



THE HILLARY FILES:

HOW SPECIAL INTERESTS THAT VIOLATE HEALTH, HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE ENVIRONMENT
HAVE PRE-PURCHASED THE CLINTON PRESIDENCY



A WHITE PAPER BY THE EDITORS OF
NEWSTARGET.COM

The Hillary Files:

How special interests that violate health, human rights and the environment have pre-purchased the Clinton presidency

A White Paper by the Editors of NewsTarget.com

September 6, 2016

“When all government, domestic and foreign, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will render powerless the checks provided of one government on another, and will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated.” – Thomas Jefferson, 1821

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Abstract.....	3
Introduction	4
I. Early Life and Political Career.....	6
1. Watergate	6
2. First lady of Arkansas.....	8
3. First lady of the United States.....	11
Whitewater summarized.....	12
Travelgate	14
Healthcare reform task force.....	15
Intimidator-in-chief.....	19
Filegate.....	20
Chinagate.....	21
Pardongate	22
II. The Senate Years.....	22
1. Campaign contributions.....	23
2. Ties to the Clinton Family Foundation.....	27
3. First presidential campaign – 2008.....	30
III. The Secretary of State Years.....	32
1. Government contributions to the Clinton Foundation.....	33
2. Industry contributions to the Clinton Foundation	38
3. Russian acquisition of strategic U.S. uranium reserves.....	39
4. Haiti.....	41
5. Africa	44
6. Keystone XL Pipeline	46
7. Additional “pay for play” scenarios.....	47
Colombia	47
India	48

The Hillary Files

8. Private email server	50
IV. Hillary's 2016 Presidential Campaign	53
1. Period before Clinton's official declaration.....	53
2. Key policy positions	54
The environment	54
Fracking.....	54
Monsanto, herbicides, GMOs, superweeds and a long relationship	60
Biosludge	66
Medicine/Healthcare.....	71
Vaccine backer.....	77
Transgender health issues	78
Abortion/Women's health.....	79
Clean, unaltered food.....	81
Geopolitical	86
The Iraq War	86
Russian "reset"	89
Libya	90
IV. Conclusions	93
References.....	96

Executive Summary

- From early in Clinton's career to the present day, she has been viewed as dishonest, self-serving, secretive, mired in scandal and beholden to special interests, and that pattern of behavior is well-documented in this paper.
- Her attempt as first lady to reform American healthcare failed, but she has embraced Obamacare's more socialistic trappings, such as broad government control over the healthcare market and a top-down, heavily regulated industry which has become more expensive and less serving to the American public.
- Clinton has shifted her positions on major regulatory and policy issues throughout her careers as a U.S. senator and two-time candidate for president, being heavily influenced by campaign contributions and foreign government access.
- Though she now claims to be an opponent of the oil and gas extraction technique known as hydraulic fracturing, or "fracking," as secretary of state she worked to expand the practice throughout the world.
- Clinton, her husband and the Clinton Family Foundation have been greatly enriched by domestic and foreign benefactors to whom she has granted special treatment and access while serving in an official capacity, rather than looking out for constituents and taxpayers.
- One of Clinton's most frequent benefactors is also one of the world's worst environmental offenders – Monsanto – whom she has consistently supported in practice, leading many to believe that, if she is elected president, the agri-business giant will control farming and environmental policy.

- Clinton backs an Environmental Protection Agency rule that allows for hazardous *biosludge* to be used as a fertilizer that poisons family gardens and other small agriculture endeavors.
- Clinton believes in, and touts, the phony global warming/climate change agenda, which will mean more regulations aimed at “curbing” its effects that will cost jobs, stunt the economy and result in heavy-handed governmental interference in daily lives.
- While claiming to be an opponent of Big Pharma, Clinton has taken millions in donations from the pharmaceutical industry and therefore is beholden to it, not to the American health consumer.
- A long-time advocate for vaccines, Clinton has been pushing for mandatory vaccination since her time as first lady with a program begun in 1993.
- As a Monsanto backer, Clinton also supports genetically modified crops and foods and will use her influence with other world leaders to expand damaging GMOs all over the world, while opposing mandatory GMO food labeling laws being pushed or passed by several states.
- She supports Obama’s virtual “open-door” immigration policies that defy her position as champion of women’s health and rights, since many women are victimized by illegal immigrants every day.
- Clinton voted in favor of the Iraq war and has a poor record of foreign policy management, as evidenced by that vote and the unrest she helped foment all across the Middle East.

Abstract

Hillary Rodham Clinton has been a public figure most of her adult life. Beginning in 1973, she was a young lawyer and member of the legal team in the House of Representatives preparing articles of impeachment against President Richard Nixon, and she has been in public service for most of her professional life since then. Currently, Clinton is running for president of the United States, and as such her long record of public service is facing renewed scrutiny. As this paper will show, her record of service is rife with scandal, charges of unethical behavior, criminal investigations and undue influence by outside special interests. Her policy positions very often match those of her most generous donors, even as she attempts to portray herself to the public as being aloof from such influence. Her secretive and legally questionable behavior also cast doubt on her judgment, a vital presidential quality. As head of the Executive Branch – and the federal agencies that fall under it – she will be tasked with guiding public policy regarding such important policy areas as healthcare, food, the environment, geopolitics and even women’s health. This paper will demonstrate a pattern of behavior that Clinton very likely will bring into the White House if elected – behavior that will be self-serving and not in the best interests of the American people.

Introduction

Hillary Rodham Clinton is a former practicing attorney, first lady, U.S. senator from New York and secretary of state – on the surface, seemingly one of the most accomplished political leaders of our time. But throughout her career she has been one of most polarizing figures in American politics as well, and she remains so today.

Much, though certainly not all, of the polarity stems from her time as first lady when she and her husband, President Bill Clinton, were either involved in, or implicated in, a number of scandals, some of which followed her and her husband into the White House from his prior position as governor of Arkansas.¹ The roles that Hillary Clinton played in her husband's presidency, and the various scandals associated with her, are well documented.

Less is known, however, about several major policy positions that the former first lady has either held or developed over the years after leaving the White House, while serving as a U.S. senator from the state of New York, and later, as secretary of state during the administration of President Barack Obama. These positions have become relevant now as she seeks the presidency once more as the Democratic Party's presumptive nominee.

Though mired in scandal yet today, talk and news coverage of Clinton's legal and political transgressions will eventually give way to more discussion of her policy positions as she faces the eventual Republican presidential nominee. Several of her views and the reasons why they are wrong for America form the basis for this white paper. Those include policy positions regarding traditional and holistic medicine, its institutions and government's overall role in healthcare; her likely environmental policies and how they would be destructive and oppressive; her belief in the "safety" of genetically modified organisms and use of dangerous chemical pesticides

due to her ties with major agribusiness companies; her disregard for women's health, despite her claims that, as the first woman president, she would be their best advocate; and her generally hawkish foreign policy that would see the U.S. involved in more "brushfire" wars overseas in countries where no military solution is possible.

This paper will further explore Clinton's vacillation on key policy positions, her penchant for changing her political views (but not her policy intentions) based on her current political environment, and how she has exhibited a pattern of behavior throughout her career in politics to defy the law, deceive the public and use the powers of government to silence or oppress political rivals.

I. Early Life and Political Career

Clinton's career in public service began in 1973 when she served as a staff attorney for Democratic members of the House Judiciary Committee, which was investigating then-President Richard Nixon's alleged involvement in the Watergate scandal.²

1. Watergate

In the early morning hours of June 17, 1972, a security guard noticed a number of burglars inside the office of the Democratic National Committee, which was located in the Watergate building in Washington, D.C., and alerted police. Upon the arrival of officers, the burglars were arrested, and upon further questioning, it was learned that they were tied to President Richard Nixon's reelection campaign. As noted by *History.com*, "this was no ordinary robbery... [the burglars] had been caught while attempting to wiretap phones and steal secret documents."³

Historians are not certain that Nixon actually had prior knowledge about the crime, but subsequent to the arrest of the burglars and the resulting political scandal he raised "hush money" for the burglars, tried to thwart an FBI investigation into the crime, destroyed evidence and fired uncooperative members of his staff.⁴

Initially, it wasn't at all clear that Nixon was tied to the crime, but soon several people began to get suspicious. They included *Washington Post* reporters Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein (who eventually cultivated an FBI source for several stories they wrote exposing the crime); trial Judge John J. Sirca; and members of Congress. And eventually some of Nixon's former staffers began to crack under pressure by investigators, detailing the president's criminal behavior.⁵

In May 1973, the U.S. Senate began televised hearings on Watergate, and in the early months of 1974, the House Judiciary Committee began

its work to draw up articles of impeachment. One of the young lawyers hired by the committee to assist in its work was 26-year-old Yale-trained lawyer Hillary Rodham, who took the job after her then-boyfriend Bill Clinton, also a Yale Law School alumnus, turned it down.⁶

One of about 45 other young lawyers, Clinton stood out for a number of reasons – most of them not good. While she did help draft the committee's procedural rules,⁷ she also drew the ire of an attorney appointed over her. There have been some reports, repeated recently now that Clinton is running for president again, that she was fired by lifelong Democrat Jerry Zeifman, the man who served as chief counsel to the House Judiciary Committee during the Watergate hearings. He has made that claim himself in interviews and in books he has written, but the public record shows that she remained with the House Judiciary Committee throughout its Watergate investigation.⁸

And while that and other claims made by Zeifman are controversial, what has seldom been challenged are his own published comments attesting to her character flaws during her time on the Watergate committee. One columnist for *WesternJournalism.com* recently wrote:⁹

As Hillary Clinton came under increasing scrutiny for her story about facing sniper fire in Bosnia, one question that arose was whether she has engaged in a pattern of lying.

The now-retired general counsel and chief of staff of the House Judiciary Committee, who supervised Hillary when she worked on the Watergate investigation, says Hillary's history of lies and unethical behavior goes back farther – and goes much deeper – than anyone realizes.

Jerry Zeifman, a lifelong Democrat, supervised the work of 27-year-old Hillary Rodham on the committee. Hillary got a job working on the investigation at the behest of her former law professor, Burke Marshall, who was also Sen. Ted Kennedy's chief counsel in the Chappaquiddick affair. When the investigation was over, Zeifman fired Hillary from the

committee staff and refused to give her a letter of recommendation – one of only three people who earned that dubious distinction in Zeifman’s 17-year career.

Why?

“Because she was a liar,” Zeifman said in an interview last week. ***“She was an unethical, dishonest lawyer. She conspired to violate the Constitution, the rules of the House, the rules of the committee and the rules of confidentiality [emphasis added].”***

Early on, then, Clinton’s own behavior made a peer question her ethics, and these are charges that have yet to be legitimately refuted, either by the candidate or her supporters. Many have tried to discredit Zeifman over discrepancies in his recollection of events, but how he personally described and characterized Hillary Clinton’s behavior on the Watergate panel is damning. What’s more, she has never commented on Zeifman’s charges.¹⁰

As we will see, this episode marked only the beginning of questions surrounding her behavior, ethics and honesty.

2. First lady of Arkansas

Before meeting her eventual husband, Hillary Clinton was active in Republican politics, and actually campaigned for the Republican Party’s 1964 presidential candidate, Barry Goldwater. She was inspired to enter public service after hearing a speech in Chicago by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in 1968, and switched her political allegiance to the Democratic Party in 1968.

After high school, Clinton attended Wellesley College, where she became active in student politics. She was elected senior class president before she graduated in 1969. She then applied for, and was accepted into, Yale University Law School. While attending Yale, she worked various jobs

as a student. In 1971, she first traveled to Washington, D.C., and worked on U.S. Sen. Walter Mondale's subcommittee on migrant workers. The following summer, she worked in the western states campaigning for Democratic presidential nominee George McGovern.¹¹

Bill Clinton met Hillary Rodham while both were attending Yale Law School in the early 1970s. They graduated in 1973 and were married in 1975. After graduation and marriage, the pair moved to Arkansas, Bill's home state, where both of them went to work briefly as professors at the University of Arkansas Law School in Fayetteville.

Bill was interested in politics as well, and shortly after they were married he ran successfully for Arkansas attorney general. In the meantime, in 1976, Hillary started working for the presidential campaign of Georgia Gov. Jimmy Carter, that year's Democratic presidential nominee. Husband Bill was elected as one of the youngest governors ever when he won the Arkansas gubernatorial race in 1978; he lost in 1980, but came back to win in 1982, 1984, 1986 (when the term was expanded to four years) and 1990.¹²

After working on the Carter campaign, Hillary joined the Rose Law Firm, a position that would later prove controversial as well. But it is here where Clinton began making corporate contacts that would become a hallmark of her political life. As noted by *Biography.com*:¹³

*Hillary joined the Rose Law Firm in Little Rock and, in 1977, was appointed to part-time chairman of the Legal Services Corporation by President Carter. As first lady of the state for a dozen years (1979-1981, 1983-1992), she chaired the Arkansas Educational Standards Committee, co-founded the Arkansas Advocates for Children and Families, and served on the boards of the Arkansas Children's Hospital, Arkansas Legal Services and the Children's Defense Fund. She also **served on the boards of TCBY and Wal-Mart.***

In 1978, the Clintons, along with business partners James and Susan McDougal, borrowed \$203,000 to buy 220 acres of land in Arkansas' Ozark Mountains, with the goal of building vacation homes. They formed the Whitewater Development Corporation; this is the same year that Bill Clinton won his first gubernatorial contest. Two years later, in 1980, Bill Clinton would lose a reelection bid and become a private citizen again. That same year, James McDougal, who served a brief stint as Gov. Clinton's economic development director, left government altogether in order to purchase a small bank in Kingston, Ark. Shortly thereafter, he loaned Hillary \$30,000 to build a model home on one of the Whitewater lots.¹⁴

In 1982 James McDougal purchased a small savings and loan association and named it Madison Guaranty. This same year, Bill Clinton was once more elected governor of Arkansas. By 1984, federal regulators began to question the lending practices and financial bedrock of Madison. According to *The Washington Post*, they became highly critical of "Madison's speculative land deals, insider-lending and hefty commissions paid to the McDougals and others."¹⁵ Bill Clinton once again won reelection.

As 1985 rolled around, the Clintons found themselves saddled with a lot of campaign debt – \$50,000, which was substantial for a governor of a small state. But James McDougal agreed to hold a fund-raiser at Madison Guaranty to help pay off some of the Clinton campaign's debt. After the event, federal investigators found that some of the money was withdrawn improperly from the funds of depositors. As federal investigators closed in, **McDougal hired the Rose Law Firm, where Hillary was a partner**, to do legal work for the ailing savings and loan. **Hillary and another Rose lawyer sought state regulatory approval for a recapitalization plan** for Madison from a state apparatus that answers, of course, to Hillary's governor husband.¹⁶

McDougal's troubles at Madison Guaranty continued to worsen, and by 1986 it was forced to borrow some \$300,000 from a company owned

by David Hale, a former judge in Little Rock. Hale's company received funds from the Small Business Administration to lend to disadvantaged business persons, but an investigation a decade later alleged that he gave as much as \$3 million to political figures instead. Federal investigators cited improper practices and removed McDougal as president of Madison, though he retained ownership. Two years later, witnesses from the Rose Law Firm said that **Hillary Clinton requested that Madison Guaranty contract files be destroyed**. She then wrote James McDougal seeking power of attorney to sell off remaining Whitewater lots and clean up all bank obligations. In 1989, Madison collapsed thanks to a series of bad loans and a change in the way government accounting worked. It was shuttered by the federal government, which spent \$60 million in taxpayer funds to bail it out. McDougal was then indicted on federal charges of fraud related to his Madison operation. He was acquitted in 1990.¹⁷

The presidential campaign of Bill Clinton ramped up in 1992, with the campaign requesting and gathering information about the Whitewater land deal and its relationship with Madison Guaranty and the McDougals. The campaign commissioned a report claiming that the Clintons lost about \$68,000 on Whitewater, though that figure was subsequently reduced to a little more than \$40,000. In examining the causes of Madison's failure, the Federal Resolution Trust Corporation sent a referral to the U.S. Department of Justice **naming both of the Clintons as "potential beneficiaries" of illegal activities** that took place at the savings and loan.¹⁸

3. First lady of the United States

Bill Clinton's first term began in January 1993. During the campaign, he regularly promised that the country would get "two for the price of one" if he were elected – a clear statement that he intended to hand off unprecedented Executive Branch responsibilities to wife Hillary Clinton.¹⁹ In March 1994, the UK's *Independent* reported:²⁰

The Clinton White House is like no White House in history. Never has a First Lady, not even Eleanor Roosevelt, been as powerful. ... None has been as influential in high-level appointments. Privately, any White House official will testify to her authority. Irrespective of the alleged philandering by her husband, the Clinton marriage has always been in good measure a professional partnership of equals. By their staff she is feared at least as much as he, and understandably so.

