

The Clinton Record: A Devastating Exposé

John Perazzo

October 14, 2016

Never in American history has anyone as unfit and undeserving as Hillary Clinton run for U.S. President. While she stands on the threshold of being elected to the White House, she quite literally belongs in a prison cell. This article lays out the case against her, chapter and verse.

Clinton's Private Email Server & the Espionage Act

Throughout her entire four-year tenure as secretary of state, Mrs. Clinton never acquired or used a government email account. Instead, she transmitted — in violation of government regulations — all of her official correspondences via a *private* email address that traced back to a secret, private, unsecured server that was housed at her New York residence.¹ And immediately after those emails were subpoenaed by Congress, Clinton instructed a team of her advisers to unilaterally delete, with no oversight, almost 32,000 of the roughly 60,000 emails in question.²

Clinton claimed that her reason for having used only a personal email account, rather than both a personal and a government account, was that she found it “easier,” “better,” “simpler” and more convenient to “carry just one device for my work and for my personal emails instead of two.”³ It was eventually learned, however, that Mrs. Clinton in fact had used no fewer than 13 mobile devices to access emails on her private server, but the FBI was unable to obtain any of those devices in its investigation, in some cases because Clinton aides had been instructed to smash them with a hammer.⁴

Clinton originally assured Americans that *not even one* piece of classified material had ever been transmitted via her unsecured, secret, personal server. But now it is known that at least 2,079 emails that she sent or received via that server, contained classified material.⁵ As the eminent broadcaster and legal scholar Mark Levin has made plain, each of those 2,079 offenses constituted a felonious violation of Section 793 of the Espionage Act.⁶ And each violation was punishable by a prison sentence of up to ten years.⁷

In January 2016, former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates said “the odds are pretty high” that Russia, China, and Iran had compromised Clinton’s unsecured email server.⁸

But hey, who cares? At least Mrs. Clinton, unlike Donald Trump, never engaged in crude, private trash talk that was recorded on tape. And all of her disparaging, condescending, hate-soaked, fiction-laced denunciations of her political rivals are delivered in measured, solemn, well-rehearsed tones. And she of course respects women deeply. In fact, she respects *all* people, including the 315 million Americans whose personal and national security was compromised when Mrs. Clinton willfully allowed top-secret information to wind up in the possession of our country’s most hostile enemies around the world.

The Clinton Foundation Scandals

In an effort to prevent foreign governments, organizations, and individuals from influencing the policy decisions of American national leaders, campaign-finance laws prohibit U.S. political figures from accepting money from foreign sources. But as the *Washington Post* noted in February 2015, the Bill, Hillary, & Chelsea Clinton Foundation “has given donors a way to potentially gain favor with the Clintons outside the traditional political [donation] limits.”⁹

As of February 2015, foreign sources accounted for about one-third of all donors who had given the Clinton Foundation more than \$1 million, and over half of those who had contributed more than \$5 million.¹⁰ Foreign donors that gave money to the Foundation included: Hezbollah supporter Issam Fares, who once served as deputy prime minister of Lebanon;¹¹ the Dubai Foundation, which also gave money to the families of Palestinian terrorists killed in action;¹² the royal family of the United Arab Emirates; a Dubai-based company that promotes Sharia Law;¹³ a privately-held Chinese construction and trade conglomerate headed by a delegate of the Chinese parliament;¹⁴ and the governments of Saudi Arabia, Brunei, the United Arab Emirates, and Qatar.¹⁵

Even during Clinton’s tenure (2009-13) as secretary of state, the Clinton Foundation received millions of dollars in donations from seven foreign governments.

Bill Clinton earned a total of \$48 million from foreign sources for his appearance and speaking fees during his wife’s term as secretary.¹⁶

In August 2016, the Associated Press reported that 85 of Hillary Clinton’s 154 scheduled meetings and phone calls with non-governmental personnel during her time at the State Department were with donors who gave \$156 million to the Clinton Foundation. The AP report also revealed that the Clinton Foundation had received \$170 million in donations from at least 16 foreign governments whose representatives met personally with Mrs. Clinton.¹⁷

In May 2015, the *International Business Times* reported that the Clinton State Department had approved billions of dollars in arms deals with governments that donated to the Clinton Foundation, including governments that were infamous for their appalling human-rights records.¹⁸

But the Clinton Foundation certainly does many wonderful things for needy people around the world, doesn't it? Well, according to a review of IRS documents by *The Federalist*, between 2009-12 the Clinton Foundation raised over \$500 million in total. A mere 15% of that went towards programmatic grants. The other \$425 million went to travel expenses, employee salaries and benefits, and "other expenses."¹⁹ In 2013, the Clinton Foundation allocated only 6% of its revenues to direct charitable aid.²⁰

But hey, who cares? At least Mrs. Clinton never engaged in crude, private trash talk that was recorded on tape. And all of her disparaging, condescending, hate-soaked, fiction-laced denunciations of her political rivals are delivered in measured, solemn, well-rehearsed tones. And she deeply respects women, including the millions of women around the world who have never benefited from the charitable services that the Clinton Foundation purports to provide, because the Foundation only spends a tiny percentage of its funds on actual charity.

Clinton's Support for the Iran Nuclear Deal

Vowing that Mrs. Clinton will "preven[t] Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon," the Clinton presidential campaign website assures Americans that "Hillary will vigorously enforce the nuclear agreement with Iran." Is this a good thing? Consider that the agreement's key provisions were as follows:

- Iran was permitted to keep more than 5,000 centrifuges.
- Iran received \$150 billion in sanctions relief.
- Russia and China were permitted to supply Iran with weapons.
- Iran was given the discretion to block international inspectors from its military installations, and was promised that it would receive 14 days' notice for any request to visit a given site.
- Only inspectors from countries that had diplomatic relations with Iran would be given access to Iranian nuclear sites; thus there would be no American inspectors.

- An embargo on the sale of weapons to Iran would be officially lifted in 5 years.
- Iran's intercontinental ballistic missile program would remain intact.
- The U.S. pledged that it would provide technical assistance to help Iran develop its nuclear program and protect its nuclear facilities, supposedly for peaceful domestic purposes.
- Sanctions would be lifted on critical parts of Iran's military.
- Iran was not required to release American prisoners whom it was holding on trumped-up charges.²¹

As a result of this nuclear deal that Mrs. Clinton so enthusiastically supports, Iran is guaranteed of having a near-zero breakout time to a nuclear bomb approximately a decade down the road.

But hey, who cares? At least Mrs. Clinton never engaged in crude, private trash talk that was recorded on tape. And all of her disparaging, condescending, hate-soaked, fiction-laced denunciations of her political rivals are delivered in measured, solemn, well-rehearsed tones. And she deeply respects women, including the scores of millions of women in the U.S., Israel, and elsewhere, whose very lives have been placed in irreversible peril as a result of this deal.

Clinton Helps Russia Gain Control of 20% of All U.S. Uranium

In 2007-08, a Canadian named Ian Telfer, chairman of a South African uranium-mining company called Uranium One, funneled millions of dollars in donations to the Clinton Foundation. In June 2010, the Russian government made an extremely generous offer to Uranium One's shareholders. If the offer were to be accepted, Russia would gain a 51% controlling stake in the company.

