

Hillary Rodham Clinton

*What Every American
Should Know*

The American
Conservative Union

Green Hill Publishers, Inc.
Ottawa, Illinois

Copyright © 2005 by The American Conservative Union

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

For information and other requests please write:

Green Hill Publishers, Inc.

722 Columbus Street

Ottawa, Illinois 61350

Phone Orders: 800-426-1357

Mail Orders: P.O. Box 738, Ottawa, IL 61350

www.greenhillpublishers.com

Printed in the United States of America.

Green Hill Publishers books are distributed to the book trade by MidPoint Trade Books, 27 West 20th Street, Suite 1102, New York, NY 10011 Bookstores please call 212-727-0190 to place orders.

Individuals call 1-800-426-1357 to place orders,

Bookstore returns should be addressed to MidPoint Trade Books, 1263 Southwest Boulevard, Kansas City, KS 66103.

ISBN: 0-89803-164-8

6 5 4 3 2 1 \ 09 08 07 06 05

A former newspaper editor who had lunch with Hillary while she was First Lady of Arkansas reported the following exchange: "During a lapse in a conversation about what Bill wanted to do, I asked her, 'What do you want to do?' She leaned toward me, eyes ablaze, and said in as intense a voice as I ever heard, 'I want to run something!'"

—John Robert Starr, "The Well-Traveled Hillary Clinton," *Arkansas Democrat-Gazette*,
November 27, 1997

Contents

INTRODUCTION The Second Coming 7

PART I Portrait of a Radical

- 1 Who Is Hillary Rodham? 9
- 2 Along Came Bill 17
- 3 What's In a Name? 19

PART II Shady Lady

- 4 Cattlegate 24
- 5 Whitewater 29
- 6 Travelgate 39
- 7 Filegate 42
- 8 Lootgate 47
- 9 The Book Deal 53
- 10 Galagate 57

PART III Hillary Votes, Speaks, and Spins

- 11 Hillary's Radical Voting Record 65
- 12 Hillary Turns to the Right 72
- 13 Conclusion 91

INTRODUCTION

The Second Coming

Some people fear nuclear attacks from third-world countries.

Others fear a catastrophic collapse of the U.S. economy.

But if you want to feel intense, gut-wrenching fear, consider this fact: There's a good chance that the Clintons will be back in the White House in 2009, pushing Hillary's Left-wing agenda, lying to the American people, flouting the nation's laws, pardoning crooks, and seducing interns.

In December of 2004 Fox News Opinion Dynamics ran a poll pitting Hillary Clinton against three of the high-profile Republicans mentioned as possible nominees in 2008. The results were chilling: Hillary beat them all—and by impressive margins.

- Against Bill Frist—the GOP Senate Majority Leader from Tennessee—Hillary wins by seven points, 40% to 33%. To be sure, Frist is not well known nationally, but thus far he has a spotless reputation and a voting record that closely mirrors the views of the American people.
- Against George Pataki, two-term governor of New York, she wins by a slightly closer margin—41% to 35%. Pataki is also relatively unknown nationwide.
- On the other hand, Jeb Bush, Governor of Florida, has high name recognition—the son and brother of presidents and governor of a large state. So you would expect him to do better against Hillary. In fact, he does worse. She wins by 46% to 35%, an 11-point margin.

To make the future even scarier, Fox News Opinion Dynamics asked those polled whether or not they thought she was up to the job. Fox found that “a clear majority of voters thinks Hillary Clinton is qualified to be president of the United States” (a whopping 59%, including a third of Republicans, 58% of independents, and 84% of Democrats).

You can be certain that at this very moment, Bill and Hillary are sitting in one of their two houses—furnished with gifts from favor-seekers like Marc Rich—planning their third term as co-presidents of the United States. Today, the Second Coming of the Clintons looms large and terrifying, like the crest of a 100-foot tsunami. However, this book demonstrates that such a catastrophe, worldwide in its implications, is by no means inevitable.

In the first place, Hillary Clinton has a history of Left-wing radicalism that the mainstream media have successfully concealed for more than a decade now. She has run with a pack of political predators fiercely committed to replacing our market economy and the traditional family with a socialist regime that commands Americans to accept economic servitude. It didn’t work in the Soviet Union. It won’t work here. Hillary Clinton believes otherwise, as this book will prove.

In the second place, as surprising as it may seem, Hillary Clinton is more devious and dishonest than Bill. Some people would argue that instead of running for president, she should be serving time in a federal prison—for unlawful manipulation of the commodities market, for shady legal practices, for misuse of FBI files for partisan political purposes, and for conspiracy to violate federal election laws. As the reader will see, her record of deceit, arrogance, and abuse of power is sufficient to raise doubts about her capacity to hold the highest office in the land.

In the third place, her voting record is among the most liberal in the Senate. As she audaciously attempts to rede-

fine herself as a “moderate,” her positions on a wide range of issues, both foreign and domestic, betray her as a worshipper of big-government, a tax-and-spend freak, a raging feminist, a warrior for gay rights, and an apologist for felons. She can’t sweep this record under one of those rugs she “lost.” Her voting pattern betrays her radicalism and duplicity, particularly in those areas where she has attempted to redefine herself as “conservative”—in national defense, immigration, faith-based initiatives, and abortion. She and her allies in the press have engaged in a campaign of disinformation so bold and so clever that only a thorough analysis of her previous statements and actions can untangle fact from fiction, truth from lies.

This book is designed to answer questions about Hillary Clinton’s political history and her qualifications to become the 44th President of the United States. One thing is certain: Without this discussion—or one like it—you will never learn enough about this woman to make a well-informed decision about her qualifications to become the leader of the free world.

PART I
PORTRAIT OF A RADICAL

1 Who Is Hillary Rodham?

Hillary Clinton is a study in contradictions—a daddy’s girl turned feminist, a frump turned

fashion plate, a Marxist turned commodities trader, a domineering woman turned into a stand-by-your-man wife.

Yet through all these metamorphoses—or apparent metamorphoses—Hillary has remained the same public woman. She has been a student protester; a defender of the Black Panthers; an advocate of “children’s rights” as defined by radicals; a Watergate prosecutor; a teeth-grinding abortion advocate; an activist First Lady; a senator; a would-be president; and, above all, a militant control freak. In these roles, she’s almost cookie-cutter perfect—a woman radicalized by the Sixties, who believes American society is inherently evil and wants to transform it—for its own good, of course—into a Scandinavian-type socialist state.

Before tracing Hillary Rodham Clinton’s record as radical activist, however, you must understand who Hillary Rodham is and where she came from.

The Rodhams were conventional middle-class suburbanites who lived northwest of Chicago. They were comfortable but neither rich nor socially prominent. Hillary’s father, Hugh Rodham, started a small custom-drapery business after World War II; and eventually he was successful enough to afford a house in Park Ridge, a community composed largely of the more affluent blue-collar workers and the less affluent white-collar workers.

As for politics, Hillary’s father, Hugh Rodham, was the family authority. Something of a curmudgeon—a petty tyrant in his own household and standoffish with his neighbors—he was regarded by many as eccentric. He was a Taft Republican, and he chewed tobacco. So sure was he of his own views that he forced his children to watch the entire 1952 GOP convention and forbade them to watch the Democratic counterpart (Christopher P. Andersen, *Bill and Hillary: The Marriage*, Best Sellers, 1999, p. 92).

Dorothy Rodham, who was secretly in rebellion against

her husband, was a closet Democrat who voted for John F. Kennedy in 1960 and quietly tried to shape her daughter’s political thinking. “How on earth,” she would later boast, “do you think Hillary ever became a Democrat?” (ibid.).

Not as the result of Dorothy Rodham.

In fact, while still in high school, Hillary became a “Goldwater Girl” and in 1964 campaigned for the Arizona senator in his unsuccessful bid for the presidency (ibid., p. 97).

However, other conflicting influences were at work. In her early teens, she learned about the social gospel as a member of the First United Methodist Church. At 13, she and other teenagers were sent to baby-sit for minority migrant workers who were harvesting crops in Illinois. At 14, she was a member of the congregation’s “University of Life,” a group the Rev. Don Jones tirelessly indoctrinated with the simplistic and appealing dogmas of the Left (ibid., pp. 95–96).

Jones showed them pictures of the victims of Franco’s forces in the Spanish Civil War. Then he took them to Chicago’s south side to show them the same conditions. His point to impressionable youngsters was obvious: America was no different from Franco’s Spain (ibid.).

Jones also introduced Hillary and the rest of his political acolytes to activist Saul Alinsky, author of *Reveille for Radicals*, and to Martin Luther King, Jr., who delivered a lecture called “Sleeping Through the Revolution” (ibid., p. 96). Despite this attempt to reshape her thinking, Hillary was still a Republican when she graduated from high school in 1965. However, as she matured, Jones would become increasingly influential in her life.

The following fall her parents drove her to Wellesley, one of the most expensive women’s colleges in the nation. There she registered for classes and was soon elected president of the Young Republicans (YR).

Most young people are intellectual chameleons, taking on the protective coloration of the political and intellectual world around them. Hillary was no exception. Within a year, she had resigned as president of the Wellesley YR and was beginning to involve herself in campus debates over civil rights, Vietnam, and capitalism. She wrote her senior thesis on the Johnson Administration's Community Action Program, a product of the Great Society (*ibid.*, p. 99).

Like so many undergraduates, she quickly surrendered the values she'd brought to college and adopted the ones her professors and fellow students were promoting. She came to Wellesley the child of her father and left a child of the Sixties. She soon hated capitalism, thought American society was decadent, and yearned for drastic change to correct the nation's misguided course. Wellesley, like many northeastern schools, had more than its share of Marxist faculty members. During that same period, an organizer for ISI, a conservative youth group, reported that he found only five Wellesley students who were willing to come out of the closet and call themselves "conservative." Even those complained of threats and harassment from both fellow students and faculty (confidential telephone interview, November 3, 1999).

All over the country, students were demonstrating against the war abroad and inequality at home, burning flags or wearing them on the seats of their pants, staging sit-ins in the offices of terrified college presidents, and even torching and bombing buildings. While this orgiastic destruction was taking place, editorial writers and TV reporters were describing campus revolutionaries as "idealistic" and "peace-loving."

Hillary Rodham was not this kind of revolutionary. Perhaps her ambitions extended beyond Wellesley and the 1960s. Her mother had encouraged her to be the first woman

on the U.S. Supreme Court. Riot and arson weren't reliable avenues to the High Court or, for that matter, to the White House. Both goals were probably in the back of Hillary's mind. So while she shared the aims and ideology of student revolutionaries, she emerged as "a voice of reason" on the campus.

Yet these early years reflect an increasing commitment to extreme Leftist ideology:

- She brought Saul Alinsky to the Wellesley campus to give his views on revolution. So worshipful was she that Alinsky offered her a job after she graduated. She turned him down to continue her studies. (Andersen, pp. 99, 100)
- Her "University of Life" experiences now seemed important, and she carried on a correspondence with the Rev. Don Jones. Also she began to read a magazine for Methodist youth called *Motive*. *Motive* was edited by Carl Oglesby, described as a Marxist-Maoist, who—while Hillary was in college—was also president of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), an organization dedicated to the violent reform of the U.S. government. (Andersen, p. 99)
- When black Senator Edward Brooke, in an address to Hillary's graduating class at Wellesley, attacked violence as a means of change, while expressing empathy for the goals of those who were rioting, student speaker Hillary Rodham stepped up to the podium and—in the imprecise and intemperate language students were using those days—told Brooke off: "Senator Brooke, part of the problem with empathy for professed goals is that empathy doesn't do anything. We've had lots of empathy. We've had lots of sympathy, but we feel that for too long our leaders have used politics as the art of the possible. And the challenge now is to practice the art of making what

appears to be impossible, possible . . . We are, all of us, exploring a world that none of us understands and attempting to create within that uncertainty. But there are things we feel, feelings that our prevailing, acquisitive, and competitive corporate life, including tragically the universities, is not the way of life for us." It was the speech of a precocious brat, but it caught the attention of the Left nationwide. (Barbara Olson, *Hell to Pay*, pp. 42–43)

After Wellesley, Hillary decided to study law at Yale; and as soon as she arrived, she threw herself into the anti-war movement, joining the League of Women Voters as a means of promoting Leftist politics in the mainstream. She also involved herself in other student activities. Again, she immediately rose to the top.

- She was chosen to make the 50th anniversary speech to the League, and she took the podium wearing a black armband commemorating the students killed at Kent State. Typical of student rhetoric at the time, her speech was shrill and Marxist in tone: "How much longer can we let corporations run us? Isn't it about time that they, as all the rest of our institutions, are held accountable to the people?" (Andersen, p. 103)
- In the spring of 1970, Black Panther leader Bobby Seale and seven fellow Panthers went on trial in New Haven for torturing and then murdering one of the brothers whom they suspected of squealing to the cops. Huey Newton and Jane Fonda came to town to lead protest rallies. After all, black radicals—particularly those dedicated to violent revolution—couldn't be expected to receive a fair trial from a corrupt WASP legal system. Hillary Rodham organized a group of students to moni-

tor the trial for the American Civil Liberties Union. In the course of that trial, the police bombarded rowdy students with tear gas, and someone set fire to the law library. When the students planned their reaction, it was Hillary who presided over the meeting. One fellow student would later say that no one "could remember what the meeting was about—only that we were awed by her." Yale students organized a strike in support of the Panthers, and Huey Newton termed the United States "fascist" and called for violent revolution. By then, such activities were familiar spectacles on almost every large campus nationwide. Spoiled, self-righteous middle-class students from Massachusetts to California were tearing down their own universities in the name of free speech and a classless society. (*Ibid.*, p. 104)

- During her junior year, Hillary met Marian Wright Edelman and served as her summer intern in Washington. Edelman, a collectivist ideologue, was using "children's rights" as a weapon with which to advance her radical agenda, and particularly to attack the institution of the family. As an intern, Hillary was assigned to Fritz Mondale's subcommittee on migrant labor, where she conducted interviews with workers in migrant labor camps, documenting the disgraceful conditions under which they worked. (Olson, pp. 101–102)
- At this stage, her righteous indignation against America and its capitalist system boiled over. When Minute Maid, a subdivision of Coca-Cola, was implicated in the migrant worker scandal, the CEO of Coca-Cola came to Washington to testify. An irate Hillary, full of self-assured indignation, confronted him at a congressional hearing and, shaking an accusing finger at him, said, "We're going to nail your ass! Nail your ass!" (Andersen, pp. 104–105)
- Bobby Seale's lawyer introduced Hillary to Robert

Treuhaft and his wife, Jessica Mitford. Both were avowed Communists, and Treuhaft for years served as the attorney for the Communist Party, USA. As the result of this meeting, Hillary spent the summer of 1971 as an intern in Treuhaft's law office in Berkeley. (Olson, p. 57)

Few mainstream journalists have focused on this aspect of Hillary's intellectual development. Some dismiss her early activism as no more than the folly of youth—a natural expression of idealism in a time of social upheaval. ("What college student didn't go a little crazy in the Sixties?") Perhaps, as politically correct activists themselves, journalists see nothing worrisome about such a past. ("What's wrong with Saul Alinsky and Bob Treuhaft? Great Americans!") And perhaps they don't want Republicans to latch onto the issue—particularly now that Hillary is the presidential nominee-apparent.

One thing is certain: Unlike Sixties revolutionary Jerry Rubin (who became a stockbroker), Hillary Rodham has never gotten the late Sixties and early Seventies out of her system. Because she connected with so many Leftist icons while she was in college and law school, she ended up on the boards of the Legal Services Corporation and the Children's Defense Fund and has never surrendered her commitment to the necessity of transforming limited government into Leviathan in order to impose order and equality on a subject people, as her infamous health-care plan illustrated.