From the outset of the Clinton administration, however, there was scandal, and much of it *was tied to Hillary Clinton*. While Bill Clinton was dogged early and often about his alleged extra-marital affairs, Hillary Clinton tended to create scandal by her own behavior. The Whitewater scandal continued to grow during the Clinton presidency.²¹

Whitewater summarized

- Close friend and former Rose Law Firm partner Vince Foster, who was named deputy White House Counsel, filed three years of delinquent Whitewater corporation tax returns in June 1993; the following month he is found dead of an apparent suicide in a Washington, D.C., park near the White House. *The Washington Post* noted that “federal investigators [were] not allowed access to Foster’s office immediately after the discovery, but White House aides enter Foster’s office shortly after his death, giving rise to speculation that files were removed from his office.”
- The White House only turned over Whitewater documents to the Justice Department after the agency began preparing a subpoena.
- An independent counsel, Robert B. Fiske, was named to investigate Whitewater.
- Webster Hubbell, another Rose Law Firm attorney, was named by the Clintons (likely Hillary) as associate attorney general, but he resigned abruptly in March 1994 after allegations about his law firm

conduct were raised – Hubbell would eventually be convicted of fraud and serve 18 months in prison.

- Rose Law Firm billing records were subpoenaed almost immediately by independent counsel Fiske, but by the end of 1994, when a new independent counsel, Kenneth Starr, was appointed, they still had not been produced;
- **Hillary Clinton’s Rose Law Firm billing records mysteriously turned up** in January 1996 after two years – *on a table in the White House residence*. They show that Hillary performed 60 hours of legal work for Madison Guaranty in 1985 and 1986.
- Though no criminality is found, a Senate panel investigating the Whitewater land deal finally received notes it had subpoenaed from the Clinton White House containing the cryptic phrase, **“Vacuum Rose law files WWDC [Whitewater Development Corporation] Docs – subpoena.”**
- In January 1996, Hillary Clinton, who had been subpoenaed by Starr **in a criminal probe** to determine if she intentionally withheld her billing records, testified before a grand jury about the discovery and content of her billing records.
- Friends of the Clintons begin to be charged and convicted – including a sitting Arkansas governor, Jim Guy Tucker and the McDougals, as well as David Hale.
- In September 1996, **an FDIC inspector general’s report concluded that Hillary Clinton created a real estate document that Madison Guaranty used to “deceive” federal regulators a decade earlier.**

- Eventually, the Clintons were cleared, but the water had been muddied and it appeared to many political observers that Clinton friends paid the price for their association with the former first couple.

As for Hillary Clinton herself, she was involved in her own set of scandals, allegations and allegedly unethical behavior. Here is a summary of the period examined:

Travelgate

The earliest of the crony scandals in the Clinton White House, “Travelgate” began in May 1993, just a few short months after Bill Clinton took office. It involved the firing of seven employees in the White House Travel Office, long-time employees who were replaced by friends of the Clintons who stood to benefit financially from the White House travel business. The first couple alleged that the employees had been fired over long-term financial improprieties, though no evidence of that charge turned up during a subsequent investigation. Most of the employees were eventually rehired in other federal departments, and the Clinton associates were removed.

Initial reports alleged that Hillary had a direct role in firing the employees – a role that she vehemently denied – and making false statements about the incident. In 1996, *The New York Times* reported:²²

*A memorandum by a former Presidential aide depicts Hillary Rodham Clinton as the central figure in the 1993 travel office dismissals, a politically damaging episode that the aide said had resulted **from a climate of fear in which officials did not dare question Mrs. Clinton’s wishes.***

*The newly released draft memorandum, written by David Watkins, the former top administrative aide at the White House, also **sharply contradicts the White House’s official account of Mrs. Clinton as merely an interested observer** in the events that led to the dismissal of the White*

House travel staff and their replacement with Clinton associates from Arkansas.

The *Times* noted further that, in addition to Hillary Clinton, Watkins had to deal with Vince Foster and Harry Thomason, a Clinton associate, Hollywood producer and part-owner of an air-charter consulting firm. Watkins said they, like her, badgered him to act.

“Once this made it onto the First Lady’s agenda,” Watkins wrote, “Vince Foster became involved, and he and Harry Thomason regularly informed me of her attention to the travel office situation -- as well as her insistence that the situation be resolved immediately by replacing the travel office staff.

“Foster regularly informed me that the First Lady was concerned and desired action -- the action desired was the firing of the travel office staff. On Friday, when I was in Memphis, Foster told me that it was important that I speak directly with the First Lady that day.”

Watkins wrote further that he had called Hillary that evening and that she had conveyed “her desire for swift and clear action to resolve the situation.”²³

The White House at the time dismissed Watkins’ memo as “inaccurate.”²⁴

Healthcare reform task force

Shortly after he took office, Bill Clinton appointed his wife to lead the Task Force on Health Care Reform. As reported by *The New York Times*, “The recommendations spawned by that panel — calling for universal health care, minimum coverage requirements and potential limits on health care spending increases — were derided as ‘Hillarycare’ by opponents and arguably cost Democrats control of the House of Representatives in the 1994 midterm elections.”²⁵

From the outset, there was controversy. First and foremost, Bill Clinton was elected with a mere 43 percent of the vote (there were three candidates in the 1992 election: Clinton; President George H. W. Bush, the Republican; and Reform Party candidate H. Ross Perot, who received nearly 19 percent of the national vote²⁶), and while he treated it as a mandate, many in Congress did not, making his healthcare reform push endangered from the outset.²⁷

But that aside, Hillary Clinton's biggest controversy in attempting to get healthcare reform passed was a pattern of behavior that would become a characteristic of hers throughout her tenure in government: Secrecy. Within a month of the Clintons taking office and just after the healthcare reform effort began, *The New York Times* reported, "The culture of secrecy is such that the White House refuses to provide a full list of consultants brought in to aid in the effort."²⁸

In January 1993, *just days* after Bill Clinton was inaugurated, *The Washington Times* reported that the first lady's task force on healthcare violated federal open records laws.²⁹ In addition, besides its secrecy being an issue, the employment of some of its members was also called into question.

According to a recounting of the period by the National Legal and Policy Center:³⁰

It was not a surprise when the media virtually ignored a story later in February by *Washington Times* reporter Paul Bedard that appeared under the headline, "First lady's task force broke law on secrecy." Bedard noted that reporters had been denied access to the first task force meeting. He went on to quote a number of attorneys and experts who asserted that this was in violation of something called the Federal Advisory Committee Act or "FACA." The little-known law, on the books since 1972, applies when a President convenes a group of people which includes private citizens to advise him on a particular issue. Although the President is advised by all kinds of

formal and informal bodies within his Administration, FACA kicks in only when non-government employees or “outsiders” take part.

Citing the law, a doctor’s group and a pair of public interest organizations sent a letter to the task force requesting they be allowed to send staff members to attend meetings. But in response they received a letter from White House Counsel Bernard Nussbaum who asserted that, for some reason, the law did not apply to the first lady, so the request was denied.³¹

In February 1993, Clinton and the six Cabinet members serving on the board were sued in U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia by the three organizations – the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, the American Council for Health Care Reform and the National Legal and Policy Center. In a sworn deposition on March 3, 1993, one of Hillary Clinton’s top aides on the reform effort, Ira C. Magaziner, falsely stated that all panel members were government employees.³² That was no small thing; even if a court eventually ruled that the FACA statute did not apply to Clinton, it would apply to the presence of “outsiders.” For months, the lie stood as fact, though. “Hillary and other participants in the task force knew it was a lie but took no action to expose it or to correct the record. Nothing would be allowed to get in the way of drafting a health plan and getting it passed by Congress,” the National Legal and Policy Center noted.³³

A federal judge eventually ruled against Hillary, ordering her to open the meetings of the committee to the public. But that ruling was overturned on White House appeal. Later, a leaked list of over 500 people involved in the task force was read into the Congressional Record by Rep. Gerald Solomon, R-NY, and published by *The Wall Street Journal*. In June 1993, *The Washington Times* reported that documents pertaining to the committee’s inner workings were being shredded, leading to a demand by an angry U.S. District Court Judge Royce Lamberth for government lawyers to identify who the custodian of the records was so he would know “who’s going to be held in contempt” if they were all destroyed.³⁴

Newspapers at the time railed against Clinton's secrecy:³⁵

On their editorial pages, the *Washington Times* and the *Wall Street Journal* were unmerciful. But liberal newspapers editorialized against the secrecy, too. *USA Today* opined that it fed "public suspicion of government." Hillary's critics were eventually so successful in making the secrecy issue stick that in July of 1994 the *Washington Post* made reference to the "administration's secret Health Care Task Force" in a straight news article.

The health plan that eventually emerged was massive – more than 1,340 pages – and centered on new concepts like "managed competition" and "managed care." It was the "product of a complicated and gargantuan task force."³⁶ The plan was immediately attacked by the insurance and pharmaceutical industries as overly repressive and regulatory. Clinton fired back at both industries, and in particular the pharmaceutical industry, which she accused of "price-gouging" and "profiteering." In attacking popular television ads that criticized the plan, Clinton claimed that they were being paid for by the insurance industry. However, there was much that Clinton was not saying – for instance, how her plan benefited *both* industries:³⁷

What Hillary did not mention is that her plan had the strong support of the nation's largest insurance companies, who had helped develop it in the first place. The HIAA is made up of mostly small and medium size insurance companies, who stood to be squeezed out under Hillary's plan. The hypocrisy of the assault on the insurance industry was largely ignored by the media. ...

Another booster of the Clinton plan was the big drug companies, which had also come under rhetorical attack from the Clintons. Shortly after the task force was announced, Hillary had accused drug companies of "price-gouging" and "profiteering." Bill visited a health clinic in Arlington, Virginia and asserted that pharmaceutical firms pursued "profits at the expense of our children." But once the

plan came into being, it contained new prescription coverage for 72 million people, translating into additional revenues of \$10 billion annually. Pharmaceutical firms had not only been on the inside of the task force, but insured their access by hiring top Clinton associates as lobbyists.

The insurance and pharmaceutical industries spent millions attempting to get Clinton's health plan, dubbed "HillaryCare" by critics, passed, but the legislation eventually died in Congress. Critics of its failure would later observe that Clinton's obsessive secrecy and willingness to skirt the law in order to get it passed ultimately doomed the bill.³⁸

Intimidator-in-chief

Bill Clinton's dalliances with members of the opposite sex who are not his wife are legion and well documented. But during her time as first lady, Hillary Clinton – no doubt with an eye toward a political future of her own – was reportedly behind several campaigns to discredit husband Bill's accusers.

One alleged former victim of unwanted sexual interaction by Bill Clinton was Kathleen Willey. In a 2007 book, *Target: Caught in the Crosshairs of Bill and Hillary Clinton*, Willey – a former Democratic activist who founded Virginians for Clinton and helped elect Bill Clinton, wrote that Hillary Clinton went out of her way to obstruct, intimidate and even threaten her for exposing the attempt by her husband to have intimate relations with Willey (an advance she says she refused). As reported by *WorldNetDaily*:³⁹

The Clintons have been accused of hiring private investigators to not only dig up dirt on perceived adversaries – such as Juanita Broaddrick, the woman allegedly raped by Bill, and other abused women such as Gennifer Flowers, Kathleen Willey and Paula Jones – but to stalk, scare and threaten them. Willey asserts Hillary was behind a campaign of intimidation and harassment against her that fit a pattern employed

against numerous other women whose claims of sexual impropriety or assault by Bill Clinton threatened the couple's political fortunes.

As for Willy personally, *WorldNetDaily* reported further: "The Clintons have been accused of hiring private investigators to not only dig up dirt on perceived adversaries – such as Juanita Broaddrick, the woman allegedly raped by Bill, and other abused women such as Gennifer Flowers, Kathleen Willey and Paula Jones – but to stalk, scare and threaten them. Willey asserts Hillary was behind a campaign of intimidation and harassment against her that fit a pattern employed against numerous other women whose claims of sexual impropriety or assault by Bill Clinton threatened the couple's political fortunes."⁴⁰

Wiley further asserts that Hillary's days of intimidating women with whom her husband had allegedly been involved go back to her days as first lady of Arkansas.

Filegate

Another scandal that Hillary Clinton was reported to be involved in pertained to the theft of FBI files on political enemies of the White House, most of them Republicans who had served in previous Republican administrations.

"In an effort to discredit the women who charged President Clinton with sexual misconduct, personal files and papers were illegally obtained and released. The courts found, under the Privacy Act, that the privacy of Linda Tripp and Kathleen Willey had been violated," reported Judicial Watch – a conservative legal watchdog group – citing just a few of more than 900 relevant files. Judicial Watch stated further that Hillary had been linked "directly to the center" of the controversy.⁴¹

The man who had taken the FBI files was Craig Livingstone, a buffoonish former bar bouncer whom Hillary hired and installed as White House security director. The theft of the files was discovered by investigators

working for the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee as they were looking into the Travelgate affair.

Chinagate

As her husband geared up for his reelection bid, Hillary allegedly concocted a scheme to raise funds that she would later employ in another administration: Foreign sources. In essence, American technology companies made donations of millions of dollars – including to the Clinton reelection campaign – in exchange for authorization to sell sophisticated, high-tech secrets to China. The sales, discovered by Judicial Watch after filing a Freedom of Information Act Request and receiving documents from the Commerce Department, found transfers “including but not limited to nuclear missile and satellite technology, apparently in exchange for millions of dollars in contributions to the 1996 Clinton-Gore re-election effort and the Democratic National Committee.”⁴²

In January 2013 then-head of Judicial Watch, founder Larry Klayman, a former Justice Department prosecutor, wrote:⁴³

*Not to be outdone by her prior scandals, **Hillary ... masterminded a scheme** whereby the Clinton-Gore presidential campaign of 1996 **took bribes from communist Chinese banks and their government to bankroll** the president's and the Democratic Party's re-election efforts when it appeared, due to their low standing in the polls, that all the stops needed to be pulled out. It was the lawsuit that I brought against Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown, **where at Hillary's instruction, he literally sold seats on Department trade missions to China and elsewhere**, which principally uncovered this [my emphasis].*

Pardongate

On his way out the White House door, Bill Clinton issued a number of controversial pardons of criminals, and as usual, a great many of them were politically motivated. In the months preceding Bill's exit after two terms, Hillary Clinton made history by launching a bid for a U.S. Senate seat in the state of New York (even though they both hailed from Arkansas). One of the most controversial pardons was of billionaire trader Marc Rich, a convicted tax evader who fled the U.S. to Switzerland in 1983 after being indicted by a federal grand jury on more than 50 counts of fraud, racketeering and trading with Iran during the hostage crisis in the late 1970s.⁴⁴

His wife, Denise Rich, a songwriter, **had made more than \$100,000 in contributions to Hillary's senatorial campaign and \$450,000 to Bill's presidential library foundation.**⁴⁵ Investigations, as before, found no wrongdoing, and Bill Clinton claimed to have granted the pardon – just hours before he left office – on the advice of legal counsel.⁴⁶

II. The Senate Years

Hillary Clinton became the first sitting first lady to be elected to office – in this case, the U.S. Senate. She was seated as New York State's junior senator just days before her husband left the office of the presidency. In running for office, it quickly became apparent that Hillary planned to use all means of political connections – both in and out of government – to raise money and launch her campaign. That meant primarily one thing: Saying what needed to be said in order to please key constituencies and donors, while all along plotting a different legislative course once she held office.

Early in her senatorial career, it became obvious Clinton would be beholden to some of the same special interests that she cultivated during her time in the White House. According to a 2015 analysis by *The*

Washington Post, both Clintons have raked in nearly \$3 billion since they entered politics. For her Senate bid in 2000, the paper found that she raised \$30 million; for her 2006 reelection bid, she raised \$60 million.⁴⁷

1. Campaign contributions

According to the website *Open Secrets*, which tracks campaign financing and donations to political parties and individual campaigns, these were the top five contributors to Clinton's 2000 senatorial bid:⁴⁸

- Citigroup (banking/finance)
- Kushner Companies (New York-based real estate developer)
- Time Warner (media)
- Goldman Sachs (banking/finance)
- Walt Disney (media)

In that same election cycle, the industries that contributed most were:⁴⁹

- Lawyers/Law Firms (\$2.3 million)
- Retired (\$1.42 million)
- Securities and Investment (\$1.19 million)
- Women's Issues (\$1.083 million)
- Real Estate (\$1.047 million)

Banking/finance companies showed up frequently on Clinton's donor list. Included in the Top 20 were JP Morgan Chase & Co., USB AG, Credit Suisse and Bear Stearns.⁵⁰

From 2001 to 2006, the year of her reelection, six of the top nine contributors to her campaign were with the financial/banking industry:⁵¹

1. Citigroup
2. Goldman Sachs
3. MetLife Inc.
4. Morgan Stanley
5. JPMorgan Chase
6. Credit Suisse Group

Financial firms weren't the only ones that found Clinton "useful." One of her top five donors through the same period was Corning Inc.,⁵² an old upstate New York company that was among the region's largest employers. The company's executives historically backed Republican candidates for office – so much so that its chairman once joked that the company had not raised money for a Democrat since 1812.⁵³ In 2006 *The New York Times* noted that, after Clinton was elected, the company warmed up to the Democratic senator, and "vice versa":⁵⁴

But since Hillary Rodham Clinton was elected to the Senate in 2000, Corning and its mainly Republican executives have become one of her largest sources of campaign contributions. And in that time, Mrs. Clinton has become one of the company's leading champions, delivering for it like no other Democratic lawmaker.