But because Uranium One controlled one-fifth of all U.S. uranium reserves — and uranium, a key component in both nuclear energy and nuclear weaponry, is considered a strategic asset with implications for American national security — the deal with Russia could not be permitted without the approval of the American government. Specifically, that approval could be granted only by the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS), which is composed of several of the most powerful members of the cabinet — the Attorney General as well as the Secretaries of Defense, Commerce, Treasury, Homeland Security, Energy, and State. (The latter, of course, was Hillary Clinton.)²²

Without the approval of these seven Obama administration officials, Russia's acquisition of Uranium One could not have taken place. All seven, including Hillary Clinton, gave their go-ahead for the deal. As a result, the Russian government took control of fully 20% of all uranium production capacity in the United States.²³

In June 2010 — the very month in which the Russian acquisition of Uranium One was approved by the CFIUS — Bill Clinton was invited to speak in Moscow for the astronomical sum of \$500,000. Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin personally thanked Mr. Clinton for speaking. And Mr. Clinton's speaking fee was paid by Renaissance Capital, a Russian investment bank with ties to the Kremlin.²⁴

But hey, who cares? At least Hillary Clinton never engaged in crude, private trash talk that was recorded on tape. And all of her disparaging, condescending, hate-soaked, fiction-laced denunciations of her political rivals are delivered in measured, solemn, well-rehearsed tones. And she deeply respects women, including the countless millions whose safety has been placed in jeopardy by permitting American uranium to be gobbled up by a hostile, fascist Russia.

The Benghazi Debacle, and Clinton's Role in Arming Jihadists in Libya and Syria

Throughout 2012, violent jihadist activity became increasingly commonplace in the city of Benghazi and elsewhere throughout Libya and North Africa. American personnel at the U.S. mission in Benghazi repeatedly asked the Clinton State Department for increased security provisions during 2012, but *all* of these requests were either denied or ignored.²⁵

On the night of September 11, 2012, a large group of heavily armed Islamic terrorists attacked the U.S. diplomatic mission in Benghazi with great violence.²⁶ In the process, they killed the U.S. Ambassador to Libya, Chris Stevens, and three other Americans.

For weeks thereafter, Mrs. Clinton and the rest of the Obama administration continued to characterize what had occurred on September 11 in Benghazi not as a carefully orchestrated act of terrorism, but as a spontaneous uprising that evolved unexpectedly from what had begun as a low-level protest against an obscure YouTube video.

For the administration, it was vital to continue putting forth this false narrative because, with the presidential election only a few weeks away, nothing could be permitted to puncture the Obama-Clinton talking points: "Al Qaeda is on the run" and "Osama bin Laden is dead."²⁷

In reality, however, within mere hours after the September 11 attack, U.S. intelligence agencies had already gained more than enough evidence to conclude unequivocally that it was a planned terrorist incident, and that the YouTube video had nothing whatsoever to do with it.²⁸

On January 23, 2013 — fully 134 days after the September 11 attack in Benghazi — Mrs. Clinton went before Congress to testify as to what she knew about the incident. At one point in the hearing, Senator Rand Paul asked her whether the United States had ever been involved in procuring weapons in Libya and transferring them to other countries including Syria. Clinton replied, “I do not know. I have no information on that.”²⁹

But a March 25, 2013 *New York Times* story subsequently indicated that the Obama administration had in fact been sending arms from Libya, through intermediary nations and ultimately to Syria, since early 2012. And another *Times* article described Mrs. Clinton as one of the driving forces who had called for arming the Syrian rebels (who were fighting Syrian President Assad) in precisely that manner.³⁰ In other words, Clinton had lied in her congressional testimony to Rand Paul.

It should be noted that the Syrian rebels whom Clinton and Obama were aiding consisted of Islamic jihadists, many of whom were affiliated with Al Qaeda. In July 2016, Julian Assange of Wikileaks revealed that a batch of hacked DNC emails contained information proving that Clinton, contrary to what she had said in her congressional testimony in 2013, knew as early as 2011 that the U.S. was sending arms from Libya to jihadists in Syria.³¹

And in October 2016, a Fox News report indicated that Obama and Clinton had also arranged for the provision of weapons to radical jihadists in Libya.³²

In September 2014, former Deputy Secretary of State Raymond Maxwell reported that in late 2012 he had witnessed — in the basement of the State Department’s headquarters — a Sunday meeting in which Cheryl Mills (Hillary Clinton’s chief of staff) and Jake Sullivan (Clinton’s deputy chief of staff) were overseeing and directing staffers who were busy purging documents that might implicate Clinton or her top people in the Benghazi attacks.³³

But hey, who cares? At least Mrs. Clinton never engaged in crude, private trash talk that was recorded on tape. And all of her disparaging, condescending, hate-soaked, fiction-laced denunciations of her political rivals are delivered in measured, solemn, well-rehearsed tones. And she deeply respects women, including: (a) the Libyan and Syrian women whose lives were destroyed by the jihadists whom Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama supported, and (b) the wives, mothers, sisters, and daughters of the four Americans who were slaughtered by jihadists in Benghazi.

The Radical Islamist Affiliations of Clinton’s Closest Aide

Hillary Clinton’s closest aide for many years has been Huma Abedin, whose late father, Syed Abedin, was affiliated with the Muslim Students Association (MSA). The MSA grew out of the

jihadist Muslim Brotherhood, which Islam expert Robert Spencer has described as “the parent organization of Hamas and al Qaeda.”³⁴

Huma’s mother, Saleha Mahmood Abedin, is a prominent member of the Muslim Sisterhood — the Muslim Brotherhood’s division for women. She is also a board member of the International Islamic Council for Dawa and Relief, a pro-Hamas entity that is part of the “Union of Good,” which the U.S. government has formally designated as an international terrorist organization. Saleha once wrote an article blaming America for having provoked the Islamic “anger and hostility” that led to the 9/11 attacks.³⁵

From 1996-2008, Huma Abedin was employed by the Institute of Muslim Minority Affairs (IMMA), a Saudi-based Islamic think tank founded by Abdullah Omar Naseef, a major Muslim Brotherhood figure who once served as secretary-general of the Muslim World League, a vehicle by which the Muslim Brotherhood promotes the ideology of Islamic supremacism. Naseef also had ties to Osama bin Laden and Al Qaeda, with whom he communicated.³⁶ Abedin was the assistant editor of IMMA’s in-house publication, the *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs (JMMA)*. At least the first seven of those years overlapped with Abdullah Omar Naseef’s active presence in the IMMA.³⁷

It is vital to note that the IMMA’s “Muslim Minority Affairs” agenda was, and remains to this day, a calculated foreign policy of the Saudi Ministry of Religious Affairs. It is designed, as former federal prosecutor Andrew C. McCarthy explains, “to grow an unassimilated, aggressive population of Islamic supremacists who will gradually but dramatically alter the character of the West.”³⁸

But hey, who cares? At least Mrs. Clinton never engaged in crude, private trash talk that was recorded on tape. And all of her disparaging, condescending, hate-soaked, fiction-laced denunciations of her political rivals are delivered in measured, solemn, well-rehearsed tones. And she respects women, including the hundreds of millions of women in Muslim nations who are oppressed by the very same Sharia Law that is promoted by the organization to which Huma Abedin devoted 12 years of her life.