However, the injustices of capitalism and family life weren't the only things on her mind at Yale. By then, she'd met Bill Clinton and had fallen unpredictably, unequivocally in love.

2 Along Came Bill

Bill Clinton was a man like none Hillary Rodham had ever seen. Tall and trim, he looked like an athlete without having to be one. He was warm, outgoing, and exhibited the easy courtesy of a plantation heir, while professing the politics of a migrant worker.

Clinton had also learned a lesson that most men skip: He listened quietly and attentively when women talked, as if he really wanted to hear what they were saying. And he had a tender, thoughtful, disarming quality about him—one that made him all but irresistible.

He also had something else women liked—a smooth self-confidence that bordered on cockiness, yet somehow stopped just short of the mark. He was never shy or awkward in their presence. He knew all the right moves and performed them flawlessly. Girls he'd seduced in high school remembered him as "sweet."

The manners, the tenderness, the warm grin, the sunny disposition hit Hillary like a freight train. Here was a man who shared her political agenda, yet wasn't an awkward Left-wing geek who made long coffee-house speeches about gender equality and treated her like a housemaid.

Hillary may have thought she'd "discovered" Bill Clinton when, in fact, literally hundreds of meretricious cuties in Arkansas, northern Virginia, England, and even New Haven had long ago discovered him—in the backseats of cars, in motel rooms, and in scores of other unlikely places.

He'd been discovered so many times that he'd lost count.

In fact, he had a real problem: He enjoyed "discovery" so much that it had become a vocation with him. He was a serial seducer, who, wherever he went, would bed as many women as he could work into a busy schedule. It wasn't something he *liked* to do. It was something he *had* to do—an addiction, an obsession—the only thing that overrode his almost boundless ambition.

By the time he arrived in New Haven, his sex life was in high gear. A glutton rather than a gourmet, he had to have a woman almost daily. His appetite was so voracious that any old girl would do, provided she was willing and they could find a private place.

Indeed, sometimes privacy was irrelevant. Dolly Kyle Browning of Arkansas—perhaps Bill's most talkative conquest—tells of coupling in a friend's backyard and parking in a residential neighborhood, taking off their clothes, and having intercourse twice in the front seat of a Cadillac convertible—with the top down. "He is so arrogant he thinks he'll never be caught," she later explained. "And then there's a part of him that wants to be caught because he thinks he can lie his way out of anything. Usually, he can" (Andersen, p. 154).

But in the case of Hillary Rodham, it wasn't just another roll in the hay. He found her as intriguing and as inviting as she found him.

Bill was not the kind of smooth Ivy League man that Hillary had been dating; and she was unlike any girl he had looked at twice. He went for cheerleaders, beauty queens, and young married women with red lips, rouged cheeks, and blonde hair that tumbled in ringlets down their bare backs. Hillary Clinton wore no makeup, didn't bother to shave her legs and wash her hair (much less style it), and barged around in clothes calculated to make her look like a grape picker's daughter.

Hillary was like no other girl Bill had ever known.

So they fell in love at Yale Law School and, to the surprise of all their friends, they were soon living together. When he went back to Arkansas, she followed him. There they lived together, and both taught at the University of Arkansas law school in Fayetteville. Finally, after a stormier relationship than most, they were married.

Marriage changed little about their lives. They continued to live together. She kept her name. He kept climbing into other women's beds. Despite these activities, however, Bill was elected Attorney General of Arkansas, and then Governor.

3 What's In a Name?

During Bill's first gubernatorial race in 1978, Hillary was not an issue. But after he was elected and the Clintons moved into the governor's mansion, the press and public began to scrutinize her more carefully. And they soon discovered she was an unlikely—and unlikable—First Lady of Arkansas.

In the first place, like a growing number of feminists, she refused to take her husband's last name. As she later explained, "I had made speeches in the name of Hillary Rodham. I had taught law under that name. I was, after all, twenty-eight when I was married, and I was fairly well-established" ("*60 Minutes*," January 26, 1992).

To many traditionalists—and Arkansas had more than its share—refusing to take your husband's name was a

repudiation of the institution of marriage itself, where two people become one flesh, a single “person” in the eyes of the law. It smacked of cohabitation rather than holy matrimony. It was also a reproof to her husband, as if becoming a Clinton was somehow demeaning.

And that wasn’t all. Instead of acting as his hostess and speaking on behalf of highway beautification at ladies’ luncheons, Hillary decided to continue her law practice at the Rose Law Firm.

“We realized that being a governor’s wife could be a full-time job,” she explained. “But I need to maintain my interests and my commitments. I need my own identity, too” (ibid.).

Many Arkansans regarded such an attitude as proud and haughty—an excess of ego and an affront to the people of the state. Others would become impatient with talk about “commitments” and “identity”—the kind of dialogue they heard on “As the World Turns.”

What’s more, because she had stringy brown hair, dressed like a social worker, scorned makeup, wore Ben Franklin glasses, and laced her speech with four-letter words, gossips spread the word that she was a lesbian. Christopher Andersen quotes an Arkansas woman as saying, “Some of the women she was close to were tough-as-nails types. They wore unflattering, boxy business suits, let their hair go gray, and swore like sailors” (Andersen, p. 173).

Instead of taking this kind of talk seriously, the First Lady of Arkansas dismissed it with remarks such as, “When I look at what’s available in the man department, I’m surprised more women aren’t gay” (ibid.).

On the other hand, before Bill’s two-year term had expired, the First Lady did something that muted the charges of sexual deviance: She gave birth to a child. Ordinarily motherhood would have acquitted her of all charges in the

eyes of Arkansans; but instead of staying home and taking care of her daughter, after four months she returned to work at the Rose Law Firm. A number of Arkansans concluded that she “just wouldn’t do.”

Both Clintons apparently assumed that Bill would win reelection and gave only half-hearted attention to the 1980 campaign. Neither apparently realized the degree to which Arkansans judged a man’s worth by the way he managed his home life. Too many voters believed that Bill Clinton’s hardboiled Yankee wife ran both their marriage and the state of Arkansas.

So widespread was the defection that in the 1980 election, Republican Frank White scored an upset, beating Bill Clinton by 31,000 votes. Both Clintons were in shock. Election night, everyone was crying, including the boy governor. Bill even gave a teary-eyed speech before a joint session of the legislature in which he said grandiosely, “Remember me as one who reached for all he could for Arkansas” (ibid., p. 180).

Bill moped around for months, in a perpetual state of self-pity. He blamed everybody under the sun for his defeat, even himself; and in private he must have blamed Hillary as well. He went up to strangers in restaurants and begged forgiveness for not living up to their expectations. As a lame duck governor, he invited clergymen to the governor’s mansion to pray for him (a ploy he would adopt again after Monica Lewinsky became front-page news) (ibid., pp. 181–182).

By 1982, however, Bill had ended his prolonged public sulk. Coddled by Hillary and friend-consultant Betsey White, he had finally wiped the tears from his eyes, managed a crooked grin, and begun to practice law with the firm of Wright, Lindsey, and Jennings. He had also announced that he would again be a candidate for governor.

Most of all, he wanted to beat Republican Frank White

and avenge the defeat. First, however, he had to win the Democratic nomination. His primary opponents were the current Lt. Governor and former Congressman Jim Guy Tucker, who was also a loser, having been recently defeated in a bid for the Senate.

But what about the Hillary factor? According to many observers, she had been the chief reason why he'd lost two years earlier. Would she continue to wear frumpy dresses and barge around Arkansas like SuperMs?

As soon as the campaign began, Arkansans noticed the transformation in Hillary Clinton.

When she went out in public, her hair was washed and even coiffed.

She wore makeup—not the brightest lipstick or the heaviest mascara, but makeup nonetheless, makeup that was noticeable.

She dressed like a smart woman rather than a truck driver in drag.

She had traded in the Ben Franklin glasses for contact lenses.

And most important of all, she was now introduced as “Mrs. Bill Clinton.” In fact, she was introducing herself that way!

Hillary must have engaged in lengthy self-examination before making this soul-wrenching concession. On the one hand, as she herself said, keeping her own name was keeping her own identity intact. Hillary Rodham was who she *was*—independent, self-assertive, refreshingly obscure, an in-your-face woman blazing a trail through the harsh and hostile wilderness of a male-dominated society.

On the other hand, Hillary Rodham was standing in the way of Bill Clinton's political career. From the beginning, the two of them had set their sights on the presidency.

And after Bill's election as Arkansas's youngest governor ever, not to mention the youngest in the nation, that goal seemed within reach. Then, in 1980 Bill was suddenly the youngest has-been in the state's history. And many people said that she was largely to blame.

Now that Bill had a chance to make a comeback, which would she choose—pride or ambition?

In the end, ambition won hands down—probably because she didn't want to waste the years she'd invested in Bill and in the hopelessly reactionary state of Arkansas. This new Hillary—the “little woman,” wearing her lipstick and blush, looking up adoringly at Bubba—wasn't a major asset to the campaign, but she was no longer a liability. Bill knocked Jim Guy Tucker out of the running in the first primary, defeated the Lt. Governor in the runoff, and whipped Frank White in the general election.

Though Hillary remained a hard-nosed professional woman and an absentee mother, she had toned down her militancy to the point where she was tolerable to Arkansas. And she continued to play her dual role, balancing her outwardly conventional appearance with her inward zeal to be a political and social Amazon. Henceforth, anyone who wished to understand her had to come to terms with the paradoxical nature of her character—and her uncanny willingness to compromise, to back down, to do whatever it took to win.

As for Bill Clinton—in part because of Hillary's sacrifice of herself on the altar of his success—he would remain Governor of Arkansas until he was elected President of the United States.

PART II
SHADY LADY

4 Cattlegate

In 1978—as her husband was on the verge of election as Governor of Arkansas—Hillary was dabbling in cattle futures.

At the time, the combined income of the Clintons was around \$60,000; so Hillary couldn't risk a lot—a mere \$1,000 to dip her toe into an uncertain stream. However, it turned out she was enormously successful—so successful that her friends called it beginner's luck. On the other hand, a lot of cynics in Arkansas and elsewhere came to believe that luck played little or no role in her windfall, that she and her financial adviser had engaged in a scam.

The popular media have said comparatively little about Hillary's venture in cattle futures—perhaps because commodities trading is complicated, perhaps because Hillary Clinton is untouchable. However, some business publications have examined these transactions in depth and found them highly suspect. Here are the bare facts.

In 1978—when her husband was still attorney general of Arkansas—Hillary Rodham Clinton opened a futures account with Refco, a Chicago-based firm, whose local broker was Robert L. “Red” Bone. She turned the management of this account over to James Blair, counsel for Tyson Foods Inc., one of the biggest chicken processors in the country and a major Arkansas employer (James B. Stewart, *Blood Sport*, p. 77).

Blair's connection with Tyson is by no means irrelevant to a consideration of Hillary's futures account. Over the years, Don Tyson had been a major supporter of Bill Clinton's political campaigns—according to some, the most generous contributor of all.

A good ol' boy with a mean streak, “Big Daddy” Tyson probably killed, gutted, packaged, and shipped more chickens in a day than most chicken farmers saw in a lifetime.

An attorney general or governor could do a lot of favors for an old chicken plucker. And Big Daddy needed all the breaks he could get from friends in high places. For example, in a state-regulated food industry, it made a difference who was inspecting for health hazards and environmental infractions. The right inspector—somebody who understood the troubles chickens could pose and who could use a little extra money “off the books”—might well make the difference in whether or not people nationwide bought Tyson's chicken tenders or Perdue's. So, if you were a chicken man, it was nice to be chums with the attorney general and odds-on future governor.

Jim Blair performed a satisfying service for Big Daddy and Bill Clinton: He arranged deals that made both men very happy. And it's hard to believe that Hillary's futures account wasn't a part of those mutually beneficial arrangements.

As noted above, her initial investment was small. However, over the next year, Blair wrought miracles that Harry Potter has yet to learn. The account grew like Jack's beanstalk and stood at almost \$100,000 when she collected her winnings. Some of her biggest scores came from selling short—a particularly risky venture because of potential margin calls (*ibid.*, pp. 79–81).

Blair and Bone had an understanding about margin calls—Refco didn't issue them, regardless of the circum-

stances. “Buying on the margin” means putting up a “down payment” on a contract. You put down 10 percent, say, selling cattle futures short based on the current price. This means you’re betting the price will fall. If the price increases, your liability increases and the new 10 percent is higher than the old one. At that point, a brokerage house will issue a margin call, asking you to put in more money to cover what looms as a substantial loss.

When it came to margin calls, Bone was defiant—so much so that in 1977 the Chicago Board of Trade had disciplined him and ordered the Refco home office in Chicago to limit his activities, an order Bone didn’t obey. He was also reprimanded by the Chicago Mercantile Exchange, which cited “repeated and serious violations of record-keeping functions, order-entry procedures, margin requirements and hedge procedures” *ibid.*, pp. 78–79).

The question of margin calls is relevant here, because had Bone and Blair played by the rules, according to James Glassman of the *New Republic*, in July of 1979 Hillary should have received a margin call to pony up \$117,500! No such call was issued, though it undoubtedly would have come from any other commodities office (*ibid.*, p. 80).

Hillary entered the market on October 11, 1978. On her first ten cattle contracts, she sold short—the most dangerous kind of trading, since you’re betting that prices will fall and risking enormous losses if they rise. With Blair handling the account, she bought and sold, either the same day or the next day, and walked off with a profit of \$5,300. By October 23 she had made an additional profit of almost \$8,000 (*ibid.*, p. 79).

Hillary—who had spent valuable time denouncing the greedy predators of Wall Street—enjoyed the exhilaration of making money the easy way. Her account experienced a few downs, but mostly Blair reported lots and lots of ups.

In fact, she admitted that while she was in labor with Chelsea, she was worrying about her sugar futures (*ibid.*, p. 84).

Marshall Magazine, a publication of the Marshall School of Business at the University of Southern California, printed a remarkably frank and revealing analysis of these transactions:

These results are quite remarkable. Two-thirds of her trades showed a profit by the end of the day she made them and 80 percent were ultimately profitable. Many of her trades took place at or near the best prices of the day.

Only four explanations can account for these remarkable results. Blair may have been an exceptionally good trader. Hillary Clinton may have been exceptionally lucky. Blair may have been front-running other orders. Or Blair may have arranged to have a broker fraudulently assign trades to benefit [Hillary] Clinton’s account. Many people familiar with these markets think that the first two explanations are exceedingly unlikely. Well-informed traders rarely trade with such remarkable success and consistency. (“Hillary Clinton’s Cattle Futures Trading Profits,” *Marshall Magazine*, Winter 1998, p. 1)

In other words, the odds of a trader honestly achieving these results are simply too high for hard-nosed traders to believe. The *Journal of Economics and Statistics* placed the odds at 250 million to one (quoted in Andersen, p. 167). And the fact that staid academic and professional journals would state the proposition in such blunt language is an indication of just how widespread and respectable these suspicions are. The only question remaining is: Which of these two illegal methods did Blair or the broker use on behalf of Hillary Clinton?

Marshall Magazine even provided a likely answer to that question:

Although no evidence of fraudulent trade assignment has ever surfaced, this method seems most likely to many people. Here is a simple explanation of how a dishonest broker can achieve this objective: Execute buy and sell orders in the same contract. The contract price will eventually go up or go down. If it goes up, assign the profitable buy trades to the favored account and assign the losing sell trades to an account owned by the benefactor. If the price falls, assign the profitable sell trades to the favored account and assign the losing buy trades to the benefactor's account (*Marshall Magazine*, p. 1).