In April 2003, a month after Corning's political action committee gave \$10,000 to her re-election campaign, Mrs. Clinton announced legislation that would provide hundreds of millions in federal aid to reduce diesel pollution, using, among other things, technology pioneered by Corning. It was one of several Congressional initiatives

Mrs. Clinton has pushed that benefit the company.

And in April 2004, Mrs. Clinton began a push to persuade the Chinese government to relax tariffs on Corning fiber optics products, inviting the Chinese ambassador to her office and personally asking President Bush for help in the matter. One month after the beginning of that ultimately successful effort, Corning's chairman, James Houghton, held a fund-raiser at his home that collected tens of thousands of dollars for her re-election campaign.

The *Times* further noted that Clinton parlayed her clout as a former first lady into a mutually beneficial relationship.⁵⁵ And it wouldn't be the last time that the Corning-Clinton relationship came in handy for both of them.

What did all of these industries get for their money? Access, for one, but not much, initially, in the way of legislation, before she really began cultivating *relationships*. According to *Open Secrets*, Clinton did not sponsor any legislation in the 107th Congress (2002) or the 108th Congress (2004). However, she sponsored or co-sponsored hundreds of pieces of legislation in the two congresses following those – the 109th in 2006 and the 110th in 2008 – which coincided with the run-up to her first presidential bid.

Equally important as the timing of her legislation and the industries that donated large sums to her campaigns is her continued association with them. The two industries that, on the surface appear to be Clinton's least favorite, are the healthcare industry and the pharmaceutical industry. It should be pointed out, however, **that these two industries are some of her biggest contributors** – so much so that even Democrat-leaning media outlets have questioned her authenticity.

A July 2006 *New York Times* article titled "Once an Enemy, Health Industry Warms to Clinton," is largely a story of omission, in that it did not provide any details about how the pharmaceutical and health

insurance industries that she supposedly disapproves of were in on the writing of her massive, failed HillaryCare legislation. But it nevertheless contained some telling details regarding those who sought to influence Clinton, and from whom her organization specifically sought donations:⁵⁶

When she tried to overhaul the nation's health care system as first lady, Hillary Rodham Clinton alienated some people and institutions in the health care industry by championing a huge expansion of the federal role. She provoked a fierce reaction from the industry, which mocked her proposal in television advertisements and dispatched lobbyists who ultimately helped kill the plan.

But times change. As she runs for re-election to the Senate from New York this year and lays the groundwork for a possible presidential bid in 2008, Mrs. Clinton is receiving hundreds of thousands of dollars in campaign contributions from doctors, hospitals, drug manufacturers and insurers.

The paper also openly stated that those donating to her campaign were doing so in order to influence her in the present and in the future – something a seasoned politician like Clinton was well aware of:⁵⁷

While some people in the health care industry are still wary of Senator Clinton, many say they see her as the likely next Democratic presidential nominee and are moving to influence her agenda on an issue that polls indicate is of growing concern to voters.

Frederick H. Graefe, a health care lawyer and lobbyist in Washington for more than 20 years, said, "People in many industries, including health care, are contributing to Senator Clinton today because they fully expect she will be the Democratic presidential nominee in 2008."

“If the usual rules apply,” Mr. Graefe said, early donors will “get a seat at the table when health care and other issues are discussed.”

Others also questioned Clinton’s veracity and authenticity:⁵⁸

Tracey Schmitt, a spokeswoman for the Republican National Committee, questioned the sincerity of Senator Clinton’s new, more pragmatic approach on health care.

“This reveals that Hillary Clinton is a politician more concerned with campaign contributions than policies she claims to support,” Ms. Schmitt said of the senator’s efforts to court the health care industry. In fact, ***during her 2000 Senate campaign, she sharply criticized her opponent, Rick A. Lazio, as being beholden to the pharmaceutical industry for taking donations from drugmakers.***

And yet, as the Center for Responsive Politics – the publishers of OpenSecrets.org – noted, Clinton received hundreds of thousands of dollars from Big Pharma, doctors, medical organizations and health insurers.

“While the health care industry was among her top supporters in her 2000 Senate race, the trend has accelerated in 2006 as her political prominence has grown and as she has become an important legislative player on health care issues,” *The New York Times* reported. “With about four months left before Election Day, Senator Clinton has already raised more money in this campaign from the health care industry than she did in her 2000 run.”⁵⁹

2. Ties to the Clinton Family Foundation

As senator, Clinton began cultivating ties to Clinton Foundation donors in the form of special favors to the larger contributors. That’s because as a senator she had the power to earmark federal funds and to influence legislation.⁶⁰

For example, Clinton introduced a bill as New York's junior senator that permitted a donor to the Clinton Foundation to utilize tax-exempt bonds to build a shopping center in Syracuse, according to public records.⁶¹

In addition, Clinton lent a legislative hand to Freddie Mac, formally known as the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, when she worked to beat back a bill that would have placed tougher regulations on the giant lender before the housing bubble actually burst and led to the Great Recession. That same year, Freddie Mac put \$50,000 and \$100,000 in two separate donations to what was then her husband's foundation, the William J. Clinton Foundation, records indicate.⁶²

The political action committee of both Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae, the latter formally known as the Federal National Mortgage Association, as well as employees linked to the companies, also donated \$75,500 to Clinton's senatorial campaign.⁶³ In sum, she was the fourth-largest recipient of the firms' total donations between 1989 and 2008 behind Barack H. Obama, John F. Kerry and Christopher J. Dodd.⁶⁴

Also, Clinton used her position as a senator to help convince the Chinese government to lower tariffs on Corning Inc.'s fiber optic products. The company's employees summarily donated hundreds of thousands of dollars to her campaigns and political action committee.⁶⁵ *The Washington Times* reported:⁶⁶

Analysts on political money have said the pattern of Clinton's intervention on behalf of donors to her husband's charity raise troubling ethical questions.

"It seems like the Clinton Foundation operates as a slush fund for the Clintons," Bill Allison, a senior fellow at the Sunlight Foundation, a government watchdog group, told the *New York Post* in April after conflict-of-interest reports started surfacing between the Clinton Foundation and Mrs. Clinton's political work.

At the time, the majority of Americans agreed with Allison's view that Clinton was being influenced by outside money – 61 percent, the *Times* noted, citing a Fox News poll.⁶⁷

Adding to the storyline of donors contributing to the Clinton Foundation getting favorable legislative treatment is one that goes hand-in-hand with the favors Clinton granted wealthy donors in general.

In 2004, for instance, Robert J. Congel, a New York builder located upstate, donated \$100,000 to the Clinton Foundation, which came just a month after Clinton, in her role as U.S. senator, helped pass legislation allowing Congel's firm to use tax-free bonds in order to construct a massive shopping center called Destiny USA in Syracuse. About one year later, Clinton added a \$5 million earmark to a highway bill for Congel's development project; it passed nine months after Congel made his Clinton Foundation contribution.⁶⁸

Now a political ally, Sen. Elizabeth Warren, D-Mass., was a Harvard law professor in 2004. In interview with veteran journalist Bill Moyers, Warren recounted a meeting with Clinton in the 1990s and, in particular, how her position on bankruptcy legislation at the time changed after she became a U.S. senator:⁶⁹

Warren had written an editorial about a piece of bankruptcy legislation that she opposed. Then-First Lady Hillary Clinton read it and asked for a meeting to discuss the bill and Warren's research, which showed that it would disproportionately affect women and children. After the meeting, Mrs. Clinton went back to the White House and the Clinton Administration reversed its position on the bill. President Clinton eventually vetoed it, and in her autobiography, Hillary Clinton took credit for preventing the bankruptcy bill from passage.

But then Hillary Clinton became a senator.

In the interview with Moyers, Warren noted that Clinton eventually voted in favor of the legislation she once said she opposed. When Moyers asked why, Warren replied:⁷⁰

As Senator Clinton, the pressures are very different. It's a well-financed industry. You know a lot of people don't realize that the industry that gave the most money to Washington over the past few years was not the oil industry, was not pharmaceuticals. It was consumer credit products. Those are the people. The credit card companies have been giving money, and they have influence. ...

She has taken money from the groups, and more to the point, she worries about them as a constituency.

3. First presidential campaign – 2008

During her final years as a U.S. senator, the always ambitious Hillary Clinton launched her first campaign for president. As in the past, big money interests were tapped early and often to fund the effort. What's more, she tried to use her Senate experience as a positive, and to downplay any appearance of unethical giving and receiving for legislative *access*.

According to a *Washington Post* analysis, Clinton raised \$255 million during her first presidential campaign before bowing out after losing the Democratic Party nomination to then-U.S. Sen. Barack Obama of Illinois.

During the campaign, Clinton staked out a number of positions, many of which aligned perfectly with the industries that were contributing most to her campaign. In 2007, for instance, she defended the outsourcing of American jobs to India, but in that same year she said Congress should end tax breaks for the outsourcing of U.S. jobs.⁷¹ The second position was much more politically popular, but during her time in the Senate she voted several times for global trade agreements that led to the outsourcing of jobs.⁷²

There was also much hypocrisy on Clinton's part when it came to Wall Street. During her first presidential bid, the housing market collapsed and the Great Recession began (2007–2009), which many Democrats and liberals blamed on the “big banks” (banks which were forced to make shaky loans to people who couldn't afford their homes thanks, ironically enough, to legislation signed by *President Bill Clinton*⁷³). Hillary Clinton was among those who did the criticizing.

“You can look at what I did in the Senate,” Clinton said during a Democratic presidential debate with fellow contender Sen. Bernie Sanders, I-Vt., in November 2015. “I did introduce legislation to rein in compensation. I looked at ways that the shareholders would have more control over what was going on in that arena. And specifically said to Wall Street, that what they were doing in the mortgage market was bringing our country down.”⁷⁴

But, as *Politico Magazine* reported:⁷⁵

Yet an examination of Clinton's remarks to Wall Street in December 2007 and her actions as a New York senator—a period when she had the best opportunity to translate her words into deeds—presents a more mixed picture of her record on the financial industry.

The bills Clinton introduced on banking and housing finance got no traction. When she had a chance to support a 2007 bill that aimed to curb a tax break she publicly decried for hedge-fund and private-equity executives, she failed to sign on.

Clinton also has some history with the shadow-banking world she says is a continuing risk to the financial system. While in the Senate, she made a little-noticed overture to Treasury Secretary Henry Paulson, who was involved in talks to rescue giant insurer AIG with government funds. She was calling on behalf of wealthy investors who stood to lose millions and had hired two longtime Clinton associates to represent them.

As for her “get-tough” approach to the financial industry, it was mainly bluster – and, as Sanders noted in the November debate, the industry must have known that because “over her political career...Wall Street been a major—the major campaign contributor to Hillary Clinton.”⁷⁶ What’s more, legislation she introduced in a Democrat-controlled Senate to “control” or “rein in Wall Street” did not appear serious because the few bills she offered garnered little traction and was largely devoid of co-sponsors. None were passed out of committee, and all died on the vine.⁷⁷ So essentially, for all her rhetoric on the issue – and with Wall Street cash coming into her campaign coffers – she was never serious about passing any legislation that would have seriously hampered her benefactors.

After losing the nomination to Obama, Clinton returned to the Senate, but only briefly. After he was inaugurated in January 2009, he nominated her to be his secretary of state, a post she took after being confirmed by the U.S. Senate.

III. The Secretary of State Years

Clinton served as President Obama’s secretary of state from 2009 to 2013. Her years spent in this post were also fraught with controversy, the most well known of those being the loss of a U.S. ambassador, Christopher Stevens, and three other Americans during a terrorist attack on the American consulate in Benghazi, Libya.

Some have dismissed criticism of her role in the Benghazi terrorist attack as partisan and to an extent that is true. But a larger issue – and one that may be eminently more important to the long-term survival of the country – has to do with her and her husband’s charity, the Clinton Foundation. Specifically, there is concern over whether she allowed foreign governments and international players to the foundation as a means to sway, through multi-million-dollar donations, future decisions that she would make as president.

1. Government contributions to the Clinton Foundation.

In February 2015, *The Washington Post* reported that foreign governments contributed millions to the foundation while Clinton was secretary of state and the nation's chief foreign policy official:⁷⁸

The Clinton Foundation accepted millions of dollars from seven foreign governments during Hillary Rodham Clinton's tenure as secretary of state, including one donation that violated its ethics agreement with the Obama administration, foundation officials disclosed Wednesday.

Most of the contributions were possible because of exceptions written into the foundation's 2008 agreement, which included limits on foreign-government donations.

The agreement, reached before Clinton's nomination amid concerns that countries could use foundation donations to gain favor with a Clinton-led State Department, allowed governments that had previously donated money to continue making contributions at similar levels.

The report noted that in one instance the foundation acknowledged that it should have, in 2010, sought State Department approval before it accepted a donation of \$500,000 from the government of Algeria.⁷⁹ And while foundation officials generally downplayed the assertion that governments were using the foundation as a conduit to win favor with Clinton, the post's report made it clear that the arrangement was highly unorthodox:⁸⁰

Rarely, if ever, has a potential commander in chief been so closely associated with an organization that has solicited financial support from foreign governments. Clinton formally joined the foundation

in 2013 after leaving the State Department, and the organization was renamed the Bill, Hillary & Chelsea Clinton Foundation.

The *Post* had previously reported that foreign sources, including governments, “made up a third of those who have given the foundation more than \$1 million over time.”⁸¹

But the suspicions did not stop there, nor did press reports of suspected unethical behavior that some in the press dubbed “pay for play”: Using her position at the State Department as secretary of state and someone positioning herself to run for president – as a fundraising tool for her charity and as a means of allowing others to buy influence. In March 2015, roughly two years after Clinton left her post at the State Department, *Investors Business Daily*, citing other reports, noted:⁸²

Ron Fournier of the National Journal advises that the emails may help us “follow the money” that has flowed into Clinton Foundation coffers, a tale of possible “pay for play” involving unknown promises in exchange for donations.

Fournier writes that “Hillary Clinton’s secret communications stash is a bombshell” whose “greatest relevancy is what the emails might reveal about any nexus between Clinton’s work at State and any donations to the Bill, Hillary and Chelsea Clinton Foundation from U.S. corporations and foreign nations.”

In May of last year, *Salon.com* openly questioned Hillary Clinton’s judgment when reporting that the Clinton Foundation had business relationships with nearly two dozen foreign governments during her tenure as secretary of state.⁸³ According to the website, at least some of the relationships carried national security implications:⁸⁴

Among all the rivers of money that have flowed to the Clinton family, one seems to raise the biggest national security questions of all: the stream of cash that came from 20 foreign governments who relied on weapons export approvals from Hillary Clinton’s State Department.

Federal law designates the secretary of state as “responsible for the continuous supervision and general direction of sales” of arms, military hardware and services to foreign countries. In practice, that meant that Clinton was charged with rejecting or approving weapons deals — and when it came to Clinton Foundation donors, Hillary Clinton’s State Department did a whole lot of approving.

While serving at State, Clinton’s department approved some \$165 billion worth of arms sales – *to Clinton Foundation donors*. That figure encompasses Clinton’s three full fiscal years in office and is roughly double the value of arms sales to those same countries during the exact same period of President George W. Bush’s second term.⁸⁵

In addition, the Clinton State Department authorized \$151 billion worth of separate deals that were brokered by the Pentagon for 16 of the countries that donated to the Clinton Foundation, or a 143-percent increase to those nations during the same time frame in the Bush administration. “The 143 percent increase in U.S. arms sales to Clinton Foundation donors compares to an 80 percent increase in such sales *to all countries over the same time period*,” noted *Salon* (my emphasis).⁸⁶

It wasn’t just countries donating to the foundation during that period in exchange for preferential arms deals. U.S. military contractors and some of their affiliates also donated to the foundation and, in some instances, helped finance handsome speaking fees for Bill Clinton. Those defense firms and their subsidiaries were listed as contractors in \$163 billion worth of sales of arms and defense systems that were authorized by the Clinton State Department.⁸⁷ *Salon* reported further:⁸⁸

Under a directive signed by President Clinton in 1995, the State Department is supposed to take foreign governments’ human rights records into account when reviewing arms deals. Yet, Hillary Clinton’s State Department increased approvals of such deals to Clinton Foundation donors that her own agency was sharply criticizing for systematic human rights abuses.