The Deadly Consequences of Clinton’s Absurd Fictions About Islam & Terrorism

In 2011 the Obama administration, in which Mrs. Clinton was obviously a major player, decided to purge, from the training materials and curricula of all federal intelligence and criminal investigators, every single item suggesting that “jihad” or “Islam” were in any way related to terrorism.³⁹ Instead, the new objective would be “countering violent extremism,” improving “cultural competency training across the United States Government,” and promoting “cultural awareness.”⁴⁰ All told, the FBI removed more than 1,000 presentations and curriculum items that were deemed “offensive” or “Islamophobic.”⁴¹

The FBI's decision to change its training materials and interrogation methods went on to have deadly serious, real-world consequences. A particularly noteworthy case involved jihadist Omar Mateen, who in June 2016 entered a gay nightclub in Orlando, Florida and murdered 49 people while wounding 53 others. The FBI had investigated Mateen extensively for 10 months in 2013 because he had family connections to Al Qaeda, he was a member of a Shi'a terrorist organization, and he had issued terroristic threats on a number of occasions. But eventually, the FBI canceled that investigation because, in accordance with the tenets of its revised training materials, it concluded that Mateen posed no threat to anyone; that his biggest problem was the psychic pain he was suffering as a result of "being marginalized because of his Muslim faith." As a result of this absurd line of reasoning, 49 innocent people from Orlando are now lying in their graves.⁴²

Hillary Clinton agrees completely with the notion that it is both counterproductive and morally unjustified to suggest any connection between Islam and terrorism — the same delusional, preposterous mentality that enabled the Orlando mass murder to take place.

But hey, who cares? At least Mrs. Clinton never engaged in crude, private trash talk that was recorded on tape. And all of her disparaging, condescending, hate-soaked, fiction-laced denunciations of her political rivals are delivered in measured, solemn, well-rehearsed tones. And she deeply respects women and homosexuals, including the 49 people who were slaughtered in the Orlando nightclub.

Clinton's Role in the Rise of ISIS and the Stratospheric Growth of Worldwide Terrorism

ISIS, which evolved out of Al Qaeda in Iraq (AQI), grew into the most powerful, well-funded horde of bloodthirsty barbarians in world history, right under Mrs. Clinton's nose, and precisely during her watch as secretary of state. While ISIS launched its campaign of mass rapes, beheadings, slaughters, and tortures of unimaginable brutality — and gained control over enormous portions of Iraq and Syria — Clinton and President Obama did absolutely nothing to thwart it.⁴³

Moreover, the rise of ISIS coincided with the expansion of terrorism to unprecedented levels all over the world. According to the Global Terrorism Index, fatalities caused by terrorism increased from 3,361 in 2000, to 11,133 in 2012, to 18,111 in 2013, to 32,658 in 2014. More than half of the 2014 killings were carried out by ISIS and Boko Haram, the latter of which has pledged allegiance to ISIS.⁴⁴ In other words, worldwide terrorism has spiraled out of control under Obama, Clinton, and Clinton's successor, John Kerry.

But hey, who cares? At least Mrs. Clinton never engaged in crude, private trash talk that was recorded on tape. And all of her disparaging, condescending, hate-soaked, fiction-laced denunciations of her political rivals are delivered in measured, solemn, well-rehearsed tones.

And she deeply respects women everywhere, including the many thousands who are killed by terrorists across the globe each year.

Clinton's Role in Squandering America's Victory in the Iraq War

ISIS's meteoric ascent to power occurred as a direct result of President Obama's decision to rapidly withdraw *all* U.S. troops from Iraq — against the advice of experienced military leaders — in 2011. Retired Army General John M. Keane, the last American commander in Iraq, had recommended that 23,000 U.S. troops be left in place to secure the U.S. war victory. But Obama, wanting to be remembered most of all as the president who ended wars rather than fought them, left no forces behind. Beaming with pride, he frequently took credit for bringing American military involvement in Iraq to a formal close.⁴⁵

Of course, when ISIS later grew into a genocidal monster, Obama tried to claim that his withdrawal from Iraq had been forced upon him by a December 2008 deal in which President Bush and Iraqi president Maliki signed a “status-of-forces” agreement stipulating that all U.S. troops must leave Iraq by December 2011.⁴⁶

But status-of-forces agreements are often amended and renegotiated, based on evolving security concerns. Obama left no U.S. forces in Iraq for one very simple and obvious reason: he didn't want to. As Obama himself stated during a 2012 debate with Republican challenger Mitt Romney: “What I would not have done is left 10,000 troops [a far cry from the 23,000 recommended by General Keane] in Iraq that would tie us down. That certainly would not help us in the Middle East.”⁴⁷

It is vital to remember, moreover, that Iraqi president Maliki would have been quite willing to accept a new status-of-forces agreement in 2011, had it stipulated that the U.S. would leave behind a contingent of troops large enough to effectively secure the peace. But when Obama and Clinton proposed to leave a mere 2,000 to 3,000 troops in Iraq, Maliki had no choice but to refuse. As *National Review* explains: “[T]he problem was that the Obama administration wanted a small force so that it could say it had ended the war. Having a very small American force wasn't worth the domestic political price Maliki would have to pay for supporting their presence.”⁴⁸

When Obama was deciding to pull all U.S. troops out of Iraq, Hillary Clinton was in 100% agreement with him. As Fox News reports: “Clinton was a leading and outspoken supporter of the Obama administration's decision to withdraw U.S. forces from Iraq.... Clinton touted the United States' commitment to Iraq in 2011 and said the Obama administration has ‘a plan in place’ to ensure Iraq's security.”⁴⁹

Instead, Iraq turned into a beehive of jihadism, terrorism, and mass murder.

But hey, who cares? At least Mrs. Clinton never engaged in crude, private trash talk that was recorded on tape. And all of her disparaging, condescending, hate-soaked, fiction-laced denunciations of her political rivals are delivered in measured, solemn, well-rehearsed tones. And she deeply respects women everywhere, including the millions whose lives were destroyed when a stable Iraq descended once again into anarchy and terror.