Marshall Magazine went so far as to speculate on the identity of the benefactor:

Many of Clinton's political enemies believe that the scheme was designed to surreptitiously transfer an illegal bribe or gratuity to Clinton in exchange for a political favor or for political influence. They believe that Don Tyson—a major supporter of Clinton—was the benefactor. (Ibid.)

This series of transactions illustrates several important points about Hillary Clinton and her role in Bill Clinton's rise to power. First, she clearly believed in the old adage that you could sup with the Devil if you used a long-handled spoon. Big Daddy Tyson was everything she'd been taught to despise at Wellesley and Yale—a greedy capitalist who hated unions and had no compunction about polluting Mother Earth for financial gain. Yet she allowed Blair, Big Daddy's right-hand man, to manage her financial affairs.

Second, assuming the speculation in *Marshall Magazine* is correct, then she was the conduit for a bribe. If so—and many signs point in that direction—then it's virtually impossible to believe that she entered into this scheme in all innocence.

Third, legal or illegal, this was not a campaign contribution, justifiable in terms of ultimate and noble political ends. This was cash flowing into the Clintons' personal account. After all, the Clintons had acquired rich, influential friends; and they needed the funds to travel comfortably in such circles. Ultimately, the cultivation of the moneyed crowd would prove politically advantageous; but they had to dress in the right clothes and entertain in the right way.

And fourth, the money came to Hillary rather than to the attorney general—a way to sidestep some of the ethical issues that might have been raised had Bill opened a futures account and beaten such incredible odds. In chivalric Arkansas, a politician's wife is cut some slack. Only in 1994, after Bill was President of the United States, would anyone seriously scrutinize her commodities trading account.

5 Whitewater

The Whitewater caper began in 1978 when Bill and Hillary were having dinner with Jim and Susan McDougal at the Black-Eyed Pea restaurant in Little Rock (Stewart, p. 60). Jim McDougal was older than Bill and had been in Arkansas politics longer. He was also a born hustler. That evening he told Bill and Hillary about "a real sweet real estate deal" that he had found and wanted to share with them.

The "deal" was 250 acres of land on a bluff high above the White River. The scene was breathtaking and the land

suitable for subdivision. McDougal believed it would be ideal property for “get-away” cabins and retirement homes. Developers all over the South were making fortunes selling such plots to Northerners who wanted to move to a milder climate, swim, fish, and generally take life easy. The whole tract could be had for a mere \$202,000. And neither couple would have to put up a dime. It could all be done on OPM (other people’s money).

McDougal would later recall that Bill Clinton “had no business sense, so he couldn’t have cared less.” But Hillary—the same Hillary who habitually denounced the insatiable greed of contemporary society—“paid very close attention to the details. She was interested, and she was the one we talked to” (Andersen, p. 165).

She concluded that what the McDougals said made sense, so the two couples formed the Whitewater Development Corporation, borrowed \$20,000 for a down payment from the United National Bank and financed the balance with a loan from Citizens Bank and Trust of Flippin (from whose president they were buying a portion of the land).

At the time, it looked like a sure thing. However, interest rates soared over the next couple of years and fewer lots sold than expected. That meant the income from land sales was often insufficient to make the mortgage payments, so somebody had to pony up the difference. That somebody was usually the McDougals, though occasionally the Clintons had to kick in a portion. Over the years these shortfall payments added up to almost \$175,000. Of this amount, \$138,000 had been paid by the McDougals, and only \$36,000 had been paid by the Clintons (Stewart, p. 153).

In fact, both couples experienced cash flow problems because of Whitewater. The McDougals chose to wheel and deal their way out of trouble. Soon enough they owed so much money that \$175,000 was petty cash. Hillary bor-

rowed \$30,000 to pump money into the project through the purchase of a house on the property, and then had trouble making the payments. Eventually Bill—by then Governor—borrowed \$20,000 to help settle Hillary’s debt, and the other \$10,000 was retired, though no one is quite sure just how (probably through the auspices of Jim McDougal, who by then owned the Madison Guaranty Trust [an S&L] and was looking at a sweet little bank in another town) (ibid. pp. 99, 101).

The story of the McDougals and Madison is itself a parable of high expectations, bad luck, mismanagement, and unscrupulous behavior. Because of all these factors, Madison was soon in deep trouble, teetering on the brink of collapse.

By early April of 1985 James McDougal thought he’d figured out a way to save Madison Guaranty from extinction. He would issue preferred stock and use proceeds from the sale of the issue to caulk up the leaks in his S&L.

In order to do that, however, he needed a big favor from his buddy in the governor’s mansion. The Arkansas Securities Commission would have to approve the issuance of the stock—and no S&L in history had ever issued preferred stock to recapitalize. Bill Clinton could ensure that approval, and McDougal had every right to expect the Governor to come through for him. After all, hadn’t the McDougals borne the primary burden of the Whitewater investment?

And he’d done the Clintons another favor—thrown some Madison business to Hillary to help shore up her position at the Rose Law Firm. According to McDougal, the Governor had jogged over to McDougal’s office, collapsed into a chair, and told McDougal—who watched as sweat poured down Bill’s back and onto an expensive blue leather chair—that the partners at Rose were putting pressure on Hillary to bring in more business. McDougal said he would

give her some of Madison's business, and Bill bounded out the door, leaving a huge greasy stain on the blue leather (*ibid.*, pp. 123–124).

Hillary and the Rose Law Firm were immediately put on a \$2,000 monthly retainer (*ibid.*, p. 124).

So the Clintons owed them.

Consider, then, the propriety of the following sequence of events, as outlined by Senator Kit Bond of Missouri in a report to the U.S. Senate entitled “Whitewater: What We Now Know,” (March 29, 1996):

- On April 3 Jim McDougal hosted a fundraiser for Governor Bill Clinton in the lobby of Madison Guaranty to pay off a personal loan of \$50,000 that Bill had floated to finance his gubernatorial campaign. The event raised \$33,000.
- On April 18 McDougal sent a memo to John Latham, president of the bank, in which he said, “I want this preferred stock matter cleared up immediately.”
- Around this time, McDougal hired Hillary Clinton as Madison Guaranty's lawyer.
- On April 23 Hillary opened a file named “preferred stock” and billed Madison Guaranty for the time she spent talking to McDougal and Latham on this matter.
- Shortly thereafter—still in the month of April—she called Arkansas Securities Commissioner Beverly Basset Schaffer about obtaining approval for the preferred stock sale. (Perhaps it's worth noting here that Commissioner Schaffer was appointed to her post by Governor Bill Clinton.)
- Hillary would later say that she didn't remember talking to Schaffer. Schaffer, however, recalled the conversation in minute detail: Hillary had told her “that they had a proposal and what it was about.” Schaffer claimed that the call didn't influence her decision on the Madison

Guaranty stock issue. However, her assistant, Charles Handley, sent her a memo stating that Madison was on shaky financial ground and advising against approval of the stock venture. Schaffer overruled him.

- Shortly thereafter, Schaffer wrote a letter to “Dear Hillary” in which she announced approval of the stock issue. McDougal forwarded the happy news to Latham, with the following note written across it: “Be sure we keep their \$2000 a month retainer paid.”

Here is Missouri Senator Kit Bond's summary of these events: “To the Average Missourian, it's clear why Jim McDougal would switch horses [attorneys] in the middle of the stream—his new attorney's husband appointed the people he needed her to call. He had just raised \$33,000 to help the Clintons pay off a personal loan, money that would have to come out of their own pocket if they could not raise the cash, so the timing to ask a favor was certainly right.”

So was that the end of Madison's problems? Unfortunately for McDougal, he couldn't find anyone naive enough to buy his preferred stock.

To save their mortgaged rear ends, Susan took over the management of the McDougal fortunes and bought a huge tract of land that she was certain would solve all their problems—another real estate venture called Castle Grande Estates.

Now the image one might conjure up of a development named Castle Grande Estates would probably be of two-story brick houses, kidney-shaped swimming pools, four-car garages, bearded oaks, and landscaped lawns—each sitting on a half acre of land, clustered behind a high wall and guarded by a suspicious gatekeeper.

In fact, Castle Grande Estates was a trailer park in the middle of a larger tract of land.

More to the point, it was a scheme to fix everything that was broken and cure everybody's financial ills.

The Castle Grande scam was a little complicated; but in essence here's how the McDougals, unable to come up with the money any other way, worked the deal.

Madison Guaranty owned a subsidiary investment company called Madison Financial Corporation. The subsidiary company bought for investment the tract of land—and the indulgent parent lent the money for the purchase.

However, Arkansas regulations prohibited an S&L from lending a subsidiary more than 6 percent of its total assets—and the Castle Grande loan exceeded that amount. So they persuaded one Seth Ward (who happened to be Rose Law Firm partner Webster Hubbell's father-in-law) to buy the land for them. Ward understood that he would receive a \$300,000 commission for allowing his name to be used as a "straw buyer" (Stewart, p. 144).

This arrangement had to be put into legalese, both to cement the deal and to conceal the circumvention of the law.

The legal work for this venture was done by the Rose Law Firm. The firm's billing lawyer for this project—Hillary Rodham Clinton.

But once again, desperate measures failed to revive the patient. Madison Guaranty expired. The story hit the newspapers in September. This news probably didn't surprise Hillary. On July 14, more than two months earlier, Hillary had sent a letter to Madison, withdrawing the Rose Law Firm as the S&L's counsel.

In her letter of termination, she wrote, on behalf of the Rose Law Firm, that since Madison "has been relying and continues to rely on a number of other law firms to provide ongoing representation" and that "our representation has been for isolated matters and has not been continuous and

significant . . . we do not believe it appropriate for us to take a prepayment of legal fees when there is only one matter we are representing Madison on. . . ." (ibid., pp. 145–6).

Then, six months later, she ordered the Rose Law Firm to destroy all her files relevant to Madison Guaranty, including Castle Grande notes and records. That done, could anyone prove she was involved in the cover-up of Castle Grande's illegal acquisition?

Investigators might be able to prove just that if they could see the billing records of the Rose Law Firm—a set of records separate from Hillary's personal files. But lo and behold, those records were nowhere to be found. Sought for two years by the courts, with Hillary pleading total ignorance throughout, they magically reappeared in the presidential suite of the White House. In 1992 when asked for billing records, she had refused to give them up. Now she said, "I was delighted when these documents showed up."

Madison Guaranty and the Castle Grande fraud, which cost American taxpayers \$4 million, was eventually investigated by three agencies—the Resolution Trust Corporation (RTC), the Federal Home Loan Bank Board (FHLBB), and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC)—and investigators questioned Hillary about her role in the fraud and deception, even after she was in the White House.

She was so evasive and contradictory in her responses that it was impossible for objective observers not to be suspicious. Even some of her natural allies, including the press, were skeptical of her sworn testimony, particularly in light of the recovery of the Rose Law Firm billing records in the White House and Hillary's subsequent revision of her story.

The following examples illustrate the problems her testimony poses.

- Hillary denied having worked on the Castle Grande deal, saying that she had no knowledge of the matter. Later when the records miraculously reappeared, she admitted she had indeed worked on the project.
- When questioned about Seth Ward's role in fronting for Castle Grande, Hillary said she had some vague idea about Ward's business dealings with her Rose Law Firm partner Webster Hubbell. However, she didn't mention her own involvement in Castle Grande—a scam for which Ward was fronting as “straw buyer.” She said she knew Ward chiefly as “Mrs. Susie Hubbell's father.” (David Maraniss and Susan Schmidt, “Hillary Clinton and The Whitewater Controversy: A Close-Up,” *The Washington Post*, June 2, 1996)
- However, in its report on the investigation of the Rose Law Firm—revised after the billing records magically reappeared in the White House—the Resolution Trust Corporation said: “The new evidence illuminates this period to a considerable extent, revealing that the firm in general and Mrs. Clinton in particular had far more contact with Ward than was previously known.” As Hillary put it, the records “certainly . . . [showed] there was a period of time when I had . . . intense contact with Mr. Ward on some matters.” Indeed, she admitted that Ward was her contact in all of her Castle Grande activities. “He was the person I dealt with on the brewery issue. He was the person that we dealt with on the utility issue. He was Madison as far as I was concerned.” (Pillsbury, Madison and Sutro, report for the Resolution Trust Corporation, December 28, 1995)

In fact, she told RTC investigators things about Ward that indicated she remembered him astonishingly well:

I would say he was a persistent, demanding client, someone who pushed very hard for lawyers to respond to him, to get his work done, and by this, I mean anything he was involved in, whether it was for Little Rock Airport or for Madison, someone who wasn't at all shy about showing up at your office unannounced and demanding that you give him the time he wanted right then, no matter what else you were involved in. So he was a client who really required attention whenever he showed up, and that was not infrequently.

David Maraniss and Susan Schmidt put it this way:

The billing records also showed that she spent nearly an hour with Ward on February 28, 1986. It was on that day when one of the biggest and most legally problematic deals transpired involving Castle Grande. In a complicated maneuver that day, Jim Guy Tucker, the future governor who was then practicing law, bought the sewer system from Ward for \$1.2 million, fully financed by a Madison loan and \$150,000 from David Hale of Capital Management Services, Inc. At the same time, Hale netted \$500,000 from a Madison loan, which he used to leverage \$1.5 million from the Small Business Administration. Of that, he then loaned \$300,000 to Susan McDougal. Everyone involved benefited from these loan swaps. (Maraniss and Schmidt)

Eventually, Jim Guy Tucker, David Hale, and Susan McDougal were convicted of criminal acts in connection with Castle Grande. But not Hillary Clinton. She was never indicted.

When asked about her work for Madison Guaranty, Hillary testified that it was “very limited.” She claimed that other associates in the firm had actually done the work. Yet the billing records, when finally discovered, showed that she had billed Madison for about 60 hours of work over a

15-month period at the firm's then-top rate of \$120 per hour. According to the records, most of the 60 hours were related to Castle Grande Estates (*ibid.*).

In her May 1993 sworn statement to the RTC, Hillary said, "I don't believe I knew anything about any of these real estate parcels and projects." And in a televised interview with Barbara Walters (ABC, January 12, 1996), she said "Castle Grande was a trailer park on a piece of property that was about a thousand acres big. I never did work for Castle Grande. And so when I was asked about it last year [in the May 1995 RTC interrogatory], I didn't recognize it, I didn't remember it. The billing records show I did not work for Castle Grande. I did work for something called IDC, which was not related to Castle Grande" (*ibid.*).

Here she was counting on her good friends in the media to accept her statement without investigation. IDC and Castle Grande were the same project, the former containing the latter. Maraniss and Schmidt were more tough-minded and objective:

Yet there is evidence that the larger development was commonly referred to as Castle Grande. Minutes of a board meeting at which Madison officers discussed the purchase of the tract of land refer to it in its entirety as Castle Grande. H. Don Denton, a senior loan officer at Madison, said that within 30 days of the purchase, "it was known as Castle Grande by everyone that was involved in it."

The *Post* writers explained that Hillary might have had a strong motive for lying about her knowledge of the Castle Grande caper: "It has now been established that real fraud was committed here."

To repeat, Hillary never was indicted, though Martha Stewart served five months in prison for a similar transgression.

6 Travelgate

"If you vote for my husband, you get me; it's a two-for-one blue-plate special"—Hillary Clinton (CBS This Morning, April 3, 1992).