A separate report noted that, as part of the massive weapons deals, Boeing and a consortium of defense contractors delivered more than \$29 billion worth of advanced fighter jets to Middle East oil-rich ally Saudi Arabia.⁸⁹ The deal was made despite the State Department's documented concerns over Saudi Arabia's human rights abuses.⁹⁰

In addition, the sale was approved despite objections from Israel that its balance of power would be greatly offset by the sale. But the State Department claimed that the sale was in the national interests of the United States and that it was "a top priority" for Clinton herself, according to a longtime top aide, Andrew Shapiro.⁹¹ Perhaps not so coincidentally, in the years leading up to Clinton's appointment to the State Department, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia contributed \$10 million, at least, to the Clinton Foundation.⁹² And just two months before the sale of jet fighters to Riyadh, Boeing contributed \$900,000 to the foundation.⁹³

In fact, Saudi Arabia was not the only Middle East regime that was showering the Clinton Foundation with donations. A recent investigation into the region's contributions found that the Clintons – Bill and Hillary – as well as their foundation has received in excess of **\$100 million** from "autocratic Persian Gulf states," which undermines Hillary Clinton's "claim that she can carry out independent Middle East politics."⁹⁴

"These regimes are buying access. You've got the Saudis. You've got the Kuwaitis, Oman, Qatar and the UAE. There are massive conflicts of interest. It's beyond comprehension," says national security analyst Patrick Poole, which he added was "simply unprecedented."⁹⁵

The Daily Caller News Foundation, which conducted the investigation, noted further:⁹⁶

The ongoing Clinton financial relationship with despotic Persian Gulf states could hurt Hillary as a supporter of labor rights and tarnish her image as a vigorous supporter of women.

Yet as secretary of state, Clinton consciously and actively sought to legitimize the sheikdoms through many new Department of State programs.

It's unclear what kind of promises or concessions the Clintons may have given the monarchs in return for their lavish financial support over the years, ***but last month the candidate reversed her long-standing support for fracking*** [emphasis added].

While many people oppose fracking – an oil-and-gas mining and extraction technique formally known as hydraulic fracturing – for environmental reasons,⁹⁷ the oil-producing regimes of the Middle East oppose it because it has enabled the United States to dramatically increase the supply of oil on the market, which has caused the price of oil to fall (and oil is the Number 1 export for these Middle East regimes).

In June of 2015, a report charged that the foundation was hiding names of many of its foreign donors to a shell charity located in Sweden:⁹⁸

The Clinton Foundation is hiding the names of secret foreign donors who contributed \$5.4 million in 2011 and 2012 to the William J. Clinton Foundation Insamlingsstiftelse (WJCFI), the Swedish shell company that is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Clinton Foundation.

While it is possible that the names of those donors are reported on the Clinton Foundation website, the website does not state that any donor listed on its website contributed first to the WJCFI, which in turn made a single “bundled” donation to the Clinton Foundation.

A separate report noted that the Clinton Foundation set up its Swedish branch – which took in \$26 million – at the same time that that country was lobbying Clinton’s State Department to forgo sanctions that would interrupt a thriving business with Iran.⁹⁹ The WJCFI was never disclosed to, or cleared by, the State Department’s ethics officials, though

one of the charity's largest donors was a Swedish government-sanctioned lottery. And as the money flowed into the WJCFI, Clinton's State Department refused to blacklist any Swedish firms – at a time when international sanctions were in place against Iran for its suspected nuclear weapons program – though career State Department officials in Stockholm warned that Sweden, and Swedish firms like telecom giant Ericsson, were bolstering economic ties with Iran and potentially undermining the West's efforts to end the Iranian nuclear program.¹⁰⁰ Clinton played a key role in determining which firms should be blacklisted over Iranian sanctions in 2011 and 2012.¹⁰¹

2. Industry contributions to the Clinton Foundation

Remember Corning Inc.? During Clinton's tenure at State, the company lobbied her department on a variety of trade issues, including the Trans-Pacific Partnership:¹⁰²

During Clinton's tenure as secretary of state, Corning lobbied the department on a variety of trade issues, including the Trans-Pacific Partnership. The company has donated between \$100,000 and \$250,000 to her family's foundation. And last July, when it was clear that Clinton would again seek the presidency in 2016, Corning coughed up a \$225,500 honorarium for Clinton to speak.

In the laundry whirl of stories about Clinton buck-raking, it might be easy for that last part to get lost in the wash. But it's the part that matters most. The \$225,500 speaking fee didn't go to help disease-stricken kids in an impoverished village on some long-forgotten patch of the planet. Nor did it go to a campaign account. It went to Hillary Clinton. Personally.

Press reports continued to document – and criticize – the “pay for play” that appeared to be *playing out* during her time as secretary of

state. Another report noted that, during her stint as secretary of state, Clinton's agency was lobbied by no fewer than 181 donors to the Clinton Foundation.¹⁰³

The set includes oil, defense, drug, tech, and news companies, as well as labor unions and foreign interests. It includes organizations as innocuous as the Girl Scouts and those as in need of brand-bur-nishing as Nike, which was once forced to vow that it would end the use of child labor in foreign sweatshops. This list of donors to the Clinton foundation who lobbied State matters because it gives a sense of just how common it was for influence-seekers to give to the Clinton Foundation, and exactly which ones did.

3. Russian acquisition of strategic U.S. uranium reserves

In one of the most egregious instances of the appearance of impropriety, *The New York Times* reported that cash flowed into the Clinton Foundation in the midst of a Russian uranium deal. In January 2013 the Russian paper *Pravda*, the quasi-official paper of the Kremlin, trumpeted this headline: "Russian Nuclear Energy Conquers the World." The piece provided details about how the Russian atomic energy agency, Rosatom, had acquired a Canadian firm that had uranium-mining interests ranging from Central Asia to Western states in the U.S. The deal put Rosatom among the world's biggest uranium producers and it brought President Vladimir Putin a step closer to his goal of controlling much of the world's uranium supply chain.¹⁰⁴

But what the *Pravda* report left out, according to the *Times*, is the involvement of Hillary Clinton in allowing the deal to go forward.

Several men involved in the deal were leaders of the Canadian mining industry – men who also were major donors to charities run by the Clintons. Members of this cabal built, financed and eventually sold to

the Russians a company that was called Uranium One. Putin and Russia already controlled lucrative mines in Kazakhstan, some of the world's richest in fact, but the acquisition of Uranium One gave Moscow control of about one-fifth of the world's uranium production capacity in the U.S. This is a big deal, since uranium – a key element in nuclear technology – is considered a strategic asset with national security implications.¹⁰⁵

Because of that, the deal had to be approved by a consortium of representatives from key U.S. government agencies and among those that eventually signed off was the State Department, then headed by Clinton. And as the Russians assumed gradual control over Uranium One, between 2009 and 2013 according to Canadian records, **money streamed into the Clinton Foundation**. The chairman of Uranium One used his own family's foundation to contribute \$2.35 million, made over the course of four separate donations. And these donations were not disclosed to the public despite an agreement that Hillary Clinton had made with the Obama administration to identify all donors publicly. Also, other people with ties to the company made donations to the foundation as well.¹⁰⁶

The *Times* noted further:¹⁰⁷

And shortly after the Russians announced their intention to acquire a majority stake in Uranium One, Mr. Clinton received \$500,000 for a Moscow speech from a Russian investment bank with links to the Kremlin that was promoting Uranium One stock.

And:¹⁰⁸

Whether the donations played any role in the approval of the uranium deal is unknown. But the episode underscores the special ethical challenges presented by the Clinton Foundation, **headed by a former president who relied heavily on foreign cash to accumulate \$250 million in assets even as his wife helped steer American foreign policy as secretary of state**, presiding over decisions with the potential to benefit the foundation's donors [emphasis added].

The *Times* noted that, at the outset of the deal, times were different and Clinton had launched a strategic “reset” with Russia, in a bid to improve relationships between Moscow and Washington. But over the years as the deal progressed, the reset failed to take and the two nations grew further apart, diplomatically. What’s more, regardless of her intent, the deal resulted in a competitor nation **acquiring a sizeable portion of a United States’ strategic asset**. Indeed, shortly after the U.S. granted its approval of the deal, Putin sat down for a staged interview with Rosatom’s chief executive, Sergei Kiriyenko. “Few could have imagined in the past that we would own 20 percent of U.S. reserves,” Kiriyenko told the Russian leader.¹⁰⁹

There’s more. A documentary called *Clinton Cash* – based on a book of the same name by Peter Schweizer – that was released in July exposed much of the money that has flowed to the Clinton Foundation from foreign sources. Most damning is that much of the money donated to the foundation came at the expense of millions of suffering people that the Clinton’s – Bill and Hillary – claimed to be helping, when in reality they were merely lining the pockets of donors.¹¹⁰

4. Haiti

On January 12, 2010, the small Caribbean nation of Haiti suffered a catastrophic 7.0 earthquake, whose epicenter was near the town of Leogane (Ouest), about 16 miles west of the country’s capital of Port-au-Prince. An estimated 3 million people were affected; the death toll is believed to range from 100,000 to 160,000.¹¹¹

Immediately, the world began to respond with aid, and that included the United States. Within a few days, then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton visited the country in a show of support and to pledge assistance. In a speech at the airport in Port-au-Prince, she promised that the U.S. “will be here today, tomorrow and for the time ahead.”¹¹² President Obama pledged \$100 million in U.S. aid.¹¹³

In the film, Schweizer documented that in all, some \$13 billion in aid to Haiti was pledged – by the U.S. government, other nations and American and foreign corporations. The State Department, under Hillary Clinton, was in charge of distributing much of that aid.¹¹⁴ Her husband had been appointed by the United Nations to be a special envoy to Haiti in 2009, following a series of natural disasters the previous year;¹¹⁵ he would also help guide the earthquake recovery effort. Schweizer noted that the Haitian recover “was a Clinton operation from the beginning.”¹¹⁶

From the outset, it became obvious that the goals of the Clintons were to assist donors to the Clinton Foundation. The Haitian government and people wanted to use the aid money that was pouring in to rebuild their destroyed country, but as Schweizer noted the Clintons were much more interested in helping corporations who donated to their foundation get in on much of the money being spent. And while Haitians complained, it fell on deaf ears; donor companies became prime contractors in many projects that had negligible benefit to Haitians in what insiders call “disaster capitalism.”¹¹⁷ Really, Schweizer said, it was the worst example of *crony capitalism*.¹¹⁸

Infrastructure projects were misguided and ineffective; contracts were going to donors to the foundation who overcharged for their work and under-delivered. One example was the \$124 million construction project of a textile factory and other ventures in Caracol Industrial Park, which was built in the northern part of Haiti, not the southern portion most affected by the quake. The industrial park in its entirety cost north of \$300 million, much of it financed by U.S. taxpayers.¹¹⁹ The Clintons and others behind the project promised that it would employ 60,000; in the end, only about 5,000 low-wage jobs were created. Who benefited from cheaper textiles? Large U.S.-based corporations that also, coincidentally, were Clinton Foundation donors.¹²⁰

In another instance, a contractor who was supposed to build 15,000 homes for displaced Haitians at a cost of \$53 million only built about 2,600 homes at a cost of \$90 million, or \$47 million *over-budget*.¹²¹

In terms of providing disaster relief, experienced firms were not awarded contracts in lieu of others with less experience (or no experience) who were foundation donors. One experienced firm spent a million dollars moving heavy equipment to Haiti, only to be passed up by the Clinton Haiti operation.¹²²

As one report noted, this habit of turning disaster into fundraising for the foundation was part of a “system” that the Clinton’s developed:¹²³

Former President Bill Clinton developed a methodology of exploiting epidemics and natural disasters to raise hundreds of millions in “charitable donations” that in a relaxed regulatory environment could be diverted to personal gain, funding Hillary Clinton’s political campaigns and supporting Democratic Party causes, charges Wall Street analyst Charles Ortel, who has conducted an in-depth investigation of the foundation’s finances.

The recovery effort was so badly mishandled – and so off-base – that even Chelsea Clinton drafted a letter to her mother and father following a visit to Haiti five weeks after the quake that was *highly critical*:¹²⁴

“The incompetence is mind numbing,” she told her parents. “The UN people I encountered were frequently out of touch ... anachronistic in their thinking at best and arrogant and incompetent at worst.” “There is NO accountability in the UN system or international humanitarian system.” The weak Haitian government, which had lost buildings and staff in the disaster, had something of a plan, she noted. Yet because it had failed to articulate its wishes quickly enough, foreigners rushed forward with a “proliferation of ad hoc efforts by the UN and INGOs [international nongovernmental organizations] to ‘help,’ some of which have helped ... some of which have hurt ... and some which have not happened at all.”

She also noted that ordinary Haitians wanted to *help themselves* and sought “reliability and accountability from their partners,” but that help did not arrive.¹²⁵

5. Africa

The continent of Africa has always held so much promise. It is a continent with a relatively young labor force and is teeming with natural resources. But over the centuries it has been exploited by nations from all over the world and remains subject to such exploitation today in a way that some have compared to 19th century colonialism.¹²⁶ The Clintons are right in the middle of it, Schweizer notes in his documentary.

Many nations in Africa are run by oligarchs who are propped up by global corporations for the purpose of keeping them in power so they can exploit their countries’ natural resources – oil, mineral and gas, mostly. The Clintons’ role in this pay-for-play scheme is to wield their political power and corporate influence as middlemen between often barbarous and murderous African leaders and the corporations that seek to do business on the continent. African leaders have no issue with granting rights to their countries’ natural resources (which really belong to *all* the people of these countries, not just the dictators and warlords) but they must be paid off by the corporations, Schweizer notes. And so must the Clintons – through speaking fees to Bill and massive donations to the family foundation.¹²⁷

For instance, consider the case of Joe Wilson, a former U.S. ambassador to African nations who was vice chairman of Jarch Capital, an investment firm that focuses primarily on “natural resource development” projects in Africa.¹²⁸ Wilson supported Hillary Clinton during her first presidential bid in 2008 after a falling-out with the Bush administration involving his wife, former CIA operative Valerie Plame.¹²⁹ Shortly after Clinton became secretary of state, the company took out a 50-year lease on a 400,000-hectare (nearly 1 million acres) plot of land in what was then Southern Sudan, which had been heavily engaged in a civil

war with the northern part of the country. The lease deal was actually made with warlords in control of the land mass at the time. Jarch Capital's agreement claimed that the company was "investing in sovereignty changes."¹³⁰

Congo: More of the same behavior between the Clintons and their benefactors could be seen in events that transpired in the Democratic Republic of Congo. There, a foundation donor named Lucus Lundin, a Swedish mining investor who pledged \$100 million to the organization, made massive profits from securing mining interests from the government, but only after Clinton intervention. According to company financial statements, Lundin's operation was worth around \$20 billion when he began making his pledges.¹³¹

Here's the back story. As a U.S. senator, Hillary Clinton supported legislation demanding democratic reform in Nigeria – changes in government that would have negatively impacted Lundin's business. But he, like others before and after, figured out a way to get her to change her mind. As she became secretary of state, Lundin began making his massive contributions to the foundation; in short order, Clinton changed her position on "democratic reform" in Congo.¹³²

A similar pattern emerged in Nigeria, believed to be one of the most corrupt governments on the continent but a country very rich in resources. Because of its corruption, the U.S. government was considering ending its financial support of the Nigerian regime; U.S. law requires that any nation receiving taxpayer-funded aid must be very transparent on how the money is spent. But the Nigerian government was not being transparent; indeed, much of what was sent by the U.S. government wound up in Swiss bank accounts and was not spent to improve the lives and condition of the Nigerian people.¹³³

But there are ways around that law. Countries can get a waiver from the U.S. government, and Nigeria did indeed receive one – from Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, after her husband was paid high fees for giving

speeches in the country (about \$1.4 million; two speeches for \$700,000 each). The fees were paid by a businessman who happened to be close to the Nigerian president; so the waiver was granted, and Nigeria continued to receive hundreds of millions of dollars in U.S. aid.¹³⁴

There are many more “pay to play” schemes, each involving foreign governments, foreign corporations, enemies of the U.S. and national security.

6. Keystone XL Pipeline

Probably one of the biggest controversies involving the environment and so-called “climate change” during Clinton’s tenure as secretary of state involved the Keystone XL Pipeline project, which is slated to stretch from oil sands fields in Alberta, Canada, to oil refineries in Louisiana and Texas. When Clinton was named as Obama’s choice to head up the State Department in late 2008, the cash-for-favors machine was immediately put in motion by people and firms with deep financial interests in seeing the project built.

For their part, the Clintons have publicly championed environmental causes. On Hillary Clinton’s campaign website, she states:¹³⁵

I won’t let anyone take us backward, deny our economy the benefits of harnessing a clean energy future, or force our children to endure the catastrophe that would result from unchecked climate change.