Clinton's Horrible Judgment Regarding Another Terrorist Enemy

As a member of the U.S. Senate, Mrs. Clinton opposed President Bush's January 2007 decision to deploy an additional 21,500 troops in a military "surge" designed to turn the tide of the Iraq War — which had devolved into a bloody quagmire — back in America's favor:

- In December 2006, when Bush was still contemplating the surge, Clinton said: "Everyone knows there is no military solution to the difficulties we face in Iraq."⁵⁰
- In January 2007, Clinton complained that the surge was "taking troops away from Afghanistan, where I think we need to be putting more troops, and sending them to Iraq on a mission that I think has a very limited, if any, chance for success."⁵¹
- In August 2007, Clinton said: "The surge was designed to give the Iraqi government time to take steps to ensure a political solution to the situation. It has failed to do so.... It is abundantly clear that there is no military solution to the sectarian fighting in Iraq. We need to stop refereeing the war, and start getting out now."⁵²
- When General David Petraeus issued a September 2007 report on the remarkably successful results that the surge was yielding, Clinton obstinately told Petraeus that his assertions required "a willing suspension of disbelief."⁵³

Contrary to Clinton's erroneous predictions and dispiriting rhetoric, the troop surge proved to be a monumentally important strategy that finally enabled the U.S. to crush the Iraqi insurgency. Prior to the surge, it had not been uncommon for 3,000 or more Iraqi civilians and security-force members to die at the hands of terrorist violence during any given month. By May 2008, the monthly mortality figure stood at 19, and it fluctuated between 7 and 25 deaths per month over the ensuing 14 months.⁵⁴

In his 2014 memoir, Robert Gates — who had served as Secretary of Defense under both George W. Bush and Barack Obama — wrote that Hillary Clinton's opposition to the troop surge had been based on how she thought her own political fortunes would be affected by taking that position. For example, Gates described a "remarkable" exchange that he had witnessed, where Clinton, speaking retrospectively, "told the president that her opposition to the [2007] surge in

Iraq had been political because she was facing him in the Iowa primary” and could not afford to be perceived as pro-war.⁵⁵

But hey, who cares? At least Mrs. Clinton never engaged in crude, private trash talk that was recorded on tape. And all of her disparaging, condescending, hate-soaked, fiction-laced denunciations of her political rivals are delivered in measured, solemn, well-rehearsed tones. And she deeply respects women everywhere, including the millions to whom she tried to deny the protection of American forces in the troop surge.

Clinton’s Empty Talk Regarding Russia and China

Hillary Clinton’s presidential campaign website boasts that in 2010 Clinton “worked to ensure ratification of the New START treaty, which will make the world safer by reducing U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals to their smallest size in 50 years.”⁵⁶

The New START agreement with Russia limited each country’s long-range nuclear weapons stockpile to 1,500.⁵⁷ But while both the U.S. and Russia agreed to these limits, only America promised to freeze its technology.⁵⁸ As the late constitutional scholar Phyllis Schlafley wrote of the treaty:

“It reads like it was written by the Russians and has nothing good in it for the United States.... The treaty allows Russia to build new and modern weapons to reach New START limits, whereas the United States is locked into reducing its current number. That means Russia will have new and tested weapons, but the U.S. will be stuck with its current, out-of-date, untested warheads.... This treaty gives Russia a veto over all U.S. defenses against incoming missiles.... Russia explained that ... it will stick with New START ‘only if the (U.S.) refrains from developing its missile defense capabilities quantitatively or qualitatively.’”⁵⁹

But hey, who cares? At least Mrs. Clinton never engaged in crude, private trash talk that was recorded on tape. And all of her disparaging, condescending, hate-soaked, fiction-laced denunciations of her political rivals are delivered in measured, solemn, well-rehearsed tones. And she deeply respects women, including the 150+ million women in the U.S. whose security was instantly and permanently compromised by the terms of the New Start Treaty.

Clinton’s Reprehensible Treatment of Israel

In 2010, Israeli Ambassador Michael Oren said that during the first two years of the Obama-Clinton administration, “Israel’s ties with the United States” had reached “their worst crisis since 1975 ... a crisis of historic proportions.”⁶⁰

Some may recall how Mrs. Clinton betrayed Israel in the aftermath of an infamous 2010 incident where terrorist members of a Turkish organization known as the IHH — which has ties to Hamas, Al Qaeda, and the Muslim Brotherhood — participated in a six-ship flotilla of pro-Palestinian and anti-Israel activists who sailed to Gaza for the purpose of breaking Israel’s naval “blockade” there. (That “blockade” was, in reality, a policy whereby Israel insisted on examining all imports passing through Gaza, so as to prevent the ruling Hamas government, which has sworn its permanent allegiance to the destruction of Israel and the genocide of Jews, from importing weaponry from abroad). The flotilla’s lead ship was owned and operated by IHH. When its crew refused to comply with repeated Israeli demands that it submit to an inspection of its cargo, Israeli commandos boarded the vessel and were violently attacked by IHH terrorists. In the melee that ensued, nine IHH members were killed, and seven Israeli soldiers were wounded. Thereafter, Clinton, by her own telling, “spent ... literally years trying to get the Israelis to finally apologize to the Turks on the flotilla.”⁶¹

In the summer of 2014, Israel engaged in a massive military operation designed to weaken the destructive capacity of Hamas terrorists who were launching more than 100 potentially deadly missiles per day from Gaza, deep into Israel. Before long, Israel discovered that Hamas, in recent years, had constructed a massive network of at least 60 underground missile storage-and-transport tunnels throughout Gaza. A number of those tunnels extended, underground, into Israeli territory — for the purpose of facilitating terror attacks, murders, and kidnappings against unsuspecting Israeli citizens. According to a *Wall Street Journal* report, Hamas had spent between \$1 million and \$10 million to build each of those tunnels, using as many as 350 truckloads of cement and other supplies per tunnel.⁶²

Then, in a bombshell revelation in August 2014, Dennis Ross, who had served as Secretary of State Clinton’s senior Mideast policy adviser, revealed that Clinton had personally assigned him the task of pressuring Israel to ease up on its military blockade of Gaza. “I argued with Israeli leaders and security officials, telling them they needed to allow more construction materials, including cement, into Gaza so that housing, schools and basic infrastructure could be built,” said Ross. “They countered that Hamas would misuse it, and they were right.” As one analysis aptly puts it, “Ross’s admission shows that it was [Clinton] who sent her personal envoy to push for a policy that ultimately enabled Hamas to build the terror tunnels.”⁶³

But hey, who cares? At least Mrs. Clinton never engaged in crude, private trash talk that was recorded on tape. And all of her disparaging, condescending, hate-soaked, fiction-laced denunciations of her political rivals are delivered in measured, solemn, well-rehearsed tones. And she deeply respects women, including the millions of Israeli Jews whose lives were placed in peril by Hamas’s underground tunnels and illegally imported weaponry.

Clinton Turns Libya into a Terrorist Hell Hole

During her tenure as secretary of state, Hillary Clinton pushed hard for the U.S. to take military action designed to drive Muammar Gaddafi from power in Libya.⁶⁴ According to former Defense

Secretary Robert Gates, who served under President Obama, Clinton played a major role in convincing Obama to lead a protracted NATO bombing campaign against Gaddafi in 2011 — a campaign that lent support to opposition rebels consisting of ISIS, Ansar al-Sharia, and other local militant groups. In other words, Clinton and Obama — in their quest to unseat Gaddafi — were aiding murderous jihadists in Libya.

What is remarkable about this, is the fact that Gaddafi at that time no longer posed any threat to American national security. Indeed, just prior to the Al Qaeda-led uprising that Clinton and Obama supported, Libya was providing the U.S. with important intelligence data. Moreover, it was a prospering, secular Islamic nation that had a national budget surplus of 8.7% and was producing 1.8 million barrels of oil per day.