When the Clintons entered the White House, it must have been like Adam and Eve taking their first stroll around the Garden of Eden. All they had to do was name the animals and leave the fruit alone.

But the fruit proved too tempting.

Always the control freak, Hillary noted with displeasure that the White House Travel Office, headed by Billy Dale, wasn't in the Plum Book—that is, the volume listing the jobs appointed by the President. Like the kitchen staff, the Travel Office staff remained as First Families came and went. Indeed, some were lifelong employees with exemplary records. Their job: to make travel arrangements for members of the White House staff—a complicated and important task, one where experience counted.

According to insiders, Hillary said she wanted to put "our people" in the Office—and that meant getting rid of existing staff members. So, on May 19, 1993, Dale and six others were summarily fired (Tony Snow, *Detroit News*, November 6, 1995).

Here again was Hillary's icy disregard for the little people who inhabited her world and got in her way. According to all evidence, the Travel Office had been both loyal and responsive to the new administration. So why get rid of them?

The reason soon became clear: The White House travel business was handed over to another provider, a company co-owned by Harry Thomason and his wife, Linda Bloodworth-Thomason, old Arkansas friends of the Clintons who had moved to Hollywood and become successful TV producers. It was Thomason who would later coach Bill in his now-famous denial of the Monica Lewinsky affair (“I never had sexual relations with that woman. . .”). In order to facilitate this removal, Harry Thomason actually accused Travel Office employees of demanding kickbacks, a charge that later proved to be utterly false.

The day the employees were fired, Catherine Cornelius, Bill Clinton’s 25-year-old cousin, took over management of the office, though she served in that capacity only a short time.

The question of who actually ordered the firing of Dale and his staff members is still a matter for debate. At first, Hillary said she didn’t issue the orders. Clinton aide David Watkins, the man who actually fired the seven, testified under oath that the decision was his and his alone.

Watkins would later be fired for commandeering a government helicopter to attend a golfing event—at an expense to taxpayers of \$13,000. He should have stayed away from golf courses. Several years later—while playing 18 holes with friends in Nashville—Watkins shot his mouth off and got into more trouble. He told the other members of his foursome that Hillary Clinton had called him and ordered the firings of Dale and the six members of his Travel Office staff. According to witnesses, Watkins said that Hillary’s exact words were, “Fire their asses” (Matt Drudge, *The Drudge Report*, June 16, 1999).

Meanwhile, Hillary—whose sworn testimony such an assertion would directly contradict—had begun to weasel. She admitted she *had* expressed “concern” about charges

of mismanagement, but she never actually “ordered” the firings (“Whatever It Takes,” *Times Daily*, January 16, 1996). She speculated that perhaps aides had misinterpreted her comments. “Fire their asses” is certainly a statement open to multiple interpretations!

Watkins’ golf course account directly contradicted Hillary’s sworn testimony, as well as his own. However, the earlier testimony and notes of several other White House aides likewise placed Hillary at the center of the firings.

Anyone familiar with her compulsion to control the world around her could have guessed whose story to believe. And few who knew her were surprised at her willingness to bend or break the truth when cornered.

She knew she could count on the media to give her sympathetic coverage and to drop the matter as quickly as possible. Sure enough, shortly after it broke, the story was buried in the vast and untended graveyard of Democratic scandals.

But the White House wouldn’t leave well enough alone. Word went to the FBI to hand over the files of these employees. Under ordinary circumstances, such a request would have been made through the Justice Department. However, the new imperial White House had no intention of following protocol. White House staff went right to the FBI with its demand. They asked for the files of Dale and the six fired employees; and while they were at it, they ordered up approximately 900 files of key Republicans.

The ensuing investigation resulted in trumped-up charges of embezzlement against Billy Dale. He was eventually tried in federal court and was quickly acquitted by a jury.

However, the high-handed commandeering of FBI files had a much longer shelf life than the Travelgate story. The press—indeed the entire Left—was highly sensitive to privacy issues. What the White House had done smacked of

Nixonism and McCarthyism—nasty words amongst the Beltway intelligentsia. And so a new issue was born—Filegate.

7 Filegate

Travelgate itself was bad enough—a breach of the rules governing White House hiring and an example of Hillary’s willingness to ruin the lives of little people in order to further her own agenda. However, as is often the case, one abuse of power led to another.

White House requests for FBI files on individuals are routine at the beginning of an administration, when the new president is filling positions in the Plum Book. Usually these file requests are made by the president’s chief of staff through the White House counsel and are sent over by the FBI two or three at a time. Such files contain the results of routine background investigations conducted by the Bureau on potential appointees.

So what was so unusual about the Clinton White House request?

In the first place, Team Clinton requested a boatload of files—as many as 900.

In the second place, the files weren’t those of potential Clinton Administration appointees. The list included former officials of the Reagan and Bush Administrations and Republican Party leaders, as well as other Clinton “enemies.” One of the names was Linda Tripp. Another was FBI agent Gary Aldrich. Indeed, the Clintons interrupted their

own search for appointees to scrutinize the files of men and women who had served in previous Republican administrations.

In the third place, evidence pointed to the First Lady as the instigator of this attempt to use FBI files for partisan political purposes. In a lawsuit on behalf of the Republicans whose files were taken—a lawsuit naming Hillary as a defendant—the Washington-based legal foundation Judicial Watch announced they had as evidence:

- an authentic FBI document and sworn testimony showing that Hillary Clinton hired Craig Livingstone, the man who helped obtain Republican FBI files. Livingstone boasted of his access to the White House residence and admitted that he sought the help of Mrs. Clinton’s chief of staff in obtaining his White House job. Secret Service logs confirm that he frequently visited the White House. (“Hillary Goes Under Oath in Filegate With Sworn Declaration Full of Loopholes,” Judicial Watch Press Release, July 14, 1999)
- Linda Tripp’s testimony that the FBI file information was being uploaded onto White House computers to be shared with the Democratic National Committee—on orders of Hillary Rodham Clinton. According to Mrs. Tripp, Mrs. Clinton “ruled the school” at the Clinton White House. (Ibid.)

Livingstone, the staff member in charge of these files, was a hefty former barroom bouncer who looked like a sullen first cousin of the late Chris Farley. In an interesting and highly unusual development, it became clear that no one bothered to ask for a background check on Livingstone. He just appeared at the White House one day and took charge of these highly sensitive personnel files.

Later—after Filegate became a major scandal—a

controversy would arise over who had hired such an ill-qualified hulk in the first place. An FBI report quotes former White House counsel Bernard Nussbaum as telling FBI agent Dennis Sculimbrenne that Livingstone's mother was a good friend of Hillary Clinton and that Mama had asked the First Lady to find her son a job. According to the FBI, then, it was Hillary who brought Livingstone aboard ("Who Hired Craig Livingstone," *Time*, July 17, 1996).

Before the scandal had finally vanished from the pages of the nation's newspapers, Livingstone had been identified as the biggest political klutz since the Watergate burglars. Suddenly everyone denied that Hillary Clinton even knew Mama. Mama signed an affidavit that she certainly didn't know Hillary. And Nussbaum claimed he never said she did.

Yet the FBI clearly documents that Hillary hired Livingstone. Indeed, he had been a part of Team Clinton for some time. He was an "advance man" for Bill during the 1992 campaign. Advance men arrive a few days ahead of the candidate, book hotel rooms, make reservations at restaurants, make contact with local supporters, arrange for transportation, and perform a variety of less important tasks. After the election, Livingstone, the advance man, was suddenly given control of White House security.

When Livingstone was questioned about the matter by the Senate Judiciary Committee, he swore that the files found their way over to the White House "by mistake" (George Archibald, "Privacy Rights Deferred at Clinton White House," *Insight*, November 4, 1996), and that he didn't know how many his deputy, Anthony Marceca, was receiving ("A Funny Thing Happened. . .," *Time*, July 8, 1996).

Mari L. Anderson, who was Craig Livingstone's assistant, told a different story to Committee investigators. She

said the White House in May of 1993 deliberately went after the FBI background files of Dale and Dale's deputy. In fact, as George Archibald reports in *Insight*, she testified in her sworn deposition that both Livingstone and Anthony B. Marceca "acquired the FBI files on hundreds of former Republican White House aides after acknowledging to her that there was no official reason to do so" (Archibald).

In addition to the partisan misuse of the FBI—by the way, one of the more serious charges leveled against Richard Nixon—White House staff members violated security procedures in their handling of confidential records. Livingstone's office, where these highly sensitive files were kept, usually remained wide open. The combination of misuse and lax security prompted people in the security community to voice their protest. As Paul Rodriguez reported:

An FBI agent near retirement said: "This is always a difficult assignment. You go out and try to get people to tell you whatever they know or think they know about their neighbors. And you promise them nobody will ever find out. You know, 'Trust us, we'll protect you.' . . . People are telling us they don't want to talk. You can tell from how they talk, they're nervous. [Filegate] has had the effect of confirming that what they tell us isn't secret." (Paul M. Rodriguez, "Clinton File Collections Rattle National Security," *Insight*, July 29, 1996.)

And Leon J. Podles, an agent with the Office of Federal Investigation, said the same thing: "It will definitely make it more difficult. If people think the Privacy Act means nothing to the White House—that the government can violate the Privacy Act and use these files for purposes which were not intended—people will be much more reluctant to supply information to allow themselves to be investigated" (*ibid.*).

Judicial Watch pressed ahead with its \$90 million lawsuit on behalf of the Reagan and Bush officials whose FBI files were ordered up by the First Lady; and since Hillary was a defendant in the suit, Judicial Watch lawyers understandably wanted to depose her.

They were stunned when, in July of 1999, she attempted to block such a deposition, arguing, in effect, that she was too busy and important to testify. As her brief put it, “as a general proposition, high-ranking government officials are not subject to depositions.” She asked that she be excused so she might “have time to dedicate to the performance of government functions” (“Hillary Clinton: I’m Too Important to Testify,” Judicial Watch Press Release, July 15, 1999).

In point of fact, she was *not* a government official. She held no public office and therefore performed no official functions. She was, however, a defendant, and the plaintiffs had every right to depose the defendants.

So Filegate, in part, turned into an attempt to cover up Travelgate; and Hillary’s attempt to avoid testifying was an attempt to cover up the truth about Filegate. At this point, even newspapers and columnists sympathetic with Democratic politicians and policies were shocked—more so, apparently, than at Clinton’s sexual dalliance with Monica Lewinsky.

Yet their criticisms ceased almost as quickly as they began, although the Washington news media beat the war drums for months before the general public finally came to believe that Richard Nixon’s conduct following the Watergate break-in was impeachable. As front-page news, Filegate was as short-lived as the World Series. With few exceptions, Hillary Clinton’s early abuses of power have been stored in the attic, like the fading photographs of great-grandparents; and they will probably remain there, unless they become issues in the upcoming presidential race. They were certainly never trumpeted during her 2000 senatorial race.

8 Lootgate

With the imminent inauguration of George W. Bush, Hillary realized that the fawning would diminish, the steady stream of gifts would slow to a trickle, the free trips and parties and private dinners would be more and more infrequent. And most important of all: She and Bill would no longer be living in the White House, with its elegant furnishings, its priceless art objects, its tons of silverware, its porcelain, its budget.

After all, the Clintons had lived in government housing so long that they had forgotten how to pay bills. Nor had they accumulated the household items that most middle-aged married couples have inevitably accrued: flatware, china, furniture, rugs, and the myriad accessories that inevitably go with gracious living. In fact, when they approached eviction day, they were like newlyweds, looking for a house, wondering what in the world they would put in it. In order to correct this deficiency, Hillary did something so grasping, so unforgivably tacky that even Washington gasped at her vulgarity.

Conservative writer Barbara Olson explained:

Hillary was not in a mood to walk away from her cherished lifestyle simply because the Twenty-second Amendment forced her husband from office on January 20, 2001. She took the trouble to register with luxury retailers, as though she were about to become an impoverished new bride. This sent

clear signals to donors as to the kinds of items they needed to buy if they expected to stay in Hillary's good graces. No first lady had ever been quite so crass. To put it in economic terms, the supply side was strong but so was the demand. John Podesta, Clinton's chief of staff, conceded to Tim Russert on *Meet the Press* that friends of Mrs. Clinton solicited others, saying, "Would you please buy this silverware, these gifts for Mrs. Clinton for her new houses?" (Barbara Olson, *The Final Days: The Last Desperate Abuses of Power by the Clinton White House*, Regnery Publishing, Inc. 2001, pp. 63–64.)

Liberal columnist Margaret Carlson commented:

What's most revealing here is not the gifts themselves—although it is hard to picture one adult giving another a sofa—but how horrified people were at the very suggestion that Hillary would lean on supporters to furnish her house. The Clintons have long dismissed the criticism of those in the vast right-wing conspiracy whom they don't respect. But how do you dismiss the views of those you do respect—who insist you would never sink so low, until they are silenced by proof of your grasping? (Margaret Carlson, "A Shower of Gifts for Hillary and Bill," CNN.com, January 29, 2001.)

When the Clintons were selling weekends in the White House, a cartoon appeared showing the executive mansion with a bar code on it. The bar code now belonged on Hillary's backside. She had ordered up high-end household goods from favor-seekers past, present, and future. People of taste and integrity were sickened—not only by the trashiness of her conduct, but also by its ethical implications.

If you don't think there was a connection between gifts and presidential favors, consider the case of Denise Rich, ex-wife of Marc Rich, a man accused of evading \$48 mil-

lion in taxes and 51 counts of tax fraud, to say nothing of trading illegally with Iran and Saddam Hussein. You may remember that Denise gave at least \$1.5 million to Clintonian causes (including at least \$109,000 to Hillary's senatorial campaign), \$100,000 to the Democratic National Committee, and \$450,000 to the Clinton Library. You may also remember that Bill Clinton pardoned Rich on January 20, Clinton's last day in office, despite the fact that the wily financier was living in Switzerland, a long-time fugitive from justice.

It should come as no surprise, then, that Denise Rich also contributed two coffee tables and two chairs (valued at \$7,375) to Hillary's little housewarming. As Denise said, "Everybody gave furniture. There was a list going around from the decorator" (*ibid.*, p. 66).

In other words, Hillary had sent out specific orders through the decorator: "You will give the following."

Barbara Olson prints only the highlights of the gift list, but it takes up the better part of three pages in her book (pp. 64–68) and contains more than 50 items. Among them are the following:

- Ron and Beth Dozoretz—a dining table, server, and golf clubs, worth \$7,000
- Iris Cantor—china, worth \$4,992
- Dale Chihuly—glass sculpture, worth \$22,000
- Mr. and Mrs. Bill Brandt—china, worth \$5,000
- Mr. and Mrs. Walter Kaye—cigar travel humidior, china cabinet, and copy of President Lincoln's Cooper union speech, worth a total of \$9,683
- Edith Wasserman—flatware, worth \$4,967
- Steve Mittman—two sofas, easy chair, and ottoman, worth \$19,900
- Mr. and Mrs. Morris Pynoos—cashmere shawl and flatware, worth \$5,767

- Steven Spielberg and wife, Kate Capshaw—china, worth \$4,920
- Ted Danson and Mary Steenburgen—china, worth \$4,787

By the way, the total for Spode China received was \$22,000 and for Faberge silverware a total of \$18,000 (Carlson).

Indeed, the Clintons ended up with enough china and flatware to serve dinner to virtually the entire population of a small Asian country. These were gifts one might have expected at the wedding of Meadow Soprano—ostentatious and pricey, vulgarity honoring vulgarity.