But her actions regarding KXL paint a much different picture. When she took office as secretary of state in January 2009, an issue directly related to the pipeline’s future awaited her. She would have to sign an environmental impact statement on whether the project should move forward. At nearly the same time, Bill Clinton received a high-paying offer of nearly \$2 million to give 10 speeches in Canada, financed by an entity known as TD Bank Investment Group. He gave his last speech as part of that package in May 2011.¹³⁶

Three months after that last speech, Secretary Clinton released an environmental impact statement that was viewed very widely as being favorable to the construction of the pipeline, a position that was immediately criticized by major environmental groups like Greenpeace, who saw it as a betrayal of her previous commitments to green energy and a climate change agenda. She did this despite the fact that she had the power to kill the deal in her hands. So why didn't she? It turns out that TD Bank Investment Group is one of the largest shareholders in KXL. It is also important to note that the dramatic rise in speaking fees for Bill Clinton, who had been out of office for years by this time, coincided with his wife's appointment as secretary of state.¹³⁷

7. Additional “pay for play” scenarios

Colombia

Here, a longtime friend of Bill Clinton, Canadian billionaire Frank Giustra, managed to secure the rights to timber in valued rainforest from the Colombian government for a time, raking in huge profits. As reported by *Bloomberg News*:¹³⁸

In Colombia, where his investments include oil, timber, and coal mines, Giustra dined one evening in 2010 with Bill and Hillary Clinton, who both met with Colombia's president the next day. Soon after, one company in which Giustra holds a stake “acquired the right to cut timber in a biologically diverse forest on the pristine Colombian shoreline,” Schweizer writes, and another was granted valuable oil drilling rights.

What is interesting and important is that the Clintons did not travel together; Bill Clinton and Giustra arrived one day and, coincidentally, Secretary Clinton arrived the following day. It is also interesting to note that both met with Colombia's president the following day.¹³⁹

India

Like the Russian acquisition of strategic uranium reserves, the India nuclear deal also has national security implications. As a politician, Hillary Clinton has said she opposes the spread of nuclear weapons. As president, Bill Clinton called for and received authority to impose sanctions on India for conducting underground nuclear tests in 1998. By 2005, India sought to get those sanctions lifted, as tensions between it and its nuclear-armed neighbors, Pakistan and China, heated up. As such, Indians either in or tied to the government in New Delhi began making sizeable donations to the Clinton Foundation while paying Bill Clinton to give speeches – tens of millions to the foundation and millions to Bill personally. In the end, as Secretary Clinton, Hillary supported the deal to transfer some U.S. nuclear technology to India.¹⁴⁰

These scenarios and schemes were of concern to many, including some members of Congress, before Clinton took her post at the State Department. Republican Sen. Richard Lugar of Indiana, during Clinton’s Senate confirmation hearing in 2009, advised that the Clinton Foundation stop taking donations from foreign governments, lest “foreign governments and entities may perceive the Clinton Foundation as a means to gain favor with the secretary of state.”¹⁴¹

As demonstrated, however, Clinton ignored Lugar’s advice.

“The word was out to these groups that one of the best ways to gain access and influence with the Clintons was to give to this foundation,” said Meredith McGehee, policy director at the Campaign Legal Center.¹⁴²

Lawrence Lessig, the director of Harvard University’s Safra Center for Ethics, said that all the payments and deals “raise a fundamental question of judgment” — and certainly one that is relevant to the 2016 presidential campaign. “Can it really be that the Clintons didn’t recognize the questions these transactions would raise?” he said. “And if they did,

what does that say about their sense of the appropriate relationship between private gain and public good?"¹⁴³

Another report further damaged Clinton's credibility. *The Daily Beast* noted that, though Clinton may have, on the surface, suspended her political aspirations while serving as secretary of state, her fundraising leviathan was in full-on mode:¹⁴⁴

More than a dozen donors to Clinton's non-profit foundation and her various political campaigns poured money into an endowment she launched in 2010 to pay for the upkeep of the Diplomatic Reception Rooms. The 42 sumptuous salons at State Department headquarters in Washington, decorated with 18th and 19th century American furnishings, are used to welcome foreign dignitaries, conduct diplomatic meetings and swearing-in ceremonies, and host official dinners.

By the following year, the campaign had raised more than \$20 million to permanently fund restoration and maintenance for the rooms and their collections of rare American artwork, thanks largely to reliable Clinton donors.

The report by *The Daily Beast* news site further noted that almost half of the 37 people and organizations who gave money to the State Department campaign – a group that came to be known as Patrons of Diplomacy – also contributed money to the Clinton Foundation, State Department and foundation records showed. And of the 11 people who served as co-chairs for the State Department campaign, who agreed to contribute their own funds or help raise money from others, six also contributed to the Clinton Foundation.¹⁴⁵

Initially, the State Department moved to keep the names of those donors secret. But when *The Daily Beast* first asked to see the donor list, a spokesperson for the department told the reporters it was the subject of a Freedom of Information Act lawsuit by the Republican

National Committee. Oddly, however, the State Department did not seem too concerned about keeping the donor list private; their names were inscribed on a wall that is located on a terrace off of one of the reception rooms, where there is a sweeping view of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall. It took a reporter reminding State Department spokespersons about an article in an internal 2012 State Department publication that mentioned the donor wall before the agency allowed the news site access to it.¹⁴⁶

The report noted that private donations for government projects are not new and have been made throughout the decades. As for the reception rooms, private donors have been helping maintain them since 1961. But that said, “the overlap between the campaign and donors to the Clinton Foundation, as well as Clinton’s political campaigns, may be problematic for the Democratic presidential frontrunner. Along with her husband, Clinton has faced repeated criticism over the years that the foundation serves as a conduit for influencing official decision-making,” said the report.¹⁴⁷

One final note on the Clinton Foundation. In 2013, despite taking in tens of millions of dollars, the organization only spent *10 percent* of its donated funds on charitable grants, according to its own tax filings.¹⁴⁸ Supporters of the Clintons debunk that figure, claiming the charity does most of its work “in-house.”¹⁴⁹ But tax filings indicate that the lion’s share of money spent by the charity in that year went to Other Expenses (34 percent); Salaries/Benefits (33 percent); IT (2 percent); Office Supplies (6 percent); Rent (5 percent); and Travel (10 percent).¹⁵⁰

8. Private email server

In March 2015, a report surfaced that Clinton used a private email server set up in her Chappaqua, New York, home, to conduct official State Department business, a practice that seemed to be in clear violation of department and Obama administration rules, as well as federal

statutes requiring that all government correspondence be kept and archived, so it can later be made available to the public.

The New York Times reported:¹⁵¹

Her expansive use of the private account was alarming to current and former National Archives and Records Administration officials and government watchdogs, who called it a serious breach.

“It is very difficult to conceive of a scenario — short of nuclear winter — where an agency would be justified in allowing its cabinet-level head officer to solely use a private email communications channel for the conduct of government business,” said Jason R. Baron, a lawyer at Drinker Biddle & Reath who is a former director of litigation at the National Archives and Records Administration.

What would follow that report was a year-long criminal investigation by the FBI – one that would result in a recommendation that no charges be filed against Clinton – but a number of revelations about her time as secretary of state came out of the case.

One group – Judicial Watch, a conservative legal watchdog organization that has a long history of pursuing alleged malfeasance by the Clintons dating back to the 1990s – took particular interest in the email case. And what it discovered, through court filings and Freedom of Information Act requests, was a direct link between Hillary Clinton’s office at State and her family foundation.¹⁵²

Internal State Department documents unearthed by Judicial Watch show that Clinton’s aides helped arrange her public thanks to organizations that made commitments to financially assisting the Clinton Global Initiative, which is a Clinton Foundation program. The “commitments to action” generally involved an organization devising a plan to tackle a global problem and then moving forward to carry it out without the Foundation’s involvement.

An email chain from August 2009¹⁵³ shows that Clinton's staff at the State Department were communicating with Clinton Foundation staffers about how she could thank supporters of the foundation for "commitments" they made.¹⁵⁴

"It would be helpful to have [a] list of commitments during whole session so she can reference more than just those around her speech," wrote Cheryl Mills, Clinton's then-chief of staff at State, in a message to Amitabh Desai, then the Clinton Foundation's director of foreign policy. The email chain also included Clinton's former chief of staff, Huma Abedin, then-deputy chief of staff for Policy Jake Sullivan and Caitlin Klevorick, a former Foundation employee who became senior adviser to the counselor and chief of staff to the secretary of State.¹⁵⁵

"Secretary of State Hillary Clinton worked hand in glove with the Clinton Foundation on fundraising and foreign policy," said Tom Fitton, president of Judicial Watch, at the time. "Despite the law and her promises to the contrary, Hillary Clinton turned the State Department into the D.C. office of the Clinton Foundation."¹⁵⁶ There was enough irregular behavior that the State Department's Office of Inspector General subpoenaed records from the Clinton Foundation, however.¹⁵⁷

As part of its investigation into Clinton's use of a private email server, one report claimed that the FBI was also examining whether there was an "intersection" of Clinton Foundation work and State Department business that may have been conducted in violation of public corruption laws.¹⁵⁸

"The agents are investigating the possible intersection of Clinton Foundation donations, the dispensation of State Department contracts and whether regular processes were followed," one source told *Fox News* in January 2016. In all, three separate sources confirmed the story.¹⁵⁹ And as of July 2016, the FBI had not ruled out an investigation into the Clinton Foundation.¹⁶⁰

As *Observer.com* noted, the nexus between Hillary Clinton's State Department and her family's foundation may be too much for the Judicial Branch to ignore.¹⁶¹

The Clinton Foundation blurs lines between politics, business, charity and public service, and the ability to investigate the Foundation's litany of questionable donations is compromised. For all the millions of dollars that have passed through the Clinton Foundation, it will be challenging—even for the Clintons—to evade an indictment if Hillary is elected president.

IV. Hillary's 2016 Presidential Campaign

After leaving the State Department on February 1, 2013,¹⁶² Clinton was replaced by John F. Kerry, who stepped down as the senior U.S. senator from Massachusetts. As many had anticipated at the time of her State Department departure, Clinton declared herself a candidate for the U.S. presidency, as a member of the Democratic Party, on April 12, 2015, marking her second bid for the White House.¹⁶³

1. Period before Clinton's official declaration

Before making her official declaration for president, Clinton stayed busy primarily padding her income and the coffers of the Clinton Foundation. As she had done as a young lawyer, first lady of the United States, U.S. senator and head of the State Department, she enriched herself and her family's foundation by granting access.

Besides writing a book – *Hard Choices* – for which she received a reported \$14 million advance and which did not sell well,¹⁶⁴ Clinton made tens of millions giving speeches, many of them to foreign governments and special interests. Her former president husband gave a number of

speeches, too, many to foreign companies and government-run enterprises, much of which was initially undisclosed, despite a 2008 ethics agreement to reveal donors “and whether any of its funding sources present conflicts of interest for Hillary Rodham Clinton as she begins her presidential campaign.”¹⁶⁵

Questions about donations to the Clinton Foundation and the subject matter of Clinton’s speeches – and who paid her for them – continued to swirl in the lead-up to her presidential declaration and beyond.

2. Key policy positions

Up to this point, this paper has demonstrated that, throughout her career, Hillary Clinton has been heavily influenced in her policies by deep-pocketed donors who essentially paid her to adopt their stance, despite her denials. That is key because there are a number of issues important to tens of millions of Americans that she claims to support, when in reality she supports just the opposite position because that’s the side her benefactors are on. This paper examines a number of those key issues: The environment, healthcare choice, food freedom, women’s health and geopolitical concerns.

The environment

Fracking

Before the New York primary in April 2016, the Clinton campaign aired a commercial on upstate television stations declaring that, in her work as secretary of state she forced “China, India some of the world’s worst polluters” to make “real change.” She also pledged to “stand firm with New Yorkers opposing fracking, giving communities the right to say ‘no.’”¹⁶⁶

The spot – which did not immediately appear on the official campaign YouTube page and that oddly was not announced by the campaign in advance – implied that Clinton had a history of opposing the

controversial oil and natural gas-extraction procedure that is formally known as “hydraulic fracturing.” But emails obtained by an investigative news site called *The Intercept* from the State Department revealed new details of behind-the-scene workings by Clinton and close aides to export the process to countries around the world.¹⁶⁷

In reality, Clinton did not seriously challenge fossil fuel companies at all. Rather, the emails showed that State Department officials under her worked hand-in-hand with private sector oil and gas companies, as well as pressured other agencies within the Obama administration, to pledge federal government resources that included technical help in finding shale reserves. In addition, the emails show that the department cut agreements with partner countries in promising to secure investments for brand-new fracking projects.¹⁶⁸

What’s more, the email documents show that the department was involved in actually bringing foreign officials and dignitaries out to a fracking site in Pennsylvania, as well as plans to transform Poland into a “laboratory for testing whether U.S. success in developing shale gas can be repeated in a different country,” particularly in Europe where some local governments opposed and even banned the drilling procedure. Plans included spreading the drilling technique to other countries – China, South Africa, Romania, Morocco, Bulgaria, Chile, India, Pakistan, Argentina, Indonesia and Ukraine.¹⁶⁹

In 2014, *Mother Jones*, a liberal, environment-friendly publication, uncovered once-confidential documents that were published online by *WikiLeaks* that essentially showed how the State Department, under Clinton, “sold fracking to the world.”¹⁷⁰ In February 2012, Clinton and her State Department entourage landed in an icy, snow-covered Sofia, Bulgaria – that country’s capital – for meetings with Bulgarian leaders, including Prime Minister Boyko Borissov, on a variety of issues including loose nuclear weapons and the Syrian civil war. But a primary focus of the talks was fracking. In 2011, Bulgaria had signed a \$68 million deal that gave U.S. oil giant Chevron millions of acres in shale

gas concessions, a deal that outraged Bulgarian citizens and led many in the Bulgarian parliament to consider a countrywide moratorium on fracking.¹⁷¹ Clinton's 2012 trip was an effort to get the Bulgarian government to reconsider, even pledging to bring to Bulgaria the "best specialists on these new technologies to present the benefits to the Bulgarian people."¹⁷²

The effort was not successful, as resistance in Bulgaria only grew. Citizens continued to protest, and the parliament once more considered banning fracking outright, as did the Romanian parliament. As *Mother Jones* noted, however, Clinton doubled down as well:¹⁷³

Again Clinton intervened, dispatching her special envoy for energy in Eurasia, Richard Morningstar, to push back against the fracking bans. The State Department's lobbying effort culminated in late May 2012, when Morningstar held a series of meetings on fracking with top Bulgarian and Romanian officials. He also touted the technology in an interview on Bulgarian national radio, saying it could lead to a fivefold drop in the price of natural gas. A few weeks later, Romania's parliament voted down its proposed fracking ban and Bulgaria's eased its moratorium.

Clinton also tapped a lawyer named David Goldwyn to become her special envoy for international energy affairs. He was instructed "to elevate energy diplomacy as a key function of US foreign policy," and he did.¹⁷⁴ Goldwyn had an extensive history of promoting drilling overseas, as a member of the Department of Energy under President Bill Clinton and as a representative of the oil and gas industry. One of his first moves at the State Department was to assemble oil and gas industry executives "to discuss the potential impact of shale gas."¹⁷⁵

After that, according to the *WikiLeaks* cables, Clinton sent a cable to American diplomats abroad, tasking them with collecting information about the potential to launch fracking operations in their host countries. Eventually those efforts led to the formation of the Global Shale

Gas Initiative, which was meant to assist other nations in developing their own industry. Clinton wrote in her cable that the effort would move forward “in a way that is as environmentally respectful as possible.” But in reality, environmental groups were barely consulted, though industry played a huge role.¹⁷⁶

Clinton even promoted shale gas exploration and development personally. She said during a 2010 meeting of foreign ministers in Washington, D.C., that the U.S. was working to promote fracking around the globe.¹⁷⁷ “I know that in some places [it] is controversial, but natural gas is the cleanest fossil fuel available for power generation today,” she said.¹⁷⁸

Clinton’s interest in fracking – and the oil and gas industry’s interest in her – did not stop after she left the State Department. In fact, contributions from the industry to her and the super PAC that is supporting her topped \$6.9 million by April 2016. The environmental group Greenpeace, using publicly available campaign finance figures, broke down the contributions:¹⁷⁹

- Direct contributions from persons working for fossil fuel companies: \$309,101
- Bundled and direct donations to the Clinton campaign: \$2,650,580
- Fossil fuel interests to Clinton Super PACs: \$4,000,000
- Number of oil, gas and coal industry lobbyists who have made direct contributions to the Clinton campaign: 65
- The amount of donations from 60 registered oil, gas and coal lobbyists to the Clinton campaign: \$142,640
- Of those 60, 13 are bundlers

- 48 lobbyists have contributed the maximum personal amount of \$2,700
- 13 lobbyists bundled \$2,502,740 in contributions to the Clinton campaign

These contributors includes:

- Lobbyists who have reported lobbying for the oil and gas industry – both in-house company lobbyists and hired lobbyists from “K-Street firms.”