By the time the Obama-Clinton bombing campaign was finished, Libya's economy had shrunk by 42% and was operating at an annual deficit of 17.1%; oil production was down by at least 80%.⁶⁵

According to *Foreign Policy In Focus*, the Obama-Clinton strategy “plunged” Libya “into chaotic unrest” and “turned [it] into a cauldron of anarchy.”⁶⁶ Today Libya is a nation teeming with jihadists, and ISIS is becoming increasingly powerful there.⁶⁷

But hey, who cares? At least Mrs. Clinton never engaged in crude, private trash talk that was recorded on tape. And all of her disparaging, condescending, hate-soaked, fiction-laced denunciations of her political rivals are delivered in measured, solemn, well-rehearsed tones. And she deeply respects women, including the millions in Libya who are now drowning in a tsunami of terrorism.

Clinton's Plan to Import 65,000 Syrian Refugees into the U.S. As Quickly As Possible

“We have to stem the flow of jihadists from Europe and America to and from Iraq, Syria, and Afghanistan,” says the Clinton presidential campaign website.⁶⁸ While this sounds like a grand idea, it begs a very obvious question: Why has Hillary Clinton explicitly called for bringing at least 65,000 refugees from Syria into the United States as quickly as possible,⁶⁹ even though:

- ISIS has vowed to deploy terrorist operatives to infiltrate the flow of Syrian refugees heading to Western nations?⁷⁰
- more than 1,500 terror-linked refugees, asylees and migrants entered the U.S. in 2014 alone?⁷¹

- more than 30,000 illegal immigrants from “countries of terrorist concern” entered the United States through America’s Southwestern border with Mexico in 2015?⁷²
- Michael Steinbach, deputy assistant director of the FBI’s counter-terrorism unit, has made it clear that it is virtually impossible to screen out terrorists who could be posing as refugees and coming to America?⁷³
- FBI Director James Comey has said that the federal government does not have the ability to conduct reliable background checks on the Syrian refugees, and has warned that “there will be a terrorist diaspora [from Syria and elsewhere in the Middle East] sometime in the next two to five years like we’ve never seen before”?⁷⁴
- Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson has admitted that the U.S. will not “know a whole lot” about the refugees it accepts?⁷⁵
- CIA director John Brennan has said that ISIS “is probably exploring a variety of means for infiltrating operatives into the West, including in refugee flows ...”?⁷⁶

As a direct result of the policy that Mrs. Clinton herself has spelled out, scores of thousands of people *from the very seat of ISIS’s power* will soon be streaming into the United States at a record pace.

But hey, who cares? At least Mrs. Clinton never engaged in crude, private trash talk that was recorded on tape. And all of her disparaging, condescending, hate-soaked, fiction-laced denunciations of her political rivals are delivered in measured, solemn, well-rehearsed tones. And she deeply respects women, including the countless American women whose lives may be imperiled by an influx of Syrian terrorists posing as refugees.

Taking a long-range view of American migration and refugee policy, Mrs. Clinton understands that eventually, when these Syrian refugees and their relatives, and then their descendants, become registered voters, they will vote heavily Democrat, as the vast majority of immigrants from the Middle East have always done.⁷⁷

And if some Americans have to get murdered along the way by terrorist infiltrators, so be it. To Mrs. Clinton, that is simply one of the costs of doing (political) business.

Immigration: Clinton Explicitly Favors Amnesty, Sanctuary Cities, and “Open Borders”

“Hillary will introduce comprehensive immigration reform with a pathway to full and equal citizenship within her first 100 days in office,” says the Clinton presidential campaign website.⁷⁸ Mrs. Clinton pledges that if she is elected president, she will extend President Obama’s two major executive orders on immigration, which protected millions of illegal aliens from deportation.⁷⁹ She vows to do this despite the fact that Obama himself, prior to issuing his executive orders, frequently acknowledged that such actions went far beyond the proper limits of presidential authority.⁸⁰ Speaking to a group of illegal immigrant high-school students in 2015, Clinton said: “I want to do everything we can to defend the president’s executive orders ... As president I would do everything possible under the law to go even further.”⁸¹

Moreover, Mrs. Clinton unequivocally supports the “sanctuary” policies that bar police and other public-sector employees in some 340 U.S. cities from notifying the federal government about the presence of illegal aliens residing in their communities. As such, these policies defy the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act that Congress passed twenty years ago to require that local governments cooperate with U.S. Immigration & Customs Enforcement (ICE).⁸²

Sanctuary policies have turned hundreds of U.S. cities into very dangerous places. Of the 9,295 deportable aliens who were released after their arrest in sanctuary jurisdictions during the first eight months of 2014 alone, some 2,320 were subsequently re-arrested, on new criminal charges, soon thereafter. And before their initial release, 58% of those 9,295 aliens already had felony charges or convictions on their records, while another 37% had serious prior misdemeanor charges.⁸³

But Mrs. Clinton’s commitment to sanctuary policies is unshakable. As Xochitl Hinojosa, the Clinton presidential campaign’s director of coalitions press, said in 2015: “Hillary Clinton believes that sanctuary cities can help further public safety, and she has defended those policies going back years.”⁸⁴

In a speech she delivered at Banco Itau, a Brazilian bank, on May 16, 2013, Mrs. Clinton stated: “My dream is a hemispheric common market, with open trade and open borders....”⁸⁵

You read that correctly: “open borders.”

But hey, who cares? At least Mrs. Clinton never engaged in crude, private trash that was recorded on tape. And all of her disparaging, condescending, hate-soaked, fiction-laced denunciations of her political rivals are delivered in measured, solemn, well-rehearsed tones. And she deeply respects women, including the many whose lives and safety are imperiled by open borders and sanctuary policies.

Clinton’s Opposition to Gun Rights

Lamenting that “too many families in America have suffered — and continue to suffer — from gun violence,” Mrs. Clinton has stated that crime victims should be allowed to sue firearm manufacturers and retailers who lawfully produced or sold a gun that was used in a crime.⁸⁶ This is a way to eliminate the Second Amendment “without firing a shot,” so to speak, as it would inevitably cause the firearms industry to disappear.⁸⁷

At a New Hampshire town hall in 2015, a man asked Mrs. Clinton whether she would consider supporting a gun buyback measure similar to the one that had been implemented in Australia: “Recently, Australia managed to get away, or take away tens of thousands, millions of handguns. In one year, they were all gone. Can we do that?” Clinton replied: “I think it would be worth considering doing it on the national level, if that could be arranged.”⁸⁸

In other words, Mrs. Clinton is eager to explore creative ways of eliminating the Second Amendment.

But hey, who cares? At least she never engaged in crude, private trash talk that was recorded on tape. And all of her disparaging, condescending, hate-soaked, fiction-laced denunciations of her political rivals are delivered in measured, solemn, well-rehearsed tones. And she deeply respects women, including those who, in the absence of the Second Amendment, will no longer be able to defend themselves and their families against home invaders and other assailants. They will no longer be among the hundreds of thousands of individuals who, each year, use guns for defensive purposes to repel or frighten away would-be attackers.⁸⁹

Clinton’s Plans to Expand Obamacare into a Government-Run, Single-Payer System

Stating unequivocally that she plans to “defend and expand the Affordable Care Act” (ACA),⁹⁰ Mrs. Clinton contends that Obamacare has thus far been a great success.