Remember that the Clintons were by no means facing a life of frugality, as were, say, Calvin and Grace Coolidge when they left the White House. Both Clintons were preparing to write books with hefty advances. Bill got \$10–12 million. Hillary got \$8 million (Les Christie, “All the President’s Money,” CNN.com, June 16, 2004). You’d think they could have managed to furnish a couple of houses—one in Chappaqua, one in Washington—without shaking down their donor list.

At the very least it was hustling. But it smacked of something much worse—a quid pro quo for services rendered or about to be rendered, a not-so-subtle form of common bribery. At least it must have looked like bribery to a lot of ordinary Americans, who buy new furniture from Sears on revolving credit and eat with plastic flatware off of paper plates.

But Hillary wasn’t satisfied with this warehouse full of plunder extorted from rich folks in need of favors. She also sacked the White House, as if she had ridden into Washington with Attila and his Huns.

She laid the groundwork for the sacking in 1993, when, as First Lady, she launched the 1993 White House Collection

of American Crafts by inviting over 70 nationally known craftsmen to donate works to be displayed at the executive mansion. Some eight years later, as the Clintons were preparing to vacate the premises, word leaked out that the entire collection had been shipped to Little Rock, Arkansas. The National Archives confirmed that the collection was now housed in an Arkansas warehouse, and White House curator Betty Monk confirmed that the order to pack it up and ship it out had been given by “Mrs. Clinton herself” (Dick Morris, “Bill and Hillary a ‘Crafty’ Duo,” *NewYorkPost.com*, February 20, 2001).

This was not what the craftsmen had been told. Indeed they had been assured that their donated works would be “displayed in a prominent location in the White House at events throughout the years” (ibid.). Instead, the collection would be housed in the Clinton Presidential Library. When critics cried “foul,” a spokesman for Mrs. Clinton said “any suggestion of wrongdoing is completely fabricated, because without Hillary Clinton this beautiful exhibit would not even exist” (ibid.).

That wasn’t all. During their eight years in the White House, the Clintons took in some \$400,000 in gifts from admirers. These included antique furniture, clothing, crystal, watches, and other high-dollar items. When word reached Capitol Hill that the Clintons were hauling away many of these gifts, Congress investigated the whole ugly mess (Vincent Morris, *The New York Post*, February 13, 2002).

According to the report from the House Government Reform Committee, here are some of the more expensive gifts the Clintons kept:

- 2 Dale Chihuly glass sculptures—\$38,000
- Lenox crystal bowl, 2 magnifying glasses—\$25,400
- Lenox crystal bowl—\$25,350

- 2 sofas, easy chair, ottoman—\$19,900
- china cabinet and chandelier—\$8,933
- 2 coffee tables, 2 chairs—\$7,375
- dining table and server—\$6,750
- 2 carpets—\$6,282
- 2 five-piece place settings for eight, fish knife, fish fork—\$4,967
- 12 five-piece place settings—\$5,000
- rug—\$5,000
- 12 five-piece place settings—\$4,992
- 8 five-piece settings, gravy ladle—\$4,944
- 9 five-piece place settings, 8 soup bowls—\$4,920
- 16 soup bowls, soup tureen and stand, salad bowl, 2 trays—\$4,787
- dining table, 4 armchairs—\$3,650
- bronze Eleanor Roosevelt statue—\$4,000
- silver-plated saxophone, 2 music books—\$3,000
- 3 TV sets, DVD player—\$2,993
- sofa—\$2,843
- 2 handbags—\$2,750
- original Peter Max painting—\$2,500
- 8 dining chairs—\$2,400
- Bible encased in sterling silver—\$1,600
- set of dumbbells—\$1,200
- 15 shares of Coca-Cola common stock—\$1,027 (Ibid.)

Among other things, investigators found that the Clintons had underestimated the value of many of the gifts, since items worth \$260 or less did not have to be reported. Some of these underestimated items came from establishments like Cartier, Gucci, and Tiffany—establishments where ashtrays and ties routinely run in the hundreds.

Then, too, congressional investigators discovered that the Clintons had “misplaced” or “lost” a number of items,

just as Hillary had “misplaced” or “lost” the billing records of the Rose Law Firm.

The “misplaced” or “lost” items, include the following, given to Hillary, Hillary and Bill, or Hillary and Chelsea:

- Bokhara oriental rug—\$1,200
- An 18K hollow yellow gold bracelet—\$1,000
- 18K gold harp brooch with large pearl—\$800
- gold Bracelet with design—\$500
- bottle of 1959 Rothschild wine—\$350
- 2 sculptured brooches—\$340
- Inscribed Tiffany silver box—\$271 (Ibid.)

No one knows, except perhaps Hillary, how many more goodies the Clintons scarfed up over the years and in those final days. In the recent past, the treasures of Suleiman the Great were displayed in Washington’s National Gallery. At some future date, the same museum may be exhibiting the treasures of Hillary the Magnificent.

9 The Book Deal

As Bill’s term drew to an end, Hillary was ready to cash in on her notoriety, to have the kind of money that Denise Rich or Beth Dozoretz had, or at least enough to float a shopping spree along Rodeo Drive or to fly to Monte Carlo for a long weekend. Because Hillary exuded a slightly disreputable glamour and knew a lot of scandalous secrets, publishers swarmed around her like blowflies as she prepared to leave the White House. You can be certain that

the same old-line New York houses weren't nearly as anxious to sign up Bess Truman or Mamie Eisenhower.

When a book promises to hit the bestseller list, publishers frequently participate in an auction to acquire the rights. In Hillary's case, the predicted advance was \$5 million—a prodigious amount. In the end, Simon & Schuster paid a cool \$8 million, just a half million less than the advance the Pope received for his book (*Les Christie*).

She had signed the book deal immediately after she had been elected to the Senate, but before she had taken office. Earlier, GOP Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich had accepted an offer of \$4.5 million from HarperCollins; and the Democrats had circled him like a pack of wolves, pawing the ground and baring their fangs. The amount was excessive, they said—and potentially corrupting. Gingrich returned the advance.

When Hillary's advance was announced, however, the usual wolves were curled in their lairs, gnawing contentedly on Gingrich's bones. Not a growl.

Their lack of indignation didn't go unnoticed. When Bill O'Reilly asked for the former Speaker's reaction, Gingrich said:

Look, I think that this \$8 million will go right next to the cattle futures money and right next to the Whitewater money. And the fact is that the Clintons have learned over the years [to] ignore the press, ignore their critics, do what you're going to do, and win. . . . You notice on her side, people who attacked me now say nothing about her. And on our side, because Republicans do believe in free enterprise and because a lot of Republicans were really angry when the Democrats unfairly attacked me, you're not getting the kind of just pure partisan reaction. So Hillary in a sense gets a free ride. (*The O'Reilly Factor*, Fox News, December 21, 2000.)

And the Republican leadership confirmed what Gingrich had predicted. Then-Majority Leader Trent Lott said when asked about the Hillary advance, "I've got plenty of more important things to worry about." And Senate Rules Committee Chairman Don Nickles, said, with reference to the House's pummeling of Gingrich, "Two wrongs don't make a right" (William Tucker, "A Fine GOP Moment," *WarRoom.com*, posted January 2, 2001).

Others weren't so cavalier. The Congressional Accountability Project, a watchdog organization, in a letter dated December 18, 2000, asked her to return the advance. In part the letter read as follows:

On December 16, *The New York Times* reported that you had agreed to accept an \$8 million book advance in a book contract with Simon & Schuster, a subsidiary of Viacom Inc., the second largest media conglomerate in the world. According to news accounts, your \$8 million book advance appears to be the largest one ever received by an elected official in the history of the world. . . .

The letter called to her attention the fact that Viacom, a giant among corporate giants, frequently comes before the Senate to influence legislation.

Given Viacom's extensive efforts to affect the outcome of numerous matters pending before the Senate and federal government, if you accept the \$8 million advance from Simon & Schuster, you may violate Senate Rules regarding conflicts of interest.

No Member, officer, or employee shall engage in any outside business or professional activity or employment for compensation which is inconsistent or in conflict with the conscientious performance of official duties.

A Member, officer, or employee of the Senate shall not receive any compensation, nor shall he permit any compensation to accrue to his beneficial interest from any source, the receipt or accrual of which would occur by virtue of influence improperly exerted from his position as a Member, officer, or employee. (Ibid.)

The letter also used the same argument made against Newt Gingrich, which eventually compelled him to return the advance—that the figure was suspiciously high.

The sheer size of your \$8 million book advance raises questions about whether you and Senate processes may be affected by large cash payments from a major media conglomerate. This book contract, with its uniquely lavish advance for an elected official, may be, in fact, a way for that corporation to place money into your pockets, perhaps to curry favor with you. (Ibid.)

The letter concludes with an appeal to Hillary's better angels.

During your campaign for Senate, you often voiced support for campaign finance reform as a way to mitigate the corrupting influence of money in politics. As an advocate against public corruption, we urge you to walk your talk, by altering the terms of your book contract to accept only copyright royalties under usual and customary contractual terms, for books actually sold. This would protect the Senate and the public from the possibility that a powerful corporation may be trying to obtain special favors from a Senator in exchange for a singularly lucrative book advance.

White House Press Secretary Jake Siewert was quick to point out that, while the acceptance of such an advance by

a Senator might be construed by some as an ethics violation, they couldn't discipline Hillary because she wasn't a Senator—not yet—only a Senator-elect (Olson, pp. 41–42). If that logic were applied across the boards, all Senators-elect could accept huge bribes for future services right up to the moment they took the oath of office.

With reference to the Gingrich episode, Seiwert said, "There was also some question about whether his story was really worth \$4.5 million. Whereas no one doubts that Mrs. Clinton's story is worth any amount of money" (White House Press Briefing by Jake Siewert, December 18, 2000).

When the book finally came out, it proved disappointing to many. You can be sure that as soon as most readers pulled the book out of the bag, they immediately flipped through the back, searching for the page describing the moment when Hillary hears the bad news about Monica Lewinsky. True Believers may have brushed away a tear or two, but most people probably shook their heads in disbelief at the author's shocked innocence, her incredulity, her astonishment that this man, a chronic adulterer, should have engaged in sex play with a willing intern. The passage was hardly worth the \$8 million that Hillary pocketed, without apology and apparently without qualms.

10 Galagate

In 2000 both the President and the First Lady attended a gala fundraiser in Hollywood. Ostensibly it was a tribute to the President. In actuality, it was a

fundraiser for the First Lady's senatorial campaign. Celebrities from the world of entertainment showed up in force: Diana Ross, Melissa Etheridge, Patti LaBelle, Sugar Ray, Paul Anka, Michael Bolton, Toni Braxton, Cher, and stars of greater and lesser magnitude. The event was a romping success (unsigned article, "How Hillary's Money Man Was Nailed for L.A. Gala," WorldNetDaily.com, January 8, 2005).

The "money man" was David Rosen, finance chairman for Hillary's senatorial campaign. His indictment came after years of careful investigation by the FBI and other federal agencies. Specifically, he was charged with deliberately submitting a false report of funds spent and received in connection with the Hollywood extravaganza. For example, in his report, Rosen said that the event raised only \$400,000, allegedly untrue. He is also charged with filing a fraudulent invoice, stating that the cost to stage this soiree was a mere \$400,000, when the actual expense was apparently a robust \$1.1 million.

Why does this matter? Because federal campaign finance law requires the campaign to pay for 40 percent of the cost of such an event. If the cost were \$400,000 then the campaign's share would be only \$160,000. However, if the cost were \$1.1 million—and, folks, it was—then the campaign's share would be a whopping \$440,000—i.e., \$280,000 less for the campaign to spend on advertising and other crucial expenses.

Dick Morris, writing in the *New York Post* (January 11, 2005), points out that Rosen low-balled this expense figure at precisely the time Hillary's opponent, Rick Lazio, had challenged her to rely solely on hard money contributions to fund her campaign. Morris translates what an honest reporting of the amount would have meant to Hillary's campaign, "The sum involved was enough to pay for almost an entire week of television advertising in New York City and exceeds the total media budget of many smaller campaigns."

To raise this sum, Morris pointed out, Hillary would have

had to get 280 donors to give the maximum \$1,000 individual donation permitted under federal law at the time. A decision of this magnitude—how much to say the event cost—would have been a huge issue within the campaign. As Morris put it:

This is no clerical error, nor is it likely to be one young man's decision to commit fraud to help the campaign. It is just not credible to believe that Hillary didn't know about and approve of the understatement of the event's cost.

An FBI agent echoes Morris's charge: "It appears that the true cost of the event was deliberately understated in order to increase the amount of funds available to New York Senate 2000 for federal campaign activities" ("How Hillary's money man was nailed . . .").

Rosen was looking at a possible five years in federal prison and fines up to \$1 million. However, he hired the best counsel big money could buy, played the role of confused amateur, and in O.J.'s California, a jury acquitted him.

One of the key organizers of this event is already serving time for his role in the caper—a man named Aaron Tonken. By his own admission, Tonken, who was 34 at the time, wanted to be a major player on the political stage. He was a high-school dropout from a small town in northern Michigan and once lived in a homeless shelter. For a while, he was Zsa Zsa Gabor's houseboy and eventually became a successful fundraiser in Hollywood, where money is almost as plentiful as cocaine. Eventually, he was blinded by the Clintons' aura, and set out to insinuate himself into their inner circle. Naïve and unprincipled, he was willing to do whatever seemed effective to help Hillary in her senatorial race. And, according to Tonken, Rosen approved every scheme, however devious and unlawful. Here is what Tonken wrote in his confessional book, *King of Cons: Exposing the Dirty, Rotten Secrets of the Washington Elite and*

Hollywood Celebrities (Nelson Current, 2004):

[Rosen] was my consultant on money matters, since I had only a passing acquaintance with campaign finance law. If there was any question in my mind, I'd call David. The problem was, whenever I asked for advice he would invariably laugh off my concerns and say, "Don't worry. Just raise as much as possible. Just keep at it."

Here's an example: I came up with what I thought was a great idea to make it look as though support were coming from a lot of little donors, instead of one big one. I proposed that Cynthia [Gershman] would write a check for forty grand, which she was willing to do, and I would run it through one of my accounts and emerge with cash and started [sic] giving it out in one-thousand- or two-thousand-dollar chunks to twenty or thirty people. They would then turn around and write personal checks of their own for the same amount, and that would be 'their' contribution. Sounded good to me, but when I presented it to David he laughed for about three minutes straight. When we got down to it, though, he told me to go ahead. I should have been suspicious when he added, "Just don't tell anyone." Later, he would pull me aside at Spago and re-emphasize the point: I was to keep that little trick of mine quiet, "very quiet." (Tonken, p. 282.)

But what about Hillary? Did she know this illegal fundraising was going on among the glitz and glitter of Hollywood? Sometimes candidates are kept in the dark so they can have "credible deniability." As Tonken tells it, he penetrated that wall of separation and told the First Lady everything. Everything. Here is his account.

I'd spent odd moments alone with her before, primarily in the evening at the White House. But this was my real shot to talk to her with no one else around, and what I wanted

was to let her know how much I admired her, how much I was behind her, and most important, what I had already done for her. It was, quite by accident, the moment of truth.

I didn't know how you earned someone's trust and friendship, except by giving them money and gifts and doing extravagant favors for them. I liked Hillary Clinton so much and wanted so badly for her to be my friend. So I did the only thing I understood: I told her about virtually every penny I'd spent on her behalf. I let her know what I was doing and had done for each event of hers. I spoke about the money and what a pleasure and honor it was to spend it on her candidacy for the U.S. Senate.