This does not include:

- Industry executives not registered as lobbyists.
- Additional workers in the fossil fuel industry.
- Corporate board members.
- Corporate PAC contributions.
- Donations by major investors.
- Contributions to Super PACS or non-profit groups.
- Contributions made to Super PACS by trade associations.

Greenpeace said it had also asked Clinton and all presidential candidates to sign its pledge to fix democracy, which lays out rejecting money from fossil fuel interests as such:¹⁸⁰

By “fossil fuel interests” we mean companies whose primary business is the extraction, processing and sale of coal, oil or gas. The pledge means that a candidate’s campaign will adopt a policy to not

knowingly accept any contributions from company PACs, registered lobbyists that work on behalf of the company, or top executives.

There is also some hypocrisy to report on the part of Clinton. During a Democratic presidential debate in New Hampshire, Clinton denied that big money interests donating to her campaign were buying influence. But in 2008, when she was running against then-Sen. Barack Obama for her party's nomination, she said contributions that Obama received from the industry were evidence of quid pro quo:¹⁸¹

In April 2008, Clinton's campaign aired a television ad portraying Obama's support for a 2005 energy bill as a quid pro quo for campaign donations. The ad said Obama had "accepted \$200,000 from executives and employees of oil companies," while criticizing him for voting "for the Bush-Cheney energy bill that that put \$6 billion in the pocket of big oil."

The clear message of the ad was that Obama was in favor of the bill as a sop to the oil industry.

Greenpeace noted also that Obama did not take any money from lobbyists or PACs during the 2008 campaign.¹⁸²

For her part, Clinton believes that shale gas – and the method of extracting it – has to potential to dramatically shift global energy politics. In a speech to a crowd at Georgetown University in October 2012, she said, "This is a moment of profound change. Countries that used to depend on others for their energy are now producers. How will this shape world events? Who will benefit, and who will not? ... The answers to these questions are being written right now, and we intend to play a major role."¹⁸³ Does this sound like someone who is interested in ending fracking?

Her longstanding support for genetically modified foods and backing from agri-business giant Monsanto raise questions about how serious

she would be in protecting the environment and the nation's food security, given that Monsanto's Roundup® herbicide is one of the most widely used – and controversial – in the world.¹⁸⁴ Serious environmentalists fear that she will continue the Environmental Protection Agency's biosolids program, which many believe are filled with pollutants.¹⁸⁵ And there is concern that she will continue to expand the power of already powerful federal agencies under the guise of “protecting the environment.”

Monsanto, herbicides, GMOs, superweeds and a long relationship

Clinton's longstanding support for genetically modified foods and backing from agri-business giant Monsanto raise questions about how serious she would be in protecting the environment and the nation's food security, given that Monsanto's Roundup® herbicide is one of the most widely used – and controversial – in the world.¹⁸⁶ Serious environmentalists also fear she will continue the Environmental Protection Agency's biosolids program, which many believe are filled with pollutants.¹⁸⁷ And there is concern that she will continue to expand the power of already powerful federal agencies under the guise of “protecting the environment.”

One of the most environmentally hazardous substances used today in commercial agriculture is glyphosate, which is the primary ingredient in the popular herbicide Roundup, manufactured by Monsanto – an agri-business giant that Clinton is very close to.

In order to put their relationship in proper context, it is necessary to provide some background into the company, its primary agricultural product – glyphosate, what it is used for, why its harmful, and who is paid by Monsanto to essentially defend its continued use despite the harm it is causing to agricultural production, the environment and humans.

The compound glyphosate is used in tandem with genetically modified (GM) crops; the chemical kills weeds while not harming the GM plant.

Because Roundup is one of Monsanto's most profitable products, the company spends a small fortune annually to counter studies and evidence demonstrating its harm.

One of the ways Monsanto operates is through the use of propaganda, and one of the company's chief propagandists is a man named Jon Entine.¹⁸⁸

He is a well-known shill for a number of chemical corporations, and he uses his media savvy to tout the positions of those companies by posing as an independent journalist. Entine has several, well documented ties to companies like Monsanto and another biochemical giant, Syngenta. He has played a key role in an industry front group called the American Council on Science and Health,¹⁸⁹ an organization that has been described as "holding a generally apologetic stance regarding virtually every other health and environmental hazard product by modern industry, accepting corporate funding from Coca-Cola, Kellogg, General Mills, Pepsico, and the American Beverage Association, among others."¹⁹⁰

Public interest advocacy group U.S. Right To Know documented further Entine-Monsanto ties:¹⁹¹

Entine founded ESG MediaMetrics, a "sustainability" communications firm whose clients included Monsanto and the Vinyl Institute.

Entine is executive director of Genetic Literacy Project (GLP), which promotes GMOs and pesticides. It states that it is "funded by grants from non-partisan foundations" but does not disclose which ones, nor whether it receives funding from corporations, trade associations or other agrichemical industry interests.

In 2014, Entine and the Genetic Literacy Project partnered with a Monsanto-backed group, Academics Review, to sponsor the Biotechnology Literacy Project "boot camp" to teach scientists how to "best engage the GMO debate with a skeptical public."

Faculty at the first boot camp included representatives from GMO manufacturers, food industry front groups and trade groups, and pro-GMO academics including University of Florida Professor Kevin Folta, and University of Illinois Professor Emeritus Bruce Chassy, both of whom have accepted undisclosed funding from Monsanto and promote the GMOs and pesticides that Monsanto sales rely upon.

As to the chemical nature of glyphosate, it has been deemed a probable carcinogen to humans and animals by a United Nations agency, the World Health Organization. In March 2015 the WHO published a study in the British journal *The Lancet Oncology*, the groundbreaking report described the chemical as “probably carcinogenic to humans,” summarily listing it as the second-highest classification for substances that may cause cancer, or just below “known carcinogen.”¹⁹² Though the results were not from a new study but rather were gleaned from a macro-analysis of dozens of previous studies, WHO officials who conducted the research were convinced that enough evidence existed to issue the warning. The paper also included an abundance of data indicating that glyphosate negatively impacts the human body, having been detected often in the blood and urine of agricultural workers who were exposed to it.¹⁹³

Specifically:¹⁹⁴

Based on an assessment of various case-control studies of occupational exposure to glyphosate conducted in the U.S., Canada and Sweden, the research team noted increased risks for non-Hodgkin lymphoma, even after accounting for exposure to other pesticides. Mice exposed to glyphosate also showed higher incidences of renal tubule carcinoma, a rare form of kidney cancer.

Other types of cancer shown to develop as a result of glyphosate exposure included haemangiosarcoma (a type of cancer common in dogs), pancreatic islet-cell adenoma and skin tumors. The

researchers also noted that aminomethylphosphoric acid (AMPA) – which occurs when glyphosate is broken down by soil organisms – is present in human blood as well, indicating absorption.

Besides being harmful to humans the chemical is harming the environment and agriculture as well. After years of application to control weeds in crops, *new monster varieties of weeds* have begun to sprout around the world – weeds that are not only resistant to Roundup but also other, equally harmful, chemical weed killers.

A 2013 report documented the new monster weeds, also dubbed “superweeds,” sprouting in fields across the globe, amid mounting use of herbicides and genetically modified crops. Weed management experts have begun sounding the alarm and looking for new ways to address the problem after years of agriculture based almost solely on the use of glyphosate, whose extended use is forcing farmers to weed *by hand* in many cases or return to costlier mechanical tilling of soil.¹⁹⁵

In a number of cases the cost of weed control and management has doubled and even tripled. During the same period of time – about 15 years – crop production has fallen, which has also cast doubt on claims that GM crops are going to solve global food shortages. “The problems associated with herbicide-resistant weeds are spreading and intensifying, especially weed species resistant to multiple products, including the mainstay of 21st century agriculture, the herbicide glyphosate,” said Bryan Young, Ph.D., a professor of Plant Soil and Agricultural Systems at Southern Illinois University in Carbondale who specializes in weed management strategies.¹⁹⁶

As for genetically modified foods, or genetically modified organisms (GMOs), one study showed that they can cause the growth of cancerous tumors.¹⁹⁷ As reported by *GreenMedInfo.com*:

“[T]he Committee for Research & Independent Information on Genetic Engineering (CRIIGEN) reported on the results of a 2 year feeding

study in rats given either NK603 Roundup-tolerant genetically modified maize, cultivated with or without Roundup, and Roundup alone, at levels permitted in drinking water and GM crops in the United States. ... The authors of the study pointed out that currently, no regulatory authority requires mandatory chronic animal feeding studies to be performed for edible GMOs and formulated pesticides, and the only 90 day feeding trials were conducted by the biotech industry.”¹⁹⁸

The findings: Unprecedented confirmation of how GMO foods can lead to cancerous tumor growth. Specifically, according to the published findings:¹⁹⁹

In females, all treated groups died 2–3 times more than controls, and more rapidly. This difference was visible in 3 male groups fed GMOs. All results were hormone and sex dependent, and the pathological profiles were comparable. Females developed large mammary tumors almost always more often than and before controls, the pituitary was the second most disabled organ; the sex hormonal balance was modified by GMO and Roundup treatments. In treated males, liver congestions and necrosis were 2.5–5.5 times higher. This pathology was confirmed by optic and transmission electron microscopy. Marked and severe kidney nephropathies were also generally 1.3–2.3 greater. Males presented 4 times more large palpable tumors than controls which occurred up to 600 days earlier. Biochemistry data confirmed very significant kidney chronic deficiencies; for all treatments and both sexes, 76% of the altered parameters were kidney related. These results can be explained by the non linear endocrine-disrupting effects of Roundup, but also by the overexpression of the transgene in the GMO and its metabolic consequences.

The study, published in the journal *Food and Chemical Toxicity*, was eventually retracted, but the editor-in-chief of the publication *did not discount the findings*:²⁰⁰

Unequivocally, the Editor-in-Chief found no evidence of fraud or intentional misrepresentation of the data. However, there is a legitimate cause for concern regarding both the number of animals in each study group and the particular strain selected. The low number of animals had been identified as a cause for concern during the initial review process, but the peer review decision ultimately weighed that the work still had merit despite this limitation.

Ultimately, the results presented (while not incorrect) are *inconclusive*...

“Inconclusive,” but not *incorrect*.

All of this is the system that Clinton supports and has been bought into. In fact, Clinton supports Monsanto (and vice versa) its genetically modified food production – and all of the problems inherent to the manner in which Monsanto has infected the food production process – to the point that she has been dubbed the “Bride of Frankenfood” by critics.²⁰¹

“Hillary Rodham Clinton’s ties to agribusiness giant Monsanto, and her advocacy for the industry’s genetically modified crops, have environmentalists in Iowa calling her ‘Bride of Frankenfood,’” reported *The Washington Times* in May 2015. “A large faction of women voiced strong support for Mrs. Clinton’s candidacy until the GMO issue came up, prompting them to switch allegiances to Sen. Bernard Sanders of Vermont, a liberal stalwart challenging her for the Democratic nomination.”²⁰²

At the 2014 Biotechnology Industry Organization (BIO) conference, Clinton repeated all of Monsanto’s favorite talking points during a speech, saying that she is in favor of using the company’s seeds and other products that have a “proven track record,” though no such statistics or records justifying those plaudits exist. Indeed, as this paper has demonstrated, superweeds are encroaching on more and more crop fields thanks to overuse of Roundup, forcing agriculture

operations to use as much as 10 times the amount of toxic herbicides they would have used on normal, non-GMO crops.²⁰³ As one reference source noted further:²⁰⁴

Hillary tries to bleed together GMO with hybrids (traditional natural breeding methods), a typical miseducation and disinformation conversation many other biotech shills use for propaganda, such as Bill Nye, the science fraud guy, and Neal DeGrasse Tyson, also a known biotech huckster. Clinton goes so far as to say during her “BIO” presentation that all anti-GMO people are anti-science idiots who can’t comprehend the “facts.”

Clinton’s ties to Monsanto don’t end there. She hired a prominent long-time Monsanto lobbyist, Jerry Crawford, to run her current presidential campaign.²⁰⁵ Crawford is reportedly the force behind Monsanto’s efforts to take small farmers to court in order to protect the company’s growing monopoly on the world’s supply of seeds.²⁰⁶ But there is more: The ties between Clinton and Crawford run deep; Clinton’s one-time law firm, Rose Law, represented Monsanto and other agri-chemical companies.²⁰⁷

Biosludge

Most people have never heard of the term *biosludge* because it’s not an “official” term but rather one given to a disturbingly dangerous substance that is sanctioned as “fertilizer” by the Environmental Protection Agency – an agency that a President Hillary Clinton would never rein in.

In the 1980s, Congress passed legislation banning the dumping of sludge into the oceans, but the EPA wrote rules allowing biosludge to be utilized as fertilizer.²⁰⁸ Industrial companies still had to have places to dump their waste products, after all. Just like the fertilizer industry has found a market for fluoride waste in drinking water, the waste water industry has created a fertilizer market for sewer sludge, using it as a cheap crop booster (allegedly). The EPA and several lobbyists claim that this “humanure” is *safe* for unrestricted use in family gardens. Only,

the compost comes from cities and is filled with whatever is flushed down toilets or makes it into the sewer system: Pharmaceuticals and antibiotics, sex hormones and other endocrine disruptors, radiated derivatives from cancer treatments, steroids and other excreted materials that then get into humans via the food chain.²⁰⁹

While Clinton has not addressed the issue of biosludge directly, neither has she condemned it. But as president and head of the executive branch, she would also be in charge of the vast federal bureaucracy, which includes the EPA as well hundreds of other agencies. On the campaign trail, Clinton has not said she would move to limit or curb the power of these agencies, but rather hinted that she would use the power of the federal government to keep in place policies that allow tainted biosludge to continue to be falsely marketed and used unwittingly by American families.

Global warming/climate change: Clinton is a believer in so-called global warming/climate change. “I won’t let anyone take us backward, deny our economy the benefits of harnessing a clean energy future, or force our children to endure the catastrophe that would result from unchecked climate change,” she said in November 2015.²¹⁰ Her campaign website states further:²¹¹

Climate change is an urgent threat and a defining challenge of our time. It threatens our economy, our national security, and our children’s health and futures. We can tackle it by making America the world’s clean energy superpower and creating millions of good-paying jobs, taking bold steps to slash carbon pollution at home and around the world, and ensuring no Americans are left out or left behind as we rapidly build a clean energy economy.

On day one in office, Clinton says she plans set in motion a three-pronged plan that would:²¹²

- Create enough energy generation through renewable sources to power every home in the country with a goal of installing half a billion solar panels by the end of her first term.
- Cut energy waste in homes, schools, hospitals and businesses by one-third, while making American manufacturing “the cleanest and most efficient in the world.”
- Reduce U.S. oil consumption by one-third through cleaner fuels and more efficient cars, boilers, ships and big rigs.

What’s more, Clinton plans to accomplish these goals as an imperial president, much like Obama has attempted to do (though U.S. courts have ruled most of his actions unconstitutional):²¹³

Hillary’s plan will deliver on the pledge President Obama made at the Paris climate conference—without relying on climate deniers in Congress to pass new legislation. She will reduce greenhouse gas emissions by up to 30 percent in 2025 relative to 2005 levels and put the country on a path to cut emissions more than 80 percent by 2050.

Other plans include the implementation of more “smart pollution and efficiency standards,” a \$60 billion “Clean Energy Challenge,” more “investment” (code for spending tax money) in clean energy infrastructure, “ensure safe and responsible energy production” (code for issuing more regulations) – and all while promising to “revitalize coal communities,” which essentially means subsidizing some of the dirtiest of all energy production.

All of what Clinton wants to do – spend more taxpayer money, spread around more regulations, and bypass Congress whenever possible – would be done in the name of a phony “problem.”

While it is no secret that, through the years, our climate has indeed undergone “changes,” there is no proof – meaning, there is nothing other than climate “models” – linking climate change to man-caused activities. There are no replicable studies and no reliable data, but like Obama, Clinton wants to essentially double down on energy policies that are unproven, expensive and meant to ‘address’ a problem that doesn’t exist.

In December 2015, *Natural News* reported on this hoax, and laid out the case as to why the lie was being perpetuated:²¹⁴

I used to casually believe the global warming narrative, but when I took a closer look at the data and motivations of those pushing the global warming agenda, it became obvious to me that global warming is a massive scientific hoax being perpetrated for political reasons.