Let’s look, for a moment, at how successfully Obamacare has helped to cut the cost of insurance premiums. When the law was being debated and formulated, President Obama repeatedly assured Americans that under his plan, the average family would save up to \$2,500 per year in annual premiums.⁹¹ The reality has been somewhat different:

- A 2014 study by the Brookings Institution found that “premiums in the individual health insurance market increased by 24.4 percent beyond what they would have had they simply followed ... [existing] trends.”⁹²
- The S&P Global Institute found that between 2013-15, the average market medical costs per individual increased by 69%.⁹³

- Premiums for ACA-compliant Qualified Health Plans that were sold to individuals on the Obamacare exchanges, were \$2,300 more expensive than premiums for non-Qualified Health Plans, i.e., plans that were in existence before 2014 and did not comply with the mandates of the ACA.⁹⁴
- In 2015, premiums for the lowest-cost plans across all tiers — bronze, silver, gold and platinum — increased by a median of 10-13%.⁹⁵
- By September 2016, fully 16 of Obamacare’s 23 state exchanges had gone bankrupt, with another one — the Tennessee exchange — “very near collapse.”⁹⁶
- It is expected that by the end of 2016, UnitedHealth Group will have exited 31 of the 34 Obamacare exchanges in which it has participated, while Aetna will have left 11 of its 15 state exchanges.⁹⁷

Meanwhile, Obamacare’s insurance policy deductibles are skyrocketing in almost every state. As *National Review* reports: “Average deductibles for silver plans — which accounted for nearly 70 percent of the exchanges’ 9.3 million enrollees [in 2015] — now average \$2,994. The second most popular Bronze plans have average deductibles of \$5,629.... Paying \$3,000 or \$5,600 before their insurance kicks in simply isn’t an option for most families ...”⁹⁸

Hillary Clinton proposes to address the financial implosion of Obamacare by implementing a “public option”⁹⁹ — i.e., a government-run insurance plan that would “compete” with private insurers. Pacific Research Institute president Sally Pipes explains how disastrous such a measure would be: “By drawing on taxpayer dollars, this public option would be able to out-price almost every private insurer in the country. Unable to compete, private insurers would be ‘crowded out,’ leaving Americans with just one choice: a government-operated health care plan that brings the entire health sector under government control.”¹⁰⁰

But that, in a nutshell, is Mrs. Clinton’s ultimate, long-range goal: to have a “single-payer,” “universal” healthcare system that is run entirely by the federal government. Her presidential campaign website candidly states that she “has never given up on the fight for universal coverage.”¹⁰¹

And what does the empirical evidence show, regarding the effectiveness of universal healthcare systems in countries around the world? It’s actually quite clear. As the Cato Institute puts it, “In countries weighted heavily toward government control, people are most likely to face waiting lists, rationing, restrictions on physician choice, and other obstacles to care.” By contrast: “[T]hose countries with national health care systems that work better, such as France, the Netherlands, and Switzerland, are successful to the degree that they incorporate market mechanisms such as competition, cost-consciousness, market prices, and consumer choice, and

eschew centralized government control. In other words, socialized medicine works — as long as it isn't socialized medicine."¹⁰²

So Hillary Clinton wants to implement a healthcare system that has failed miserably in country after country, confident that she'll get better results because she'll put smarter bureaucrats in charge of it.

But hey, who cares? At least Mrs. Clinton never engaged in crude, private trash talk that was recorded on tape. And all of her disparaging, condescending, hate-soaked, fiction-laced denunciations of her political rivals are delivered in measured, solemn, well-rehearsed tones. And she respects women and girls deeply — even the 150+ million females whose lives and health will be placed in peril by the expansion of Obamacare and the pursuit of a single-payer system.

Rejecting School Vouchers for Poor Minority Children in Failing Urban Schools

Professing to have spent her entire adult life “fighting for children,”¹⁰³ Hillary Clinton dogmatically opposes the implementation of school voucher programs¹⁰⁴ which would enable the parents of low-income, mostly-minority children who attend failing, inner-city public schools, to send their youngsters instead to private schools where they might actually have a chance of succeeding academically.

Why would anyone reject such programs, if he or she actually cared about poor minority kids?

As always, if you want to find out what motivates Mrs. Clinton, you have to follow the money. Together, the two largest teachers' unions in the United States — the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) — have given tens of millions of dollars in campaign contributions to political candidates since the early 1990s, and more than 95% of that money has gone to Democrats. If we also count the massive expenditures that teachers' unions make on politically oriented initiatives like television ads and get-out-the-vote efforts, the numbers become almost unfathomable. From 2007-12, the NEA and AFT together spent more than \$330 million to influence elections in favor of Democrats.¹⁰⁵

The leading objective of both the NEA and AFT is to maximize employment opportunities for dues-paying members of their unions. This is highly significant because mandatory dues constitute the very lifeblood of those unions. And voucher programs, which would siphon students as well as money away from the public schools, don't promote union membership or union dues.

So Hillary Clinton rejects voucher programs because her union benefactors oppose them.

But hey, who cares? At least she never engaged in crude, private trash talk that was recorded on tape. And all of her disparaging, condescending, hate-soaked, fiction-laced denunciations of her political rivals are delivered in measured, solemn, well-rehearsed tones. And she deeply respects women — even impoverished, inner-city minority women who have no choice but to send their children to public schools that are beset by academic failure and violence of monumental proportions.

“Criminal Justice Reform”: Going Soft on Crime, and Filling America’s Graveyards

Hillary Clinton tells us that Americans everywhere “are crying out for criminal justice reform” because “families are being torn apart by excessive incarceration,” and “children are growing up in homes shattered by prison and poverty.”¹⁰⁶

How does Mrs. Clinton know that our country’s current levels of incarceration are excessive? What, exactly, would be the right number of people in prison? How would we arrive at that number?

Consider some highly noteworthy facts:

- In 1990, when there were about 1,149,000 prisoners in penitentiaries nationwide, there were 1,820,130 violent crimes committed that year, including 23,440 murders.¹⁰⁷
- In 2014, when there were 2,208,000 inmates in penitentiaries nationwide, a total of 1,197,987 violent crimes were committed that year, including 14,249 murders.¹⁰⁸
- So, even as the population of the United States grew by 28% between 1990 and 2014, the incidence of violent crimes declined by 46%, and the incidence of murders fell by 39%.

These numbers suggest that putting more criminals in prison has helped to spare at least a million people per year from being victimized by violent crimes, and to save at least 9,000 people per year from being murdered. If we look at the numbers from this perspective, incarceration suddenly doesn’t look like such a bad thing, does it?

And indeed, Mrs. Clinton herself inadvertently admitted this when she recently said, while railing against “mass incarceration,” that “the numbers [of prisoners] today are much higher than they were 30, 40 years ago, despite the fact that crime is at historic lows.”¹⁰⁹

Poor Hillary Clinton. She opened her mouth in an unscripted moment and accidentally told the truth.

But hey, who cares if she supports policies that result in more death and destruction? At least Mrs. Clinton never engaged in crude, private trash talk that was recorded on tape. And all of her disparaging, condescending, hate-soaked, fiction-laced denunciations of her political rivals are delivered in measured, solemn, well-rehearsed tones. Plus, she deeply respects women, including the ones who, under her criminal-justice “reform” policies, would face a far greater likelihood of being abused, violated, or slain by criminals who really belonged in prison.