Once and for all, I wanted it clear in her mind who was the person really doing things for her. There was so much jockeying for position among those around her: Kelly, David, Jim Levin, and so on. People taking credit for stuff. I thought I might have been short-changed, and I wanted to correct that. I believed that once she knew the facts, she would see how valuable I was to her and welcome me into her inner circle.

The whole thing was intended to be solely for my benefit. I never wanted to hurt her. I could tell she wasn't entirely comfortable with this conversation, and yet I couldn't stop.

It wasn't until much later that I fully realized what I had done. Whatever protection her staff had built around her, however much in the dark they had kept her, that was over.

Now she knew. (Ibid., pp. 365–6.)

You have to feel for him as he writes of that gala evening and his delusion of triumph:

Just before they got into the limo, I handed the president gifts from me, Stan Lee, and Peter Paul: for him, a custom

humidor and a handmade gold watch worth tens of thousands; for Hillary, a necklace that cost eight grand. The first lady disliked it and later sent it back.

Before my car arrived, I had my last fond glimpses of this gathering of the rich and famous. I watched them drive off into the night. I may have been the ultimate outsider growing up, but not any more. Now I was in, and *they* were my people. (Ibid., p. 12.)

Less than three years later, this grand illusion collapsed in a heap of broken glitz:

Instead of chronicling my stunning successes, *Variety's* Army Archerd would be writing about my criminal misdeeds; I'd be talking not to presidents and movie stars, but to the FBI and other federal agencies, handing over more than two dozen boxes of letters, e-mails, receipts and invoices, cooperating as the government pursued a multifaceted investigation into the corruption that lay hidden behind all the glitter. (Ibid.)

The top organizer/contributor at that event was a man named Peter Paul, who, by his own testimony, wanted to connect with the Clintons. According to Tonken, the favors were biggies: a pardon for felony convictions and joining Paul's Internet business after the White House days had ended. To accomplish these twin goals, Paul plowed almost \$2 million of his own money into the fundraiser. Initially, he got what he wanted: access to the First Couple. He was photographed deep in conversation with the President and with the First Lady—the kind of snapshots you take with you when you approach a federal agency asking for a slice of the pie.

But Paul says he was mainly interested in doing business with ex-President Clinton. According to Judicial Watch,

which filed a lawsuit on behalf of Paul in 2001, Bill Clinton reneged on a \$17-million deal to join Paul's Internet companies after January 21, 2001. In addition, the suit charged that Hillary's campaign did not report the expenses Paul had incurred in the fundraising event—as required by law.

Paul also claimed that he could document his charges with checks, thank-you-notes, and video footage and photographs that showed him schmoozing with both Bill and Hillary.

The Left was extremely nervous over this late-breaking scandal. In fact, on February 9, 2005, the *New York Times* printed an article by Raymond Hernandez and Ian Urbina ("Lesson of Clinton Fund-Raiser: Double-Check That Donor List") that is little more than a soft-sell piece aimed at cleansing the Clintons and discrediting Peter Paul. As the title implies, Hernandez and Urbino suggest that the Clintons were innocent parties to this violation of federal law, that two decades ago Paul served 42 months in prison for cocaine possession and for trying to defraud the Cuban government.

The article is laced with passages designed to emphasize the Clintons' innocence of any wrongdoing:

Associates of the Clintons say the couple did not know of Mr. Paul's troubled past at the time, and in the months after the event, Mr. Paul turned on the Clintons, later urging investigators to look into the fundraiser.

* * *

A spokesman for the Justice Department, Bryan Sierra, said in a recent interview that Mrs. Clinton was not a subject of the investigation that led to the indictment, which named not Mr. Paul, but another person connected to the event, David Rosen, the finance director of Mrs. Clinton's Senate campaign, who is accused of underreporting the cost of the

fundraiser. No one else has been accused of any wrongdoing arising from the accusations.

* * *

Mr. Kendall dismissed Mr. Paul's claim that a deal had been struck to have the President assist Mr. Paul in his business dealings provided that Mr. Paul raised money for Mrs. Clinton's campaign. "There was never any kind of quid pro quo," he said. (Raymond Hernandez and Ian Urbina.)

Of course there wasn't, any more than there was a quid pro quo when Bill Clinton issued a pardon to Marc Rich. However, in this case, more than one person is willing to contradict such a statement. Both Tonken and Paul might, as witnesses, testify that Hillary knew about the scam, was just as aware as Rosen that money was being laundered, illegal contributions were being accepted, the cost of the event and the amount of money taken in were being falsified on the FEC report. Such knowledge may well add up to conspiracy, since she said nothing about it and allowed the report to be filed.

Will the FBI eventually investigate Hillary's role in this fraudulent report? Now that David Rosen has been acquitted, federal prosecutions have lost the chance to persuade him to give up Hillary in order to negotiate for a lesser sentence. And as usual, the smaller fish get caught in the net—like Webster Hubbell and the McDougals—while the big fish swim freely in deeper and deeper waters.

PART III HILLARY VOTES, SPEAKS, AND SPINS

11

Hillary's Radical Voting Record

Though Hillary Clinton is currently masquerading as a "moderate," her voting record allows us to look behind the mask and see the Left-wing ideologue she has always been. The Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) is an unabashedly Left-leaning pressure group. Its leaders know a Liberal when they see one. They do not list Hillary Clinton as a "moderate." In fact, they rate her record in the Senate as far-Left. Consider the following:

- From 2001 through 2004 (the last year for which the Americans for Democratic Action has posted ratings), Hillary scored an average of 95% on the ADA scale. In fact, each of these years she voted with the far-Left 19 out of 20 times. ***The 2004 ratings of the American Conservative Union have Hillary falling to a zero conservative score—voting liberal 18 out of 20 times and absent twice—tied with Teddy Kennedy.***
- Her ADA average during her time in the Senate is just a couple of percentage points below Teddy Kennedy's.
- In fact, her liberal rating is nearly ten percentage points higher than the combined average of all Democrats. So she is one of the most liberal members of the liberal party.

In order to understand just how really far-out this woman has veered, consider the following stands on key issues.

Taxes

Appearing in San Francisco at a fundraiser for Senator Barbara Boxer, Hillary told a Democratic audience:

Many of you are well enough off that . . . the tax cuts may have helped you. We're saying that for America to get back on track, we're probably going to cut that short and not give it to you. We're going to take things away from you on behalf of the common good. (Beth Fouhy, Associated Press, on SFGate.com, June 28, 2004.)

By “common good,” she meant for the good of Big Labor, Big Government, the gay rights movement, abortion mills, and the trial lawyers. She likes taxes—big taxes, small taxes, new taxes, old taxes. As a Left-wing ideologue, she believes as a matter of principle that the government should redistribute the wealth by punishing success and rewarding failure. As a liberal Democrat, she understands that the heavier the tax burden, the more money the Democrats will confiscate in order to buy votes with boondoggles and welfare programs.

Here are her votes on taxation, as recorded by the ACU:

- In 2001 Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-TX) proposed an amendment to the tax bill that would have accelerated the elimination of the “marriage penalty,” a bizarre tax policy that rewards men and women who cohabit and punishes those who marry. Hillary voted in favor of punishing married couples for a while longer.
- In 2001 in an effort to stimulate the economy, Senator Gregg of New Hampshire proposed a temporary reduction of the tax rate on capital gains. Hillary voted against stimulating the economy.
- In 2001 Hillary voted against the final version of the Bush tax cut, which subsequently ended the recession the President inherited from the Clinton Administration.

- In 2002 Tom Daschle (D-SD) presented a Democratic “stimulus package” based on the principle that increased government spending would cure the Clinton-generated recession that President Bush inherited. While extending tax benefits to select groups, the Daschle bill did nothing to lower overall tax rates. With the promise of more spending and the assurance of the same high tax rate for most Americans, Hillary voted for this bill.
- In 2001 the Republicans repealed the unfair double-jeopardy “death tax,” which taxed a citizen’s income when he or she was alive, and then taxed it again following interment. In 2002 Republicans tried to make that repeal permanent. Hillary voted against the bill, and it was defeated.
- In 2003 the Republicans proposed a measure that would accelerate the repeal of the “death tax.” Like a circling buzzard, Hillary voted against the proposal, but this time it passed.
- The same year, she voted to reduce the Bush tax cuts three times.
- In 2004 she voted in favor of rescinding already-passed tax cuts, in favor of taxing the Internet, and in favor of raising the top income tax rate (American Conservative Union, www.conservative.org).

Abortion

As noted elsewhere, in January of 2005 Hillary made a speech on this subject that to some sounded almost humane. However, her voting record reveals her true commitment—which is to NOW, NARAL, and the killing of unborn babies. Like all liberal women, Hillary is fanatic about abortion. Whenever the subject comes up in the Senate—her vote is predictable.

- In 2002 she voted in favor of taxpayer-funded abortions for military women and the wives and daughters of military men.

- In 2003 a resolution came before the Senate affirming the *Roe v. Wade* decision of 1973 that allowed pregnant women to kill their babies in the womb. Needless to say, Hillary voted for that one.
- In 2003 she voted “no” on a bill to ban partial-birth abortion, except when the life of the mother is endangered. (issues2000.org)
- In 2004 she voted against a bill that would have imposed a penalty on any criminal who harmed an unborn child while committing another crime. (Ibid.)
- According to NARAL (the National Abortion Rights Action League) her abortion voting record is 100 percent.

Big Government

As she has indicated many times, Hillary supports greater and greater government involvement in the lives of Americans. In *It Takes a Village*, her book on child-rearing, she equates African tribes with American cities—and argues that the state should assume a primary role in raising our children. In a speech on this subject, she went even further:

And we have learned that to raise a happy, healthy, and hopeful child, it takes a family, it takes teachers, it takes clergy, it takes business people, it takes community leaders, it takes those who protect our health and safety, it takes all of us.

Yes, it takes a village.

And it takes a president. It takes a president who believes not only in the potential of his own child, but of all children—who believes not only in the strength of his own family, but of the American family, who believes not only in the promise of each of us as individuals, but in our promise together as a nation. It takes a president who not only holds these beliefs but acts on them. It takes Bill Clinton. (Associated Press, August 26, 1996.)

If she wanted government (and Bill Clinton) to take over the functions of families, then you can be certain she favors government intrusion into every facet of our society. Her votes certainly confirm this conclusion.

Freedom of Speech

A growing number of critics have complained about the excessive influence of high-profile issue-groups and PACs such as MoveOn.org. The emergence of such operations is the direct and inevitable result of the ill-named Bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform Act, which also placed restrictions on free speech during elections.

In some ways the strictures placed on fundraising, campaign expenses, and content constitute the most obvious repression of free speech since the Alien and Sedition Acts, passed in 1798, during the presidency of John Adams. The electoral process should be as free as possible of government control, since citizens can only control government through free elections.

Now fatcats like George Soros are dominating federal campaigns nationwide and government bureaucrats are deciding whether or not political statements are in violation of the new law. Everyone, including the U.S. Supreme Court, has forgotten about the First Amendment. Needless to say, all the Liberals voted for the bill, including Hillary.

President Bush's Judicial and Cabinet Nominees

Perhaps the most outrageous strategy the Liberals have devised is the precipitation of a constitutional crisis by refusing to bring President Bush's nominees for the federal judiciary to a vote on the Senate floor. The authority to make such appointments is specified in the Constitution:

... [The President] shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law...

For 150 years or more, the Senate, with a few exceptions, routinely approved the President's nominations. Indeed, in the past, many confirmations took place in a day or two. The rationale: The President was elected by the majority of the people, therefore he should be able to appoint his cabinet members, sub-cabinet members, and the federal judiciary. The parties had a gentlemen's agreement to grant each other's chief executive that prerogative, thus honoring the will of the people.

When Robert Bork was nominated by President Reagan, the Democrats—in cahoots with their special interest groups—manufactured outright lies about Bork and consequently were able to reject his nomination when it came to a vote. But at least they allowed his name to come to the floor. What Hillary and her cronies are doing now is an unprecedented betrayal of the Constitution.

- Hillary Clinton, Teddy Kennedy, Tom Daschle, and a small cabal of Democratic leaders used the filibuster to keep a number of the President's nominees, sure of confirmation, from ever coming up for a vote.
- Because President Bush was elected on a conservative platform, he nominated John Ashcroft, a Conservative, to be attorney general. Like every other Left-winger, Hillary voted against him.
- President Bush nominated John Robert Bolton of Maryland to be Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and

International Security. Hillary and her liberal friends were afraid Bolton would be too tough in negotiating with our enemies and voted against him. At this writing, the Democrats are filibustering to keep Bolton from being confirmed as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

Miscellaneous

- When gay rights activists and sympathetic Leftists began to pressure the United Way, private firms, and schools to de-fund the Boy Scouts of America because they refused to permit open homosexuals to be Scoutmasters, Senator Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) proposed a bill that would allow federal funds to be withheld from public schools that bar the Boy Scouts from using their facilities, Hillary voted for the homosexuals and against the Boy Scouts.
- When Senator Gregg (R-NH) proposed an amendment to an education bill that would create a demonstration program in ten school districts to allow parents to use vouchers to move their children out of failing schools, Hillary voted against the plan, fearing that the school-choice programs would succeed and the hands of the National Education Association would be pried from the throats of America's schools.
- On February 17, 2005, Hillary Clinton joined with Left-wing Senator Barbara Boxer in introducing the Count Every Vote Act, a hodge-podge of so-called "reforms" backed by extreme liberal groups such as People for the American Way. In a statement posted on her Web site, Senator Clinton said: "Voting is the most precious right of every citizen, and we have a moral obligation to ensure the integrity of our voting process." Ensuring that integrity means, among other things, allowing millions of convicted murderers, rapists, armed robbers, and other

violent offenders to vote. You can be sure that a vast majority of those currently barred from federal elections would vote for her in the 2008 election. That's why the Count Every Vote Act states that all reforms must be in place by 2006.

These votes and introduced legislation are now facts of history as opposed to mere political rhetoric. They tell us more about the true intentions of Hillary Clinton than all the agreeable language crafted by her speechwriters to sell the American people a cleverly packaged product.

Those who call her "a moderate" are either unfamiliar with this consistently Leftist record or else have little regard for the truth. They do the American people a disservice by using this label. If a pharmaceutical house were to misrepresent a new drug in this fashion, the company would be disciplined by the FDA. In the market place of ideas, the only acceptable discipline is truth.

12 Hillary Turns to the Right

One look at the red-blue election maps currently popping up all over the Internet and you see the challenge Hillary faces in a run for the presidency. The South, the lower Midwest, the Southwest, and Northwest are all red. You can barely see the blue nibbling at the fringes of America—the two coasts and a few states surrounding the Great Lakes. The county-by-county map is so red you wonder why the margin of Bush's electoral votes wasn't wider.

Meanwhile, Hillary Clinton has recognized her problem and is already addressing it. According to conventional wisdom, in order to be a credible nominee in 2008—"centrist" enough to beat a Republican in the general election—she has to transform herself into a moderate, acceptable to at least some of red-state America.

But where to begin? As Hillary and her courtiers well know, the Democratic Party is nothing more than a coalition of special interest groups that must be regularly stroked and fed—or else. Hogs crowding at the trough, gangs collecting protection money—these groups are present at every Democratic strategy meeting and form the nucleus of every Democratic campaign. In no particular order, they include: Big Labor, minority activists, the pro-abortion feminists, the gay rights movement, and the radical environmentalists. Every Democrat is required to support these diverse agendas. Hillary Clinton is no exception.