In that article, I further laid out those reasons, all of which were based on documentation:²¹⁵

- Governments around the world pushing the climate change narrative only began doing so after the initial narrative – *global warming* – was disproven following nearly 20 years of *cooling* temperatures. In fact, some scientists are predicting a three-decade-long period of cooling.²¹⁶
- Much of what is called the “mainstream media” serves as an echo chamber for politicians pushing the climate change narrative.²¹⁷
- Government officials use allies in the press and entertainment industry to push the narrative that they want to “save the planet” but the real agenda is control of populations through various regulatory mechanisms that limit travel individualism and freedom of movement.²¹⁸

- CO² – the “greenhouse gas” most vilified by those pushing the climate change narrative, is a necessary compound that is essential to life on the planet and, therefore, cannot be limited or eliminated.²¹⁹
- Scientists who do not toe the line of official climate change narratives have seen their research debunked and livelihoods destroyed, as well as their reputations.²²⁰
- Satellite and other global temperature and climate data has been systematically tampered with to make it fit the climate change narrative. Even NASA has been caught manipulating data.²²¹
- Climate science has been nearly universally corrupted by corporations and governments, as part of a scam involving more than a trillion dollars per year.²²²

To that last point, *The Washington Times* reported that the “climate change industry” had ballooned to a \$1.5 trillion-a-year business.²²³

“Interest in climate change is becoming an increasingly powerful economic driver, so much so that some see it as an industry in itself whose growth is driven in large part by policymaking, notes Don Jergler, an analyst for *Insurance Journal*, an industry publication. “The \$1.5 trillion global ‘climate change industry’ grew at between 17 and 24 percent annually from 2005-2008, slowing to between 4 and 6 percent following the recession with the exception of 2011’s inexplicable 15 percent growth, according to *Climate Change Business Journal*.”²²⁴

Forbes, in 2011, added:²²⁵

The U.S. Government Accounting Office (GAO) can’t figure out what benefits taxpayers are getting from the many billions of dollars spent each year on policies that are purportedly aimed at addressing climate change.

In addition to the cost to taxpayers, climate change policies are costing American businesses dearly in terms of compliance – money that could be better spent on expansion and growth, which would create jobs. *Forbes* further noted:²²⁶

The Small Business Administration estimates that compliance with such regulations costs the U.S. economy more than \$1.75 trillion per year — about 12%-14% of GDP, and half of the \$3.456 trillion Washington is currently spending. The Competitive Enterprise Institute believes the annual cost is closer to \$1.8 trillion when an estimated \$55.4 billion regulatory administration and policing budget is included. CEI further observes that those regulation costs exceed 2008 corporate pretax profits of \$1.436 trillion; tower over estimated individual income taxes of \$936 billion by 87%; and reveal a federal government whose share of the entire economy reaches 35.5% when combined with federal 2010 spending outlays.

A U.S. Energy Information Administration economic forecasting model indicates that a proposed 70% cut in CO2 emissions will cause gasoline prices to rise 77% over baseline projections, kill more than 3 million jobs, and reduce average household income by more than \$4,000 each year.

And this is the system that Clinton not only defends but, according to her own campaign website, *wants to expand*.

Medicine/Healthcare

Hillary Clinton's positions on medicine – medical care, vaccines, pharmaceutical and health insurance companies – can be fairly described as *mainstream*. That is, despite her campaign rhetoric, there is no indication that she would alter policies that would promote more alternative and holistic medicine, vaccine choice and a de-escalation of reliance on Big Pharma.

For example, though she has publicly chastised major pharmaceutical companies over the prices that they charge for medications, Clinton is also the presidential candidate who has received the most campaign cash from that industry.²²⁷

“As your president, I want to build on the progress we’ve made. I’ll do more to bring down health care costs for families, ease burdens on small businesses, and make sure consumers have the choices they deserve. And frankly, it is finally time for us to deal with the skyrocketing out-of-pocket health costs, **and particularly runaway prescription drug prices** [emphasis added],” Clinton said in September 2015, at a campaign event.²²⁸

On her campaign website, she claims she will:²²⁹

Prescription drug spending accelerated from 2.5 percent in 2013 to 12.6 percent in 2014. It’s no wonder that almost three-quarters of Americans believe prescription drug costs are unreasonable. Hillary believes we need to demand lower drug costs for hardworking families and seniors.

She has called drug companies “bad actors” and has claimed they are “making a fortune off of people’s misfortune.” That same month, Clinton outlined a plan that she says will reform the way pharmaceutical companies are allowed to do business, in particular by stopping them from spending government grants on advertising and by permitting Medicare, and the U.S. government at large, to negotiate down drug costs (the latter plan has also been suggested by GOP presidential nominee Donald J. Trump). “Under my plan, drug companies who want to keep getting federal support will have to redirect more of their profits into meaningful investments in research and development,” Clinton said at a community forum in Iowa, in September. “That will mean more breakthroughs, more good drugs, not fewer.”²³⁰

In a campaign advertisement released in March 2016, Clinton is featured reading a letter from a woman who said the price of one medication went from about \$180 in the early 1980s to more than \$14,700 now. “The company is called Valeant Pharmaceuticals,” Clinton says. “I’m going after them. This is predatory pricing, and we’re going to make sure it is stopped.”²³¹ (Come to find out, the woman in Clinton’s ad told Valeant after the company offered her prescription assistance that she wasn’t worried because her insurance company covered the cost.)²³²

A report in *The Hill* noted further:²³³

Clinton’s ad is part of her larger campaign message assailing pharmaceutical companies for their prices.

She has put forward a range of proposals that are strongly opposed by industry, such as allowing Medicare to negotiate prices, allowing the importation of drugs from abroad and requiring drug companies to invest a certain portion of their revenues in research and development.

But such pledges ring hollow to many who claim that she can’t be serious about punishing drug companies while collecting millions from them in campaign contributions. As of this writing, Clinton has received more than \$3 million from the pharmaceutical industry.²³⁴

For another, not everyone agrees that Medicare ought to be able to negotiate with drug companies like Medicaid and the Department of Veterans Affairs are permitted to do. One expert – Joseph Gulfo, the executive director of the Rothman Institute of Innovation and Entrepreneurship at Fairleigh Dickinson University, author and someone with a quarter-century’s worth of experience in the biopharmaceutical and medical-device industries – believes the federal government *is* the problem, not the solution (Clinton, as she has intimated, believes in a *federal government first* approach).²³⁵

What we are seeing here is an out-of-control regulatory paradigm and the real solution lies in evaluating the FDA's current system of drug development regulation and approval and removing barriers to creating highly competitive markets that would promote lower prices.

Clinton has also repeatedly voiced support for the Affordable Care Act, better known by its moniker *Obamacare*, and has vowed that she would not “repeal or replace” it.²³⁶ According to her campaign website:²³⁷

Defend and expand the Affordable Care Act, which covers 20 million people. Hillary will stand up to Republican-led attacks on this landmark law—and build on its success to bring the promise of affordable health care to more people and make a “public option” possible. She will also support letting people over 55 years old buy into Medicare.

“You know, before it was called Obamacare it was called Hillarycare,” Clinton said at a rally in Elko, Nevada, in February 2016.²³⁸ The term stretches back to her failed effort to do to the U.S. healthcare system what President Obama and majority Democrats did to it in 2010 and was meant as an insult but now she has embraced it, now that she has made Obamacare a central theme of her healthcare platform.²³⁹

Her chief rival for the Democratic presidential nomination, Sen. Bernie Sanders, I-Vt., campaigned on a “universal health care” platform – that is, eliminate the private health insurance market altogether and replace it with a taxpayer-supported government-run system. Clinton, however, “has gone all in with Obamacare, embracing the controversial health law and promising to defend and expand it.”²⁴⁰

“I am a staunch supporter of President Obama’s principal accomplishment, namely the Affordable Care Act,” she said in a debate in Milwaukee on Feb. 11.²⁴¹

This would be bad news for tens of millions of Americans who have seen double-digit increases in insurance premiums and out-of-pocket co-pays, two things that Obama repeatedly promised his law would address.

In June, a study released by the Kaiser Family Foundation found that Obamacare premiums, even for the cheapest plans that were purchased by many low-income families, are set to increase by double digits – 11 percent – just ahead of the November elections. And by 2017, the study found that the most popular types of health insurance sold by Obamacare marketplaces will be hit with even higher premiums at a faster pace than increases in recent years.²⁴²

While we cannot generalize to all states until more data become available later this year, in most of these population centers, the costs for the lowest and second-lowest silver plans are, in fact, increasing faster in 2017 than they have in previous years. Based on insurer rate requests, the cost of the second-lowest silver plan in these cities will increase by a weighted average of 10% in 2017. Last year, premiums for the second-lowest silver plans in these areas increased 5% following review by state insurance departments. There is substantial variation across markets, with premium changes for second-lowest silver plans ranging from a drop of 13% to an increase of 18%. Premiums for 2017 are still preliminary and could be raised or lowered through these states' rate review processes.

What's more, choices for consumers are going to disappear as well, according to the study.²⁴³

We also find that some states will have fewer insurers participating in 2017 than participated in 2016. On average across these 14 marketplaces, participation is down slightly from 2016 but similar to that of 2014. In the 14 marketplaces included in this analysis, half (7) will see insurer participation remain steady or increase, while the other 7 states will see a drop in the number of issuers, in many cases due to the withdrawal of UnitedHealth.

To this last point, most of the health insurance co-ops formed under Obamacare have now failed; just one-third of them remain open. In July 2016 reports noted that two more co-ops – one in Oregon and another in Connecticut – failed, joining others in Arizona, Colorado, Kentucky, Michigan, Nevada, New York, Ohio, South Carolina, Tennessee and Utah, as well as a co-op that served both Iowa and Nebraska. As of this writing, only eight of the initial 23 co-ops are still in operation.²⁴⁴

In addition to costing consumers more, Obamacare is being blamed for costing Americans *jobs*. In June 2016 the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that the economy created only 38,000 jobs the previous month, while an estimated 458,000 Americans left the workforce. Of that latter figure, 130,000 left but were still desiring employment.²⁴⁵

As *The Fiscal Times* noted:²⁴⁶

One data point in particular might give at least some indication why. The number of part-time workers in jobs for economic reasons shot up by 468,000, apart from the 458,000 that left the workforce altogether. Slack work or business conditions accounted for 181,000 of these jobs, while another 77,000 could only find part-time work.

“The evidence suggests that the [Affordable Care Act] has at least modestly elevated involuntary part-time employment,” Goldman Sachs economist Alec Philips wrote in a research note.²⁴⁷

Others agreed. Joseph Lawler, writing at *The Washington Examiner*, wrote that in May 2016 “involuntary part-time employment” soared that month. “The number of people forced into part-time work was only 119,000 lower than a year before, and up 611,000 from September of last year, when it hit a post-recession low,” he reported, citing U.S. government labor data.²⁴⁸

The Fiscal Times reported further:²⁴⁹

The ACA directly incentivizes employers to use part-time rather than full-time workers, and smaller businesses have the necessity of grasping at any competitive advantage they can get. Six years after its passage and almost three years after its implementation, Goldman Sachs still sees Obamacare as a prime driver of forced part-time employment.

On her campaign website, Clinton also claims that she wants to “bring down out-of-pocket costs like copays and deductibles”²⁵⁰ – which, as this paper demonstrates, are indeed rising. But she has said she wants to preserve Obamacare as well, making her *real* position unclear and likely to be influenced by other factors.

Vaccine backer

Clinton is a long-time advocate for vaccines, an advocacy that began in 1993 during her husband’s first year in office. She was the primary driver behind initiatives like the Childhood Immunization Initiative and the Vaccines for Children program.²⁵¹

But like so many issues, her position has changed over the years. In 2008, during her first campaign for president, she alluded to research that established a link between vaccines and autism. “I am committed to make investments to find the causes of autism, *including possible environmental causes like vaccines...*We don’t know what, if any, kind of link there is between vaccines and autism - but we should find out,” she said.²⁵²

In February 2015, however, in response to the subject of vaccine safety being brought up during one of the earliest Republican presidential debates – in which a few candidates voiced caution about the efficacy of vaccinating children with a high number at once – Clinton tweeted out, “The science is clear: The earth is round, the sky is blue

and #vaccineswork. Let's protect our kids.”²⁵³ That position reeks of hypocrisy given what she said she believed in 2008. But it also sends a chilling signal in terms of vaccine choice. Coupled with the monetary support Clinton is receiving from the pharmaceutical industry, her opinion now seems to be solidly in the camp of Big Pharma, an industry that is helping her campaign pay its bills. And that means less freedom for American parents. It is even possible she would push for a vaccine mandate nationwide, like the one passed recently in California.²⁵⁴

Transgender health issues

Some are worried that Clinton will back efforts to force economically hard-pressed health insurance companies to cover politically correct procedures like transgender surgery, even though the vast majority of health insurers have never covered cosmetic, non-medically necessary procedures.²⁵⁵

The push by consumers has already begun. In June 2016, *Natural News* reported that a man, Joe Robinson, in Arizona filed suit against his health insurer for “discrimination” after the company refused to provide employee coverage for sexual transition care. The individual was born female but is currently transitioning into a man:²⁵⁶

In federal court filings, Robinson and the American Civil Liberties Union argued that Dignity Health has an insurance policy that discriminates based on sex, because it denied the plaintiff treatment for gender-dysphoria, instead labeling his condition a “personality disorder.”

As a result, Robinson paid “thousands of dollars” out of his own pocket for gender-dysphoria healthcare, including \$7,450 for a double mastectomy. In addition to breast removal surgery, the plaintiff requested that his provider also pay for phalloplasty, or penis implant surgery.

Clinton has not only voiced support for the transgender community,²⁵⁷ but she has also sought to expand procedures that health insurers would be required to cover. At present, most insurance companies do not cover voluntary cosmetic surgery because it is expensive and not medically necessary.

Abortion/Women's health

Clinton is a supporter of abortion. According to her campaign website, she would:²⁵⁸

Defend access to reproductive health care. Hillary will work to ensure that all women have access to preventive care, affordable contraception, and safe and legal abortion.

On this, too, Clinton's various positions conflict.

Clinton has been celebrated as a champion of women's rights, and she has touted herself as an advocate for women. "Too often, these are called women's issues. Well, I am a proud lifelong fighter for women's issues, because I firmly believe what's good for women is good for America. ... As far as I'm concerned, any issue that affects women's lives and futures is a women's issue," she said in September 2015 at a campaign event.²⁵⁹

But, as this paper has shown, Clinton is a major benefactor of Monsanto, and backs the agri-business giant's genetically modified crops. And yet, research has shown that "GMO Frankenfoods" have been found to cause birth defects, infertility, breast cancer and miscarriages.²⁶⁰

What's more, the Clinton campaign and the Clinton Foundation have received money – millions of dollars – from countries around the world with horrid records on the treatment of women and women's rights. These countries include Saudi Arabia, Oman, Algeria and the United Arab Emirates.²⁶¹

According to a November 2015 report by *Observer.com*:²⁶²

Ms. Clinton's supposed penchant for women's rights wasn't taken into account when it came to taking money from countries that exhibit some of the worst examples of gender inequality in the world. These donations beg the question of whether Ms. Clinton's efforts on the behalf of women were more for show than genuinely wanting to make an impact for women today.

Clinton also backs President Obama's liberal open-door immigration policies and has not put forth a serious border security plan even to stop *illegal* immigration. In fact, she supports rewarding those who have violated our immigration laws with citizenship.²⁶³

"If we claim we are for family, then we have to pull together and resolve the outstanding issues around our broken immigration system. The American people support comprehensive immigration reform not just because it's the right thing to do—and it is—but because they know it strengthens families, strengthens our economy, and strengthens our country. ... We can't wait any longer for a path to full and equal citizenship," she said in May 2015, at a campaign event.²⁶⁴

She also says she backs President Obama's executive orders on immigration. According to her campaign website she vows to:²⁶⁵

Defend President Obama's executive actions—known as DACA and DAPA—against partisan attacks. The Supreme Court's deadlocked decision on DAPA was a heartbreaking reminder of how high the stakes are in this election. Hillary believes DAPA is squarely within the president's authority and won't stop fighting until we see it through. The estimated 5 million people eligible for DAPA—including DREAMers and parents of Americans and lawful residents—should be protected under the executive actions.