Fighting Voter ID Laws As “Racist” Schemes to Disenfranchise Minorities

At an August 2013 meeting of the American Bar Association, Mrs. Clinton lamented that “more than 80 bills restricting voting rights” had been “introduced in 31 states” during the first eight months of that year. These were generally bills that sought to institute Voter ID requirements at polling places, shorten early-voting periods, eliminate same-day voter registration, prevent the arbitrary extension of voting hours, and carefully regulate the use of absentee voting. All of these proposed measures were designed to reduce the likelihood of voter fraud, but Mrs. Clinton called them “voter suppression” efforts that were part of a racist scheme to “disproportionately [disenfranchise] African-Americans, Latino[s] and young voters.”¹¹⁰ On another occasion, Clinton said that Voter ID laws are emblematic of a racist form of “fear-mongering about a phantom epidemic of election fraud.”¹¹¹

Is Mrs. Clinton correct? Look at the evidence and decide for yourself:

- A 2012 report by the Pew Center on the States found that 24 million voter registrations — one-eighth of all registrations nationwide — were either invalid or inaccurate, including more than 1.8 million dead people who were still registered.¹¹²
- A 2014 study found that two years earlier, some 155,692 registered voters in North Carolina *alone* had first and last names, birth dates, and final-four Social Security Number digits that matched those of voters who were registered in other states.¹¹³
- The same study also found that 35,570 people who had *actually voted* in North Carolina, had first names, last names, and birth dates that matched those of voters who had cast ballots in other states.¹¹⁴
- In 2008, Democrat Al Franken won a highly controversial U.S. Senate race in Minnesota by just 312 votes. It was later discovered that 1,099 felons — all legally ineligible to vote — had cast ballots in the election, almost exclusively for Franken.¹¹⁵
- A 2006 study found that 77,000 dead people were listed on New York’s statewide database of registered voters, and that as many as 2,600 of them had somehow managed to cast ballots from the grave.¹¹⁶

- In Milwaukee in 2004, approximately 5,300 more ballots were cast, than voters who were recorded as having shown up at the polls.¹¹⁷
- In 2008, election officials nationwide had to discard at least 400,000 bogus voter registrations submitted by ACORN,¹¹⁸ the now-defunct criminal operation masquerading as a “community organization.” (Speaking at ACORN’s 2006 national convention, Mrs. Clinton said: “I thank you for being part of that great movement, that progressive tradition that has rolled across our country.”)¹¹⁹
- In 2011, a Colorado study found that of the nearly 12,000 non-citizens who were illegally registered to vote in that state, about 5,000 had taken part in the 2010 general election.¹²⁰
- In ten Colorado counties in 2012, voter registrations *outnumbered the total voting-age population* by between 4% and 40%.¹²¹

The foregoing examples represent only the barest tip of a colossal election-fraud iceberg. And Hillary Clinton *knows all about it*. She really *isn’t* dumb enough to believe what she says about election fraud and voter ID. She’s just counting on *voters* being dumb enough to believe her.

But hey, who cares? At least Mrs. Clinton never engaged in crude, private trash talk that was recorded on tape. And all of her disparaging, condescending, hate-soaked, fiction-laced denunciations of her political rivals are delivered in measured, solemn, well-rehearsed tones. Plus, she deeply respects women — even the ones whose votes are nullified by the ballots of people who are legally ineligible to participate in elections.

Clinton’s Affiliation with Al Sharpton & Black Lives Matter

In April 2007, Mrs. Clinton spoke at an event held by Al Sharpton’s National Action Network, where she stated that her own presidential bid was possible only because of the dedicated work of longtime civil-rights leaders who, like Sharpton, had fought on behalf of those traditionally excluded from power positions in American life. “I have enjoyed a long and positive relationship with Reverend Al Sharpton and National Action Network,” said Clinton, “and I don’t ever remember saying ‘no’ to them, and I intend to remain their partner in civil rights as I clean the dirt from under the carpet in the Oval Office when I am elected President.”¹²²

And nothing whatsoever has changed in Mrs. Clinton’s estimation of Sharpton, perhaps the most repugnant racial arsonist in contemporary America, in the years since then. In April 2016, for instance, Clinton again spoke at a National Action Network event where she lauded Sharpton and his organization for steadfastly working “on the frontlines of our nation’s continuing struggle for civil rights,” and “in a million ways lift[ing] up voices that too often go unheard.”¹²³

Speaking of repugnant racial arsonists, in August 2015 Mrs. Clinton held an impromptu, videotaped conversation with three Black Lives Matter (BLM) activists who were complaining about the “mass incarceration” of African Americans. In response to them, Clinton said: “This country has still not recovered from its original sin [slavery] ... Your analysis is totally fair. It’s historically fair, it’s psychologically fair, it’s economically fair.... All I’m suggesting is, even for us sinners [white people], find some common ground on agendas that can make a difference right here and now in people’s lives.”¹²⁴

A bit of background information about BLM is in order here. Founded by Marxist revolutionaries in 2013, BLM depicts the United States as a nation thoroughly awash in racism, sexism, and homophobia. Demonstrators at BLM events commonly smear white police as trigger-happy bigots who are intent upon killing innocent, unarmed black males. The protesters also taunt, and direct obscenities at, uniformed police officers who are on duty. Their principal hero is the Marxist icon, former Black Panther, convicted accomplice in a cop-killing, and longtime fugitive Assata Shakur. At all BLM events, demonstrators invoke a quote by Shakur that includes an excerpt from the *Communist Manifesto* of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.¹²⁵

But hey, who cares? At least Mrs. Clinton never engaged in crude, private trash talk that was recorded on tape. And all of her disparaging, condescending, hate-soaked, fiction-laced denunciations of her political rivals are delivered in measured, solemn, well-rehearsed tones. Plus, of course, it goes without saying that she respects women deeply. Oh, so deeply.

Clinton’s View of the Supreme Court and Its Purpose

When Mrs. Clinton was asked, in an October 2016 presidential debate, to articulate what would be her chief considerations when appointing Supreme Court Justices, she never once mentioned fidelity to the Constitution, which is in fact the principal duty of the Court. Instead, Clinton alluded to the idea that Justices should try to balance the proverbial scales of power in favor of people who lack wealth and influence: “I want to appoint Supreme Court Justices who understand the way the world really works ... [and] actually understand what people are up against.” In other words, Clinton prefers Justices who seek to enforce her particular vision of “social justice,” rather than an ideal of blind, unbiased justice.

Mrs. Clinton then proceeded to explain that she would nominate only Justices who share her public-policy preferences vis-à-vis certain hot-button, litmus-test issues:

(1) “I would want to see the Supreme Court reverse *Citizens United* and get dark unaccountable money out of our politics.” (*Citizens United* was a 2010 Supreme Court ruling that left intact the federal law prohibiting corporations and unions from making campaign contributions to politicians, but nullified a provision barring such entities from paying for political ads made independently of candidate campaigns—on grounds that the First Amendment prohibits Congress from censoring any entity’s right to engage in, or to fund, political speech.)

