review, but they were stripped of the identifiers that would let the White House know that the information was coming from Blumenthal. Clinton contended that she did this merely in order to ensure that the intelligence was evaluated on its merits and not its source, but the more likely explanation is that it would have enraged the White House, which had blocked Blumenthal from serving on Clinton's staff. In a sentence, Hillary Clinton misled the President of the United States on a matter related to the conduct of American foreign affairs and national security.

Even for those who don't concern themselves with good governance, that should be at least modestly troubling. Political reporters who are almost exclusively concerned with point-scoring should perhaps concede that Blumenthal represents a problem for Clinton.

## **Weekly Standard**

### **Clinton Made Time For Donors At State Department**

by Shoshana Weissmann

Hillary Clinton always makes time for friends at the State Department—especially those who have money.

In a newly released email from the State Department, an official sends Clinton her schedule. On that [schedule](#), one sees the entry, "3:10 pm (t) PRIVATE DROP-BY — DANNY ABRAHAM (T)."

Abraham isn't just an old friend, he's also [founder](#) of Slim Fast and a big donor to the Clintons. He has contributed between \$5 and \$10 million to the Clinton Foundation, and almost a million in hard and soft money to the Clintons.

In 2010, Clinton said, "I don't know how many times Danny called my husband in the 1990s ... or how many times he called and said he had to come see me in the Senate or come see me in the State Department."

But remember, Clinton says she'd [support](#) a constitutional amendment to get rid of money in politics.

"We have to end the flood of secret, unaccountable money that is distorting our elections, corrupting our political system, and drowning out the voices of too many everyday Americans ... Our democracy should be about expanding the franchise, not charging an entrance fee."

## **Jewish World Review**

### **Hillary 2.0**

by Thomas Sowell

Many people may share Senator Bernie Sanders' complaint that he was tired of hearing about Hillary Clinton's e-mails. But the controversy is about issues far bigger than e-mails.

One issue is the utter disaster created by the Obama administration's foreign policy in Libya, carried out by Hillary Clinton as Secretary of State.

An even bigger issue is whether high officials of government can ignore the law and refuse to produce evidence when it is subpoenaed. If they can, then the whole separation of powers — the checks and balances in the Constitution — gives way to arbitrary government by corrupt officials who are accountable to no one.

This is not the first time Hillary Clinton has defied the law to cover up what she had done. When Bill Clinton was president, back in the 1990s, both he and Hillary developed the strategy of responding to charges of illegal actions on their part by stalling and stonewalling when either courts or Congress tried to get them to produce documents related to these charges.

Hillary claimed then, as now, that key documents had disappeared. Her more recent claim that many of her e-mails had been deleted was just Hillary 2.0. Only after three years of stalling and stonewalling on her part has the fact finally come out this year that those e-mails could be recovered, and now have been.

By this time, however, Hillary and her supporters used the same tactics that both Clintons used back in the 1990s — namely, saying that this was old news, stuff that had already been investigated too long, that it was time to "move on."

That was Hillary 1.0. More recently Hillary 2.0 said, melodramatically, "What difference, at this point, does it make?"

One of the things that the former Secretary of State was now trying to cover up was the utter disaster of the Obama administration's foreign policy that she carried out in Libya.

Having intervened in Libya to help overthrow the government of Muammar Qaddafi, who was no threat to America's interests in the Middle East, the Obama administration was confronted with the fact that Qaddafi's ouster simply threw the country into such chaos that Islamic terrorists were now able to operate freely in Libya.

Just how freely was shown in September 2012, when terrorists stormed the compound in Benghazi where the American ambassador to Libya, Christopher Stevens, was staying. They murdered him and three other Americans who tried to defend him.

Moreover, the terrorists did not even have to go into hiding afterwards, and at least one of them was interviewed by journalists. That's how chaotic Libya had become.

Meanwhile, there was an American presidential election campaign in 2012, and Barack Obama was presenting himself to the voters as someone who had defeated Al Qaeda and suppressed the terrorist threat in the Middle East.

Obviously the truth about this attack could have totally undermined the image that Obama was trying to project during the election campaign, and perhaps cost him the White House. So a lie was concocted instead.

The lie was that the attack was not by terrorists — who supposedly had been suppressed by Obama — but was a spontaneous protest demonstration against an American video insulting Islam, and that protest just got out of control.

Now that Hillary Clinton's e-mails have finally been recovered and revealed, after three years of stalling and stonewalling, they showed explicitly that she knew from the outset that the attack that killed Ambassador Stevens and others was not a result of some video but was a coordinated terrorist operation.

Nevertheless, Hillary 2.0, along with President Obama and national security advisor Susan Rice, told the world in 2012 that the deaths in Benghazi were due to the video, not a terrorist organization that was now operating freely in Libya, thanks to the policy that got rid of the Qaddafi government.

Yet that key fact was treated by the media as old news, and what was exciting now was how well Hillary 2.0 outperformed the Congressional committee on television. If the corruption and undermining of the American system of Constitutional government eventually costs us our freedom, will the media say, "What difference does it make now?"