This, despite a federal appeals court have ruled those actions outside the realm of the Executive Branch's authority.²⁶⁶ Nevertheless, Clinton backs them. The case made it to the U.S. Supreme Court which was short one justice following the untimely death of Antonin Scalia; after the court deadlocked in a 4-4 tie on the issue in a June 2016 ruling, Clinton tweeted, "Today's heartbreaking #SCOTUS immigration ruling could tear apart 5 million families facing deportation. We must do better. -H."²⁶⁷

But American women have suffered under the Obama mass immigration plan that Clinton supports. Women have been raped and killed by illegal aliens for years, and as more are allowed into the country, more women's lives are threatened.²⁶⁸

Clean, unaltered food

As noted earlier in this paper, Clinton is an advocate for Monsanto's GMO seeds and foods, a position that has endeared her to the company in the form of multiple campaign donations. During an hour-long speech at the Biotechnology Industry Organization's annual meeting in June 2014, she said in response to a question on whether she supported GMOs, "I stand in favor of using seeds and products that have a proven track record. ... Genetically modified sounds 'Frankensteinish' – drought resistant sounds really like something you want."²⁶⁹

Besides campaign contributions, Clinton's support for Monsanto and GMOs was bought and paid for in other ways as well. Her appearance at the BIO conference was not just coincidental; she was paid \$335,000 in speaking fees to make the appearance. BIO, it turns out, is a Monsanto front group whose mission is to push GMOs.²⁷⁰

During her speech, Clinton reportedly received a standing ovation when she gave advice on how to get others to support and consume genetically modified foods as well. After discussing use of the phrase "drought-resistant" instead of "genetically modified," Clinton advised the crowd, "Be more careful so you don't raise that red flag immediately."²⁷¹

No one should be surprised by this. During her tenure as secretary of state, Clinton pushed other countries to utilize GM crops. In a leaked memo from 2009, her first year in office, she wrote, “Our biotech outreach objectives for 2010 are to increase access to, and markets for, biotech as a means to help address the underlying causes of the food crisis, and to promote agricultural technology’s role in mitigating climate change and increasing biofuel production.”²⁷²

She further noted, “We urge [diplomatic] posts to pay particular attention to advancing this strategy with **countries that have key biotech legislation pending or are at a cross-roads on the technology**, those that **provide opportunities for active engagement on ag biotech to address food production** and mitigate climate change, and those that are active players in international fora where biotechnology issues are discussed (e.g., CODEX Alimentarius and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety) [emphasis added].”²⁷³

Writing at *Food Democracy Now*, an advocacy group for clean food, the founder, Dave Murphy, wrote that Clinton’s ties to Monsanto money date back to her first campaign for president as well:²⁷⁴

In 2007, Clinton’s campaign was so out of touch that they called her fundraiser at Monsanto’s law firm ‘Rural Americans for Hillary.’ The Clinton campaign even had the audacity to put a ‘Welcome Hillary’ on the back of a giant soybean sprayer! You know the type that sprays Roundup, which has been linked to cancer, on Monsanto’s patented GMO seeds.

Why is that a big deal? The organization explains further:²⁷⁵

While some might think the Clinton campaign was just trying to be cute, in Iowa, chemical agriculture is no laughing matter. According to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), Iowa has the highest rates of cancer of any state in the Midwest and it should come as no surprise that 97% of soybeans and 93% of corn grown in Iowa are

genetically engineered to be sprayed with Monsanto's Roundup, which the World Health Organization's International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) recently linked to causing cancer in humans just last year.

As for genetically modified foods, a number of studies have shown them to be potentially harmful to humans, causing all kinds of ailments and conditions, but the biotech industry has spent millions on "studies" that all conclude, not surprisingly, that genetically modified crops and foods are safe. But the problem is, most of these studies are for only short periods of time; they don't track subjects who consume them for years at a time, like other studies. What's more, the studies showing that GMOs are safe are performed by the industry itself.²⁷⁶

But an independent researcher who conducted a two-year study came up with dramatically different findings. The study completed in 2012 by French researcher Gilles-Eric Seralini of the University of Caen was the first ever study to examine the long-term (lifetime) effects of eating GMOs. It involved feeding laboratory rats Monsanto's GM maize and within a few months the rats began to develop grotesque, massive tumors. Published in *The Food & Chemical Toxicology Journal*, the study's primary findings included:²⁷⁷

- Up to 50% of males and 70% of females suffered **premature death**.
- Rats that drank trace amounts of Roundup (at levels legally allowed in the water supply) had a **200% to 300% increase in large tumors**.
- Rats fed GM corn and traces of Roundup suffered **severe organ damage** including liver damage and kidney damage.
- The study fed these rats NK603, the Monsanto variety of GM corn that's grown across North America and widely fed to animals

and humans. This is the same corn that's in your corn-based breakfast cereal, corn tortillas and corn snack chips.

The study's abstract noted further:²⁷⁸

Our analysis clearly reveals for the 3 GMOs new side effects linked with GM maize consumption, which were sex- and often dose-dependent. Effects were mostly associated with the kidney and liver, the dietary detoxifying organs, although different between the 3 GMOs. Other effects were also noticed in the heart, adrenal glands, spleen and haematopoietic system. We conclude that these data highlight signs of hepatorenal toxicity, possibly due to the new pesticides specific to each GM corn. In addition, unintended direct or indirect metabolic consequences of the genetic modification cannot be excluded.

This is the company – Monsanto – and this is the food – genetically modified – that Clinton serves and wants to serve to the American people.

What's more, Clinton's ties to Monsanto mean that as president, she very likely would veto any federal legislation that would require all foods containing genetically modified ingredients to list them on the packaging label, just like most other ingredients are currently required to be on packaging. Monsanto has spent millions of dollars lobbying and campaigning against GMO labeling efforts in some U.S. states, including California – even while supporting GMO labeling in Europe.²⁷⁹

NaturalNews.com reported in September 2012:²⁸⁰

By far the biggest opponent to California's Proposition 37, the upcoming ballot initiative that would require genetically modified (GM) foods to be properly labeled, is biotechnology giant Monsanto, which has already forked over at least \$4.3 million towards efforts to kill the bill. But a little more than a decade ago, Monsanto was actually leading the charge in promoting GMO labeling in the U.K.,

where the company actually ran advertisements in favor of food ingredient transparency.

In January 2016, as she was battling Sen. Sanders for the Democratic Party presidential nomination Clinton appeared to side with food transparency and voiced support for GMO labeling. That's because her chief opponent had been pushing for it since his home state of Vermont became the first state in the country to require it.²⁸¹ Speaking on the floor of the Senate in May 2013, Sanders pushed for an amendment to legislation that would require nationwide GMO food labeling:²⁸²

People want to know what is in their food and I think that is a very reasonable request.... The FDA already requires the labeling of over 3,000 ingredients and additives. If you want to know if your food contains gluten, aspartame, high-fructose corn syrup, trans fats, or MSG, you simply read the ingredient label.

In voicing her "support" for GMO labeling legislation, Clinton backed legislation in Congress that required only *voluntary compliance* among food makers to add GMO ingredients to their labels. So her stance makes it look like Clinton is a GMO labeling supporter but in reality, the law has no enforcement provisions and no penalties for companies that don't add GMOs to food packaging.²⁸³

As one report noted regarding the legislation Clinton said she supported:²⁸⁴

- The USDA approach that Hillary supports does not require labeling of products that do have GMOs.
- It does not allow states to adopt their own policies to let their citizens make informed choices, as Vermont, Connecticut, and Maine have already voted to do.
- It would make labeled non-GMO products cost more because participating companies pay to have products tested.

- It gives an advantage to companies that produce large quantities of a product because they will be able to distribute the cost for the labeling over more sales.

It is highly unlikely that Clinton would ever support real legislation that actually *required* GMO labeling, enforceable via the federal bureaucracy, with well-established monetary penalties, especially since her benefactor, Monsanto, opposes such a law.

Geopolitical

The Iraq War

In 2008, and again during this presidential campaign, Clinton has been questioned about her vote as senator in 2002 to give then-President Bush authority to use military force in Iraq, to oust then-Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein over his refusal to abide by a United Nations resolution to allow weapons inspectors free access to Iraq's military and weapons programs. Clinton has since said that voting for the authorization of force in Iraq was a "mistake,"²⁸⁵ but it nevertheless was seen as one reason why she lost her party's nomination to Barack Obama, who opposed the war and the authorization as an Illinois state senator and U.S. senator respectively, in 2008.²⁸⁶

"This time around, Clinton supporters have been hoping that enough Democratic voters — the overwhelming majority of whom opposed the war — will forget about her strong endorsement of the Bush administration's most disastrous foreign policy," writes Stephen Zune of Foreign Policy in Focus. "Failing that, they've come up with a number of excuses to justify her October 2002 vote for the authorization of military force."²⁸⁷

Clinton's defenders say that she merely voted for the authorization because it wasn't for war but to force Hussein to accept UN weapons inspectors back into his country. At the time of the vote, in October 2002,

Hussein had already agreed in principle to allow inspectors back. Also, if Clinton really only wanted to push Hussein back into compliance with the inspection process, she would not have voted against an amendment offered by Sen. Carl Levin which also would have given Bush authority to use force in Iraq but only if Hussein's government defied subsequent UN inspection demands. She instead voted for a resolution giving Bush the authority to attack at a time of his choosing.²⁸⁸ (She has since said that Bush *abused* that authority and she would not have voted the way she did had she known.²⁸⁹)

Zunes noted further:²⁹⁰

Despite the UN weapons inspectors having not found any evidence of WMDs or active WMD programs after months of searching, Clinton made clear that the United States should invade Iraq anyway. Indeed, she asserted that even though Saddam was in full compliance with the UN Security Council, he nevertheless needed to resign as president, leave the country, and allow U.S. troops to occupy the country. "The president gave Saddam Hussein one last chance to avoid war," Clinton said in a statement[*], "and the world hopes that Saddam Hussein will finally hear this ultimatum, understand the severity of those words, and act accordingly."

[*Her statement.²⁹¹]

Clinton also backed a Senate resolution providing "unequivocal support" for Bush's "firm leadership and decisive action" as "part of the ongoing Global War on Terrorism."²⁹²

Other excuses include:²⁹³

- "Most other congressional Democrats also voted for the authorization." In fact, a sizeable majority of congressional Democrats *opposed* the Iraq war authorization, even though all but one supported the war against Al Qaeda following the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist

attacks in New York City and the Pentagon. “There were 21 Senate Democrats — along with one Republican, Lincoln Chafee, and one independent, Jim Jeffords — who voted against the war resolution, while 126 of 209 House Democrats also voted against it.”²⁹⁴ At the time the Democrats controlled the Senate; had they closed ranks and voted against the authorization, the administration could have launched military operations in Iraq, at least legally.

- “The vote was a mistake.” That is hardly the case because generally speaking Clinton has a hawkish view of the world. Also, by the time of the vote there had already been months of public debate, in Congress and around the country, about the issue. Hussein’s treatment of UN weapons inspectors was also very well known, and it was assumed by most in Congress and in capitals around the Western world that Iraq was manufacturing, and hiding, weapons of mass destruction, which is why most believed he continually hampered UN weapons inspectors’ efforts and even barred them from Iraq. “Clinton had met with scores of constituents, arms control analysts, and Middle East scholars who informed her that the war was unnecessary, illegal, and would likely end in disaster. But she decided to support going to war anyway. She even rejected the advice of fellow Democratic senator Bob Graham that she read the full National Intelligence Estimate, which would have further challenged some of the Bush administration’s claims justifying the war.”

(In reality, the NIE that Zunes references *did* state:²⁹⁵

“We judge that Iraq has continued its weapons of mass destruction (WMD) programs in defiance of UN resolutions and restrictions. Baghdad has chemical and biological weapons as well as missiles with ranges in excess of UN restrictions; if left unchecked, it probably will have a nuclear weapon during this decade.

“We judge that we are seeing only a portion of Iraq’s WMD efforts, owing to Baghdad’s vigorous denial and deception efforts.

Revelations after the Gulf war starkly demonstrate the extensive efforts undertaken by Iraq to deny information.”)

- “Clinton believed voting for the war was politically necessary.” If this is true, then this certainly disqualifies her to be president, in the eyes of many foreign policy experts. “To have believed that supporting the invasion would somehow be seen as a good thing would have meant that Clinton believed that the broad consensus of Middle East scholars who warned of a costly counterinsurgency war were wrong — and that the Bush administration’s insistence that U.S. occupation forces would be ‘treated as liberators’ was credible.”²⁹⁶ Few Middle East experts believed any of the situations the Bush administration predicted on the ground following the invasion would occur.²⁹⁷

Russian “reset”

One of Clinton’s first acts as secretary of state was to launch a “reset” of relations between the U.S. and Russia, which she claimed suffered under the Bush administration. But by any measure of Clinton’s and the Obama administration’s efforts, no one can claim that the famed reset – which even got off on a bad note – was successful:²⁹⁸

- In 2009, Clinton met with Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov, her counterpart, in Geneva, Switzerland. She gave him a gift – a “reset button” – that was labeled with the Russian word for “overcharge,” not “reset.”
- Later that year, Obama met then-Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin at the latter’s residence outside Moscow in Novo-Ogarevo. Obama praised Putin’s “extraordinary work” as Russia’s president and then prime minister, but said the two countries did not agree on everything.

- Meetings in 2010 between Obama and then-Russian President Dimitry Medvedev, and 2011 between Vice President Joe Biden and Putin, went well insofar as that went. But by 2012, Obama – who met Putin in Los Cabos, Mexico, are at odds over Russia’s handling of domestic protests and controversial killings.
- In 2013, thanks to Russia’s allowance of former National Security Agency (NSA) contractor Edward Snowden – the man who spilled the beans on the Obama administration’s mass electronic surveillance programs – ratcheted up tensions between the U.S. and Russia. Also, the U.S. opposed Russia’s backing of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad, who had just begun to brutally put down rebels in his country, as well as forces belonging to the Islamic State.
- The fall of Viktor Yanukovich’s pro-Russia government in Ukraine in 2014, and subsequent invasion and takeover of the Crimea and parts of eastern Ukraine by Russian forces, further strained relations. Later in the year, the new secretary of state, former U.S. Sen. John Kerry, met with Lavrov in hopes of finding common ground on Syria. After the meeting, Lavrov told reporters that they had “no common views.”

Clinton left the State Department in 2013, well after relations between both countries began to worsen. The “reset” had failed.

Libya

Clinton and Obama were supporters of the “Arab Spring,” quasi-independence movements that were occurring nearly simultaneously in a number of countries in the Middle East. They included Syria, which lapsed into civil war and violence; Libya, which suffered a similar fate; and Egypt, which was on the brink of violence but has since stabilized.

In October 2012, Reuters reported that Clinton supported the Arab Spring, despite the fact that they were already turning violent:²⁹⁹

“We recognize that these transitions are not America’s to manage, and certainly not ours to win or lose,” Clinton said in a speech to the Center for Strategic and International Studies, a Washington think tank. “But we have to stand with those who are working every day to strengthen democratic institutions, defend universal rights, and drive inclusive economic growth. That will produce more capable partners and more durable security over the long term.”

That is noteworthy for a many reasons. First, those comments came just weeks after a U.S. consulate in Benghazi, Libya, was overrun by militant extremists, who attacked on Sept. 11 – the 11th anniversary of the 9/11 attacks. Also, four Americans were killed by the attackers, including U.S. Ambassador Christopher Stevens, who became the first American diplomat to die in decades. Clinton blamed the attacks on an anti-Muslim Internet video, despite the fact that she knew³⁰⁰ – and other diplomatic officials knew³⁰¹ – that the consulate attack was a preplanned act of terrorism.³⁰²

But what is also informative about the Libyan engagement is that Clinton was fully supportive of using U.S. military power there, despite the poor outcome. As reported by *The Atlantic*:³⁰³

She characterized the Obama Administration’s response as “smart power at its best,” saying that while America refused to take the lead in the war, “we will provide essential, unique capabilities that we have, but the Europeans and the Arabs had to be first over the line. We did not put one single American soldier on the ground.”

She then put a positive gloss on the war’s outcome. “I’ll say this for the Libyan people...” she said. “I think President Obama made the right decision at the time. And the Libyan people had a free election the first time since 1951. And you know what, they voted for moderates, they voted with the hope of democracy. Because of the Arab Spring, because of a lot of other things, there was turmoil to be followed.”

That is about as misleading as summarizing the Iraq War by saying that the Iraqis had a terrible leader; they had a free election after the war; and they voted for moderates. It elides massive suffering and security threats that have occurred in postwar Libya.

Clinton also appears to have enriched herself and her family during her tenure as secretary of state. While head of the State Department, the agency approved 215 speeches for her husband, for a total income of \$48 million. Some of those speeches were delivered in global trouble spots and were paid for by entities with business or policy interests before the U.S. government.³⁰⁴

In addition, according to documents from the State Department obtained through Freedom of Information Act requests in July 2014:³⁰⁵

The documents also show that in June 2011, the State Department approved a consulting agreement between Bill Clinton and a controversial Clinton Foundation adviser, Doug Band.

The consultancy with Band's Teneo Strategy ended eight months later following an uproar over Teneo's ties to the failed investment firm MF Global.

State Department legal advisers, serving as "designated agency ethics officials," approved Bill Clinton's speeches in China, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, the United Arab Emirates, Panama, Turkey, Taiwan, India, the Cayman Islands and other countries.

In addition, all memos approving Bill Clinton's speeches were copied to trusted and longtime advisor and chief of staff to Hillary, Cheryl Mills. Under long-standing State Department protocols, a "designated agency ethics official" is supposed to advise the secretary of state about "potential or actual conflicts of interest."

A December 2008 Memorandum of Understanding signed by Valerie Jarrett, representing the incoming Obama administration, and Bruce Lindsey, CEO of the William J. Clinton Foundation, states that those protocols were extended to the ex-president, his foundation and related entities. An accompanying letter from Clinton