Given that immutable fact, Hillary's metamorphosis has seemed even more unlikely. She can't become a fiscal conservative or a Friend of Business. She can't fight the imposition of various quotas on every segment of society. She can't vote in favor of a ban on partial-birth abortion. She can't support the Federal Marriage Amendment. And she can't point out that a surprising number of Nobel Prize winners believe global warming is an Al Gore fairy tale.

In addition, all of these groups are hard Leftists on most of the other issues that separate Liberals from Conservatives. They all favor higher taxes and expanded government, and they oppose privatization and the free market.

Trying to find a conservative stance that won't offend any or all of these groups is like trying to find a hog in a kibbutz. Hillary, Bill, and Harold Ickes must have spent weeks poring over possibilities. After weighing each, Team Hillary finally came up with four issues she could wax conserva-

tive over and still not alienate her base—immigration, a stronger defense posture, faith-based initiatives, and one that she might exploit through the use of double talk—abortion.

Given her past record, let's see how she has addressed these four issues with an eye toward making conservative converts.

Strengthening National Defense

While appearing on Fox News Sunday with Chris Wallace (May 23, 2004), Hillary Clinton said the following:

... we have to face the fact we need a larger active-duty military. We cannot continue to stretch our troops, both active-duty, Guard and Reserve, to the breaking point, which is what we're doing now... I'm supporting an effort to increase the end strength of the Army, increase the size of the military. This is a big decision for our country to make. It is expensive, but I don't think we have any alternatives.

She might just as well have said, "I'm running for president in 2008 and I'm after the hawk vote." A lot of history precedes that statement, history she hopes the American people will forget. As co-presidents ("two for the price of one"), she and Bill systematically gutted our military, with little or no regard for the safety of American troops and civilians. If what she says is true—if President Bush has an understaffed and under-funded military with which to defend America—it is because of the cruel and foolhardy cuts the Clinton Administration made in our defense budget.

During the 2000 presidential campaign, when the role of our military became an issue, Jack Spencer of the Heritage Foundation issued a report on U.S. preparedness—an assessment of our defense capability at the end of the Clintons' four-year reign (Backgrounder #1304, The Heritage

Foundation, September 15, 2000). Among other things, he found the following facts: The size of our military had been drastically, dangerously reduced during the surprisingly bellicose Clinton years. For example, between 1992 and 2000, Bill and Hillary cut national defense "by more than half a million personnel and \$50 billion in inflation-adjusted dollars." Translated into military units, the Army lost four active divisions and two reserve divisions for a total of more than 205,000 soldiers. As for the other branches, the "total number of active personnel" in the Air Force decreased by almost 30 percent and the number of bombers decreased from 270 to 178. The Navy lost around 77 ships, a decrease from some 393 ships in 1992 to some 316 in 2000. Even the Marines lost 22,000 personnel.

But perhaps this was simply the result of a kinder, gentler America, courtesy of the peace-loving Clintons. Perhaps we don't need a strong military when the nation isn't ruled by a vast right-wing conspiracy. Not so, said Jack Spencer.

In fact, the use of U.S. troops abroad "increased dramatically" during the Clinton years—by sixteen times. During the Cold War, "the Army conducted 10 operations outside of normal training and alliance commitments." However, with the Clintons as commanders-in-chief, "between 1992 and 1998, the Army conducted 26 such operations." As for the Marines, they "conducted 15 contingency operations between 1982 and 1989, and 62 since 1989. During the 1990s, U.S. forces of 20,000 or more troops were engaged in non-war fighting missions in Somalia (1993), Haiti (1994), Bosnia (1996), and Iraq and Kuwait (1998)."

Spencer's comment in 2000 is eerily similar to Hillary's hawkish statements on "Fox News Sunday," though it goes even further:

The Clinton Administration has damaged the U.S. military with a dangerous combination of reduced budgets, diminished forces, and increased missions. The result has been a steep decline in readiness and an overall decline in U.S. military strength. Nearly a decade of misdirected policy coupled with a myopic modernization strategy has rendered America's armed forces years away from top form. (Ibid.)

After the Clintons' history of slashing the military budget and weakening America's defense capabilities, how serious can we view Hillary's newfound zeal to strengthen America? When she took the oath of office, she demanded and got a seat on the Senate Armed Services Committee. She says she is as committed to national defense as she is to higher taxes. She certainly talks a good game. In fact, in 2003 she began blaming George Bush for the sorry state of our defense:

We have relied on a myth of homeland security—a myth written in rhetoric, inadequate resources and a new bureaucracy instead of relying on good, old-fashioned American ingenuity, might and muscle. ("Senator Clinton: Homeland Security a 'Myth,'" CNN.com, January 24, 2003.)

This may be the most eloquent piece of junk prose churned out by her staff writers. The passage is long on sound and fury, short on meaning. But you get the point. After eight Clinton years of unconscionable cuts in the military budget and dramatically increased military deployment, she has the gall to attack the Republican president for not defending America.

So maybe she has changed her mind since 9/11. Maybe she sees just how wrong she and Bill were to cut into the muscle and bone of our defense budget. O.K., so how committed has she been to defense since 9/11? Let's see.

When President Bush, taking the war against terrorism seriously, proposed the creation of a Department of Homeland Security, how did she react? Did she exude good, old-fashioned American ingenuity and come up with an alternative plan, one that relied on "might and muscle"? Or did she behave like a Democrat and oppose the President's plan on the grounds that it might inconvenience one of the pressure groups? Let's look at the record.

- In July of 2002 recognizing the urgency to act quickly, the Republican-controlled House passed a bill (H.R. 5005) that created the Department of Homeland Security—after only 32 days of deliberation.
- However, when the question came up for debate in the Senate, Hillary and her fellow Democrats stalled the legislation. Why? Because they wanted to include pro-union provisions.

America was trying to build its defenses as quickly as possible in the wake of a lethal attack on American soil, but Hillary Clinton and Teddy Kennedy and Tom Daschle were more worried about union prerogatives. As one reporter explained it, "Senate Democrats rallied with more than 100 union workers . . . to demand full union benefits and privileges for employees of the proposed new Department of Homeland Security. The unions oppose Bush administration requests for "management flexibility" at the new agency" (Jeff Johnson, "Democrats Rally To Protect Unions At New Security Dept.," CNSNews.com, September 5, 2002).

To put it bluntly, Hillary and her fellow Democrats were holding the lives of millions of Americans hostage while they negotiated a labor contract. And what did she have to say about a bill to strengthen our nation's defenses? Did she claim it wasn't tough enough or ingenious enough

or that it didn't have enough might and muscle. No, she said the Bush Administration was trying to "undermine and eliminate the rights of federal workers" (Douglas Turner, "Quinn Takes On A Key Role," *The Buffalo News*, August 11, 2002).

In fact, she voted at least four times for a substitute motion that would have tied the President's hands during a terrorist attack—just so she could give the federal workers' union a lollypop (S.A. 4471 To H.R. 5005, Roll Call Vote #218: Cloture Motion Rejected 50–49, With Clinton Voting Yes: R 0–48; D 49–1; I 1–0, September 19, 2002; S.A. 4471 To H.R. 5005, Roll Call Vote #225: Cloture Motion Rejected 49–49, With Clinton Voting Yes: R 1–47; D 47–2; I 1–0, September 25, 2002; S.A. 4471 To H.R. 5005, Roll Call Vote #226: Cloture Motion Rejected 50–49, With Clinton Voting Yes: R 1–48; D 48–1; I 1–0, September 26, 2002; S.A. 4471 To H.R. 5005, Roll Call Vote #241: Motion To Table Agreed To 50–47, With Clinton Voting No: R 48–0; D 1–46; I 1–1, November 13, 2002).

Why would she do such a thing? Maybe because she has received over \$350,000 in campaign contributions from government-employee unions, the only unions that have been growing in recent years (see www.campaignfinanceanalysisproject.com). And these contributions only hint at the aid and comfort she receives from these folks. When union bosses wag their tails, the whole Democratic Party wags.

So what effect did this extortion have on the Homeland Security bill? Did it postpone the strengthening of America's defenses by a few days? Or a few weeks? Try almost four months. In fact, the Senate took 112 days to approve a version of the House-passed bill, while Hillary and the Democrats ignored the security of the nation in order to money-grub for the unions (H.R. 5005, Roll Call Vote #367: Passed 295–132: R 207–10; D 88–120; I 0–2, July 26, 2002;

H.R. 5005, Roll Call Vote #249: Passed 90–9: R 48–0; D 41–8; I 1–1, November 19, 2002; H.R. 5005, House Agreed To Senate Amendments By Unanimous Consent, November 22, 2002).

You would think that she would be too ashamed of her role in undermining military preparedness during the 1990s—to say nothing of this later extortion scheme—to raise the issue of national security ever again. But "shame" is not a word spoken in the Clinton household. Thus by January of 2003 she was saying: "The truth is we are not prepared. We are not supporting our first responders, and our approach to securing our nation is haphazard at best" (CNN.com, January 24, 2003).

Could any American with brain waves vote for a candidate who would place the welfare of a pressure group above the security of the nation? The answer to that question is "Yes." Too many members of the AFL-CIO, NARAL, the NAACP, the Human Rights Campaign, and Greenpeace will vote to line their own pockets rather than to strengthen national security. However, many Americans will vote against their own narrow interests in order to support a stronger and freer America.

They won't do so, however, if they don't understand the full dimensions of Hillary Clinton's attempt to transform herself from a 1960s protester into Joan of Arc. If the time comes when wild-eyed terrorists again attack this nation, will Hillary Clinton rally to the defense of her country?

Not if it means inconveniencing Big Labor, NARAL, the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, or Greenpeace.

Immigration

Over the past several years, polls—lots of polls—have indicated that Americans are widely dissatisfied with the way the government has behaved toward both legal and illegal

immigration. This dissatisfaction erupted immediately after the 9/11 attack, as recorded by the following surveys:

- Zogby International, polling (September 15–16, 2001), reported that 77% said the government was not doing enough “to control the border and to screen people allowed into the country.”
- A September 19–20 Fox News poll showed that 92% were in favor of “imposing stricter immigration and border crossing policies.”

So immediately after 9/11, many Americans saw immigration—both legal and illegal—as a security threat. However, as the months and years passed, opposition tapered off—somewhat.

- In 2002 Zogby reported that 58% of Americans wanted to reduce immigration, 65% opposed granting amnesty to illegals, and 68% said the U.S. should station military troops along the border to stop illegal immigration.
- A Gallup poll released in July of 2004 revealed that 14% of Americans want to see immigration increased; another 33% want it kept at the present level and 49% want it decreased.

Clearly, anti-immigration sentiment has diminished somewhat over the past several years. Perhaps because of this opinion shift, President Bush has chosen to propose that we allow illegal aliens already in the United States to apply for permission to remain in this country as long as an employer certifies that work is available and that no U.S. citizen is being deprived of a job. The president also said he wanted to increase the level of overall legal immigration—not a popular position within the grassroots of his own party.

In Bush’s bold (some say reckless) stance, Hillary has seen the possibility of political gain, particularly if the sooth-

sayers are right when they predict another high-profile terrorist attack on a major U.S. city or the nation’s capital or Disney World. Even more than three years after the Twin Towers disaster, virtually half of all Americans still oppose the level of immigration that we now tolerate. If thousands more are killed in another such disaster, the number of immigration opponents is likely to soar, and Hillary Clinton could be the Winston Churchill of 21st-century America. With that possibility in mind, she has pressed the issue.

In an interview on WABC radio, she said:

I am, you know, adamantly against illegal immigrants. . . . Clearly, we have to make some tough decisions as a country, and one of them ought to be coming up with a much better entry-and-exit system so that if we’re going to let people in for the work that otherwise would not be done, let’s have a system that keeps track of them. (Quoted in the *Washington Times*, December 13, 2004.)

Indeed, she was downright judgmental when it came to the hiring of illegals:

People have to stop employing illegal immigrants. I mean, come up to Westchester, go to Suffolk and Nassau counties, stand on the street corners in Brooklyn or the Bronx. You’re going to see loads of people waiting to get picked up to go do yard work and construction work and domestic work. (Ibid.)

Reading this, one wonders if she is worried that so many illegals are living and working in New York or if she is furious that so many of her affluent neighbors have access to cheap labor—the Left-wing Wellesley girl taking up this issue to punish privilege.

Consider this statement, also in the WABC interview, in which she said she favored “at least a visa ID, some kind

of an entry and exit ID. And . . . perhaps, although I'm not a big fan of it, we might have to move towards an ID system even for citizens."

One sentence only, but the idea she launches strikes terror in the hearts of many Americans, particularly when voiced by a Left-wing ideologue who wants to "run something." A national ID card has been the persistent dream of the Left for generations. However, she apparently hasn't noticed how easily illegal immigrants can acquire green cards and any other ID to help them remain in this country. Like gun control, a national ID card would put law-abiding Americans at risk and do little to solve the problem at hand.

Carlos Espinoza, a spokesman for Rep. Tom Tancredo (R-CO), the leading Capitol Hill advocate of stricter immigration controls, said this of Hillary. "She's not a dumb woman. She's got a great liberal base, and she realizes there's no better way to draw in more conservative voters. She has really come out to the forefront on that" (ibid.).

Espinoza noted that Hillary began to speak out on this issue during and after the November election, when she saw John Kerry, Tom Daschle, and other liberal Democrats defeated by a wave of conservative candidates. "I think she's realizing how much this issue has grown since 9/11," he said. "If you talked about it before then, you were just a flat-out racist. Now it's this huge issue" (ibid.).

Conservative columnist Carl Limbacher, writing on NewsMax.com, has said the same thing: "More than any other leader of either political party, U.S. Sen. Hillary Clinton has been focusing on immigration reform and border security—taking hard-line positions that appeal to frustrated Republicans in a move that could guarantee her enough support in red states to win the White House in 2008" (ibid.).

Jennifer Duffy, writing for the *Cook Political Report*,

predicted that a stand against illegal immigration would help Hillary if she runs for president in 2008 (ibid.). "Democrats are asking if it's really smart to nominate another Northeastern Democrat, and she is a Northeastern Democrat," she said. "It's probably smart to blur that perception a little."

Whatever her motives or her level of sincerity, immigration is an issue she can exploit without jeopardizing her base. Indeed, blue-collar workers and African-Americans tend to see immigrants as the competition in a sometimes-volatile job market. And despite some recent GOP gains in the Hispanic community, Democratic strategists still see that particular immigrant population as their natural constituency.

However, Hillary's ability to use immigration as a Trojan horse to gain access to Conservatives is limited by the necessity to hold the Hispanic vote and to appear "generous and compassionate," the image Liberals persistently cultivate. So far her comments have amounted to little more than vague generalities. Only when someone demands specifics, will her sincerity be tested.

Does she advocate a massive concentration of U.S. troops on our southern border?

Would she, as commander-in-chief, give the order, "shoot to kill"? Or would she merely promise to lead a delegation to Mexico City to reason with President Vicente Fox, whose government has published a how-to-do-it manual for Mexicans illegally entering the U.S.?

Anyone who understands this woman's ideological sensibilities knows that her opposition to illegal immigration will never translate into decisive action. She can chatter about the issue until the votes are counted in 2008, knowing that the Republicans are divided on this question and that no tough legislation is likely to come up for a vote.

However, she needs to be challenged on this point before she lies her way into the hearts of those who are genuinely concerned for the security of America.