(2) “I would like the Supreme Court to understand that voting rights are a big problem in many parts of the country. That we don’t do always do everything we can to make it possible for people of color and older people and young people to be able to exercise their franchise.” (In other words, Mrs. Clinton would appoint Justices who oppose Voter ID laws, favor extended early-voting periods, support voting rights for convicted felons, and endorse universal voter registration — all measures that would make it significantly easier to commit voter fraud.)

(3) “I want a Supreme Court that will stick with *Roe v. Wade* and a woman’s right to choose.”

(4) “I want a Supreme Court that will stick with marriage equality” (i.e., same-sex marriage).

Clinton Supports Partial-Birth Abortion

On March 12, 2003, Hillary Clinton went to the Senate floor to speak out against legislation that proposed to ban the procedure commonly known as “partial-birth abortion” — where the abortionist maneuvers the baby into a breech (feet-first) delivery position, permits its entire body to exit the birth canal except for its head, and then uses scissors to puncture the baby’s brain and kill it while the head is still inside the mother. Defending the legality of this procedure and condemning Republicans for trying to outlaw it, Clinton argued that any attempt “to criminalize a medical procedure” would compromise American liberty.¹²⁶

But hey, who cares? At least Mrs. Clinton never engaged in crude, private trash talk that was recorded on tape. And all of her disparaging, condescending, hate-soaked, fiction-laced denunciations of her political rivals are delivered in measured, solemn, well-rehearsed tones. Plus, she respects not only women, but girls as well — even the female babies who are subjected to atrocities like the one described above.

For Hillary Clinton, abortion is a civil liberty that should be funded not by the biological mother herself, but by all taxpayers. Indeed, Planned Parenthood — to Clinton’s delight — receives more than \$520 billion per year in government funding, and much of that is used to pay for abortions.¹²⁷ Moreover, Mrs. Clinton has vowed to repeal what is known as the Hyde Amendment, a 1976 law that has traditionally prohibited federal funding for abortions.¹²⁸ Apparently, for Mrs. Clinton “it takes a village”¹²⁹ to produce enough cultural and moral rot to fully destroy a civilization.

Clinton’s Personal Persecution of a Young Rape Victim

While the Clinton presidential campaign website touts “Hillary’s plan to end campus sexual assault,” it laments that “many who choose to report sexual assault in the criminal justice system fear that their voices will be dismissed instead of heard.”¹³⁰ But Mrs. Clinton herself took part in

one of the most repulsive exhibitions of cruelty to a rape victim ever seen in an American courtroom.

The year was 1975, and attorney Hillary Clinton was defending Thomas Alfred Taylor, a 41-year-old man accused of raping and beating a 12-year-old girl named Kathy Shelton. So brutal was Taylor's assault, that the victim spent five days in a coma immediately afterward; then several months recovering from the physical thrashing that accompanied the rape; plus, more than 10 years in psychotherapy.¹³¹

Mrs. Clinton knew for certain that Taylor was guilty of this crime, as she made clear years later when she discussed the case in a 1980s interview with Arkansas journalist Roy Reed. "He [Taylor] took a lie detector test!" Mrs. Clinton recalled. "I had him take a polygraph test, which he passed, which forever destroyed my faith in polygraphs."¹³²

Notwithstanding her certitude regarding the man's guilt, Clinton negotiated a plea bargain for Taylor by taking advantage of a prosecutorial error — the prosecutors had cut out and examined the blood-covered section of Taylor's underwear that proved his guilt, but then discarded the fabric, making it impossible for the defense to examine it. Because of this misstep, Clinton, confident that the prosecution would be unable to prove Taylor's guilt, pushed for a plea bargain.¹³³

In the aforementioned 1980s interview, Mrs. Clinton laughed as she recounted how the polygraph results were clearly erroneous, and how a forensic scientist from New York was prepared to testify that Taylor could not be convicted if the underwear fabric was no longer available. When Reed asked Clinton about the outcome of the case, she replied, nonchalantly, "Oh he plea bargained. Got him off with time served in the county jail, he'd been in the county jail about two months."¹³⁴

Subsequent to the Taylor trial, a *Newsday* examination of court files and investigative files revealed that Mrs. Clinton had also attacked the young victim's character during the trial by calling into question her motives, her honesty, her temperament, and her ability to perceive reality — even though she knew with 100% certainty that her client was guilty.¹³⁵

In a highly emotional June 2014 interview, Kathy Shelton accused Mrs. Clinton of intentionally lying about her in court documents and going to extraordinary lengths to discredit evidence of the rape. "Hillary Clinton took me through Hell," Shelton said. "She lied like a dog on me. I think she was trying to do whatever she could do to make herself look good at the time.... She wanted it to look good, she didn't care if those guys [Taylor and an accomplice] did it or not. Them two guys should have got a lot longer time [in prison]. I do not think justice was served at all."¹³⁶

But hey, who cares? At least Mrs. Clinton never engaged in crude, private trash talk that was recorded on tape. And all of her disparaging, condescending, hate-soaked, fiction-laced denunciations of her political rivals are delivered in measured, solemn, well-rehearsed tones. Plus, she deeply respects females, even young girls whose known rapists she defends in court, and whose trials she later recalls with self-satisfied bellows of laughter.

Conclusion

This, then, is Hillary Clinton: a woman who is wholly, unequivocally unfit to serve as anything more than an inmate in a federal penitentiary. She has demonstrated, time and again:

- that she cannot, under any circumstances, be trusted with national security or state secrets;
- that she treats the paper on which the Espionage Act is written, with no more reverence than she would give to a strip of toilet paper;
- that she treats with similar disregard the paper on which the U.S. Constitution is written;
- that her judgment in matters of international conflict, diplomacy, and terrorism is an abomination;
- that she routinely uses her “charitable foundation” as a money-laundering operation designed to enrich herself under the guise of helping the needy;
- that she will gladly sell out her country, and everyone in it, in exchange for material riches and political dominion;
- that she is intent upon using the most irresponsible refugee and immigration policies imaginable to import countless millions of people from hostile, impoverished nations across the globe for one core purpose: to permanently transform the American population into one that will vote reliably Democrat from now until the end of time;
- that she fully intends to purge the Second Amendment from the Bill of Rights;
- that she unequivocally plans to expand the disastrous, failing Obamacare debacle into an even more monstrous, government-run, single-payer healthcare system;

- that she favors soft-on-crime policies that have repeatedly been shown to cause violent crime rates to skyrocket;
- that she is perfectly willing to institutionalize massive, ubiquitous voter fraud because she believes that it will ensure additional power for her political party;
- that she views white Americans as a whole, as inherently, “implicitly,”¹³⁷ and “irredeemably”¹³⁸ racist, and therefore in constant need of an all-powerful government to restrain their bigoted impulses;
- that despite her professed aversion to racism in general, she is quite happy to ally herself with “politically correct” racists like Al Sharpton and the Black Lives Matter movement; and
- that she opposes the imposition of any restrictions whatsoever on abortion rights, or on the government’s power to force taxpayers to fund abortions.

In the final analysis, Hillary Clinton is a woman with a mindset that is totalitarian in every respect. To make matters worse, she is a lying, deceiving, manipulative, self-absorbed criminal without a shred of personal virtue. Truly it can be said that never before in American history has anyone so unfit and so undeserving, run for president. Never.