Faith-Based Initiatives

Another conservative issue she has exploited is federal funding of so-called “faith-based initiatives.” For those unfamiliar with the phrase, here’s an example: The Salvation Army feeds and clothes the homeless, but the organization is also openly Christian and offers spiritual counseling to its clients. The Salvation Army, then, is a faith-based initiative. In recent years, liberal-controlled municipalities and states have withdrawn financial support from the Army because its teachings are grounded in the Bible. Virtually all Left-wing Democrats argue that any government funding of an organization with religious ties is unconstitutional.

For this reason, political observers were astonished to read that Hillary Clinton—speaking to about 500 people at Boston’s Fairmont Copley Plaza—had expressed opinions that might have been voiced by the Rev. Jerry Falwell. According to Boston Globe Correspondent Michael Jonas, she spoke of a “false division” between faith-based approaches to social problems and recognition of the separation of church of state. As she put it, “There is no contradiction between support for faith-based initiatives and upholding our constitutional principles” (Boston.com, January 20, 2005).

Jonas reported that during her speech, she “invoked God more than half a dozen times” and, in a confessional mood, told the audience “I’ve always been a praying person.” She said religious people must be allowed to “live out their faith in the public square.”

On the surface, this seems like a change of heart as sudden and unpredictable as the conversion of Paul on the road

to Damascus. However, these statements are vague in nature and surrender little. Teddy Kennedy could have said the same thing without deviating from his socially permissive agenda.

The devil is in the details.

Would Hillary support government funding of religious education? Absolutely not. The National Education Association wouldn’t allow it.

Would she approve government funding for the Salvation Army, which refuses to recruit homosexual employees? Absolutely not, because gay rights organizations would regard such approval as an unforgivable transgression.

On the other hand, if the Rev. Jesse Jackson wanted federal funding to organize a voter registration drive in historically Democratic precincts, she would call that “living out his faith in the public square.”

Again, in the coming months and years, she must be questioned quite specifically on this important issue. Conservatives must not be misled by generalities—abstract statements of principle that may not translate into conservative public policy. Remember that Hillary and Teddy Kennedy say they are personally opposed to abortion, but vote in favor of it whenever the Senate affords them the opportunity.

Many say that President Bush won reelection by a substantial popular majority because in 2004, the evangelical community voted in greater numbers than in 2000. In fact, the single most important issue of the presidential election turned out to be “moral values” rather than “jobs” or “the economy.” Hillary has taken note. If “getting right” with the electorate means “getting right” with God, then she’s ready and willing. After all, for her, the cost is no more than a few well-chosen words, and her reward may well be the presidency.

The Abortion Switch That Wasn't

When speaking of abortion, Hillary has often been harsh and confrontational, full of the self-righteous militancy of organized feminism. During her senatorial campaign, she said, "There are a number of forces at work in our society that would try to turn back the clock and undermine a woman's right to choose, and [we] must remain vigilant (*New York Times*, A11, January 22, 2000).

So more recently, when she seemed to speak in a less strident tone, people were startled and puzzled. According to observers ranging from the Clinton clique at the *New York Times* to Conservative columnist John Leo, in a late-January 2005 speech, she adopted a "new language" in an attempt to transform herself into a political moderate on this issue.

In the highly praised speech—delivered in Albany to a group of Planned Parenthood types—she appeared to be taking positions she hadn't taken since she was a Goldwater Girl. A move to the center, many said. How shrewd! How unDemocratic!

Actually, this subtle shift in her position on abortion is an illusion created by the *New York Times*, whose editors are well-aware that millions of pro-family voters—even those for whom abortion is not the highest priority—view spokeswomen for NARAL and the National Organization for Women as shrill harpies. With this constituency in mind, the *Times* dished up the following story, from which most of the subsequent commentary sprang.

ALBANY, Jan. 24—Proposing new political language about abortion rights for the Democratic Party, Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton said today that friends and foes on the issue should come together on "common ground" to reduce the number of "unwanted pregnancies" and ultimately abor-

tions, which she called a "sad, even tragic choice to many, many women."

Mrs. Clinton, in a speech to about 1,000 abortion rights supporters at the state Capitol, firmly restated her support for the Supreme Court ruling that legalized abortion nationwide, *Roe v. Wade*. But then she quickly shifted gears, offering warm words to opponents of abortion—particularly members of religious groups—asserting that there was "common ground" to be found after three decades of emotional and political warfare over abortion. (Patrick D. Healy, *New York Times*, January 24, 2005)

Conservative columnist John Leo wrote:

And last week, while clearly underlining her pro-choice position, she expressed many sentiments firmly held by the anti-abortion movement. She called abortion a "sad, even tragic choice to many, many women," called on pro-choicers and pro-lifers to work together to reduce the number of abortions, and praised the influence of religious and moral values in delaying teenaged girls from becoming sexually active. Imagine, an important Democrat saying a good word for abstinence. (John Leo, "Hillary's Move," *TownHall.com*, January 31, 2005)

The *New York Sun* editorialized as follows:

It's become increasingly clear that at least some Democratic leaders are waking up to the need to move their party away from an extreme position on abortion so as to reach out to the "values voters" who are said to have won President Bush the election. Mrs. Clinton was once an exemplar of the combative stance that alienates such voters, but she's now effecting a turnaround. (*New York Sun*, Staff Editorial, January 25, 2005)

Just how “moderate” a speech did she deliver? And how new was her rhetoric?

Contrary to this gee-whiz commentary, with its talk about “moving toward the middle” and its celebration of her political savvy, this was the same old Hillary—hard line pro-abortion, pro-condoms, pro-Planned Parenthood oratory. The phrases repeated in many of the news reports and editorial commentary weren’t new. She had said most of these things before in almost the same language.

In addition, the quotes were taken out of context to suggest a warm, cuddly commitment to “family values.” However, virtually all of them were followed by the word “but” which took away what little had been given previously, as the following examples show [with emphasis added]:

- “Research shows that the primary reason that teenage girls abstain is because of their religious and moral values. We should embrace this—and support programs that reinforce the idea that abstinence at a young age is not just the smart thing to do, it is the right thing to do. **But** we should also recognize what works and what doesn’t work, and to be fair, the jury is still out on the effectiveness of abstinence-only programs. I don’t think this debate should be about ideology, it should be about facts and evidence—we have to deal with the choices young people make, not just the choice[s] we wish they would make. We should use all the resources at our disposal to ensure that teens are getting the information they need to make the right decision.” (“Remarks by Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton to the NYS Family Planning Providers,” January 24, 2005.)
- “Yes we do have deeply held differences of opinion about the issue of abortion. I, for one, respect those who believe

with all their hearts and conscience that there are no circumstances under which any abortion should ever be available. **But** that does not represent even the majority opinion within the anti-abortion community [that there are no circumstances under which abortion should be available].”

- We should also do more to educate and involve parents about the critical role they can play in encouraging their children to abstain from sexual activity. Teenagers who have strong emotional ties to their parents are much less likely to become sexually active at an early age. **But** we have to do more than just send the right messages and values to our children. Preventing unwanted pregnancy demands that we do better as adults to create the structure in which children live and the services they need to make the right decisions. A big part of that means increasing access to family planning services.

In addition to all the “butting,” the phrases which seem to move toward pro-abstinence and pro-life are so few in number, and so short, that they are all but swallowed up by the pro-abortion, pro-condom rhetoric. This was a long speech—almost seven single-spaced pages in Hillary’s press release. The total number of pro-family pages would amount to about a third of one page. The rest is vintage Left-wing rant, which includes a grim narrative about how Romanian women were forced to produce babies for the state, an attack on the Reagan/Bush refusal to allow tax dollars to support abortion providers in foreign countries, a celebration of condom-education, a demand for increased funding for Planned Parenthood and other such organizations, and a bunch of statistics from the Alan Guttmacher Institute.

Of course, she didn’t emphasize the word “condom,” but with that bunch, she didn’t have to. They understood

perfectly. Consider the following reaction by the pro-con-
dom, pro-abortion crowd:

- “I think Sen. Clinton’s comments were a perfect statement of the pro-choice position,” NARAL president Nancy Keenan told the *Buffalo News*. “She has not changed her position.”
- Eleanor Smeal, president of the Feminist Majority Foundation, told the Buffalo newspaper she was concerned when she saw the story but reassured when she read the complete text of Clinton’s speech. “I think the [*New York Times*] account is a distortion of the speech,” Smeal said. “In many ways, she said that if you’re interested in reducing the number of abortions, you should be with us.”
- Amy White, marketing and communications director for Planned Parenthood of Buffalo and Erie County, presented the kind of star-struck response that shows Clinton hasn’t alienated her core base. “She just energized the room,” White said. “We were all honored to be in her presence.”

Right to Life advocates likewise agreed that Clinton was not changing her long-standing views backing abortion (Steven Erfelt, “Abortion Advocates Defend Hillary Clinton After ‘Common Ground’ Speech,” LifeNews.com, January 27, 2005).

Does anyone, Right or Left, really believe that a mere change in rhetoric will turn enemies into friends, Phyllis Schlafly and Eleanor Smeal into happy, hugging moderates? Those who accept this view fail to understand that NARAL regards abortion as the elimination of inconvenient tissue, and the National Right to Life Committee regards it as murder. So where’s the common ground? In a collaboration to “reduce the need for abortion,” Hillary’s side gives up nothing. Abortion continues, but on a somewhat reduced scale.

Hillary Clinton’s voting record tells us exactly where her heart lies. Like all liberal women, she and her supporters are obsessed with abortion. She and others like her see this issue as central to their femininity, their self-esteem, their true being. If they lose the right to abortion on demand, then they are once again the slaves of men, nature, and God.

Thus, whenever abortion legislation comes up in the Senate—Senator Clinton’s vote is predictable. Until she votes against partial-birth abortion and in favor of measures that require parental notification and informing a patient about the pain the fetus suffers then—and only then—can we say that she has “moderated” her image. Until she changes her voting pattern, her policy toward pro-life, pro-family Americans is the same as it always has been: “Let them eat rhetoric.”

13 Conclusion

Anyone reading this book with an open mind should understand several things about Hillary Clinton’s potential as a presidential candidate.

First, American voters recognize her name, face, and voice—and that gives her a head start over most of her potential opponents, Democratic and Republican alike.

No one should underestimate this advantage. John Kerry spent a good deal of his time and resources telling Americans just who he was. So did Michael Dukakis. Many Americans don’t pay as much attention to politics as their more

activist neighbors. A surprising number don't know their party's candidate until after he or she is nominated. That's why incumbents at all levels of government are usually reelected—because people recognize their name on the ballot.

Hillary Clinton is a celebrity, a star. As a candidate, she begins where most presidential candidates hope to end—known by a vast majority of Americans. That means she already has a platform and can use it to broadcast her message and sell herself to the American people. No potential adversary in either party enjoys this advantage. You can be certain that she will make ample use of her celebrity status to appear on as many news programs and talk shows as possible and to gain additional exposure at high-fashion social events and at down-home gatherings like county fairs and NASCAR races.

Second, the media love her, ignore her mistakes, and trumpet her virtues, real or imagined.

The press has airbrushed her image from the time she first appeared on “60 Minutes” in 1992 when she and Bill—with the connivance of CBS—played the role of ideal married couple for a national TV audience. Occasionally a liberal newspaper like the *Washington Post* will probe her shady behavior, but for the most part she has gotten a free ride from the media in general, and the liberal TV networks in particular—ABC, CBS, NBC, and CNN.

For this reason, few Americans know who Hillary Clinton is and what she says and does. As a consequence, she is regarded by millions as a woman who has suffered much at the hands of her husband and someone who is both attractive and scrupulous. That impression alone is probably worth several million votes. It certainly worked wonders for her in the New York senatorial race.

The information contained in this book is enough to

influence the thinking of millions of Americans who, up until now, view Hillary Clinton with an uncritical eye.

Most Americans are sensible in their political views and traditional in their ethics. They don't want public officials who are pure ideologues or who involve themselves in a series of shady, even illegal escapades. As this book demonstrates, Hillary Clinton is a Left-wing feminist with an uncanny ability to end up engaging in morally questionable activities—one after another. Without a book such as this, few people would ever know what Hillary Clinton is about.

In 2008 the American people will be faced with the very real prospect of another eight years of Bill and Hillary in the White House—or, if you prefer, Hillary and Bill. Imagine what such an administration could look like.

- The likes of Sandy Berger and Madeleine Albright would be running the State Department. These are the authors of our current problems in the Middle East, the architects of a do-nothing policy that allowed the murder of American citizens and military personnel to go unpunished, permitted Osama bin Laden to go free when he was within our grasp, and left us open to terrorist attacks. Their motto: “Weaken our defenses, and coddle our enemies.”
- A clone of Janet Reno would be Attorney General, engineering more Wacos, sending fugitive children back to Cuba to starve under a totalitarian regime, and refusing to investigate high crimes and misdemeanors at the White House.
- Perhaps another Joycelyn Elders would be a likely choice as Secretary of Education, where she could fund programs that teach first graders how to masturbate.
- With an aging and ailing Supreme Court, Hillary would

be able to nominate more Justices to authorize the theft of private property and to legalize ever more exotic sexual practices. Expect radical Harvard professor Lawrence Tribe to be her first appointee.

- And Ira Magaziner could be back to help Hillary devise yet another socialist health-care plan that would place all doctors and hospitals under the thumb of the federal bureaucracy.

These things could happen. The choice will be up to an electorate which knows little enough about Hillary Clinton. This book is intended to remedy this deficiency. If you think what you have read is important, please help to spread the word by supporting the ACU and giving copies of this book—call 800-426-1357—to your friends. More than ever, the America people need knowledge in order to make wise decisions in our representative democracy.



Join the American Conservative Union Today!

Fill out the form below to become a member of the nation's oldest and largest grassroots conservative lobbying organization.

Annual membership dues are \$25. Additional contributions are appreciated*

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____

Zip _____

Phone _____

Fax _____

email _____

\$25 \$50 \$100 \$250 Other \$ _____

Please select payment method:

Check made payable to "ACU"

Visa Mastercard AmEx

Card No. _____

Exp. Date _____

Signature _____

Please return this completed form along with payment to:

The American Conservative Union

1007 Cameron Street

Alexandria, VA 22314

Tel (703) 836-8602 Fax (703) 836-8606

Visit us online at www.conservative.org

*ACU is a non-profit organization. Contributions to ACU are not tax-deductible. The IRS has determined ACU to be a 501(c)(4) organization, exempt from federal income tax. A copy of ACU's financial report may be obtained by contacting the American Conservative Union.

You Can Help Tell America About *Hillary Rodham Clinton*

This special abridged paperback created for you by The American Conservative Union can have a powerful effect on our Country's future—if you and others act soon!

Please consider giving copies to your friends at home and across America, so all Americans can learn the truth about Hillary Rodham Clinton the liberal media is not telling us.

By distributing as many copies as you can, you will be helping one of The American Conservative Union's most important educational campaigns ever, and you could help change American history.

Please act today!

**Special Bulk Copy Discount Schedule—
*Postage & handling included***

1 book.....\$ 4.95	25 books.....\$35.00	500 books\$295.00
5 books\$12.00	50 books.....\$65.00	1000 books ..\$495.00
10 books ..\$20.00	100 books...\$95.00	

**American Conservative Union
P.O. Box 738
Ottawa, IL 61350**

**ORDER TOLL FREE
800-426-1357**

Please send me _____ copies of Hillary Rodham Clinton.

Enclosed is my check for \$ _____ or please charge my

Mastercard Visa

No. _____ Exp. Date _____

Signature _____ Telephone _____

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Illinois residents please add 6.5% sales tax. Please allow 2 weeks for delivery. All sales are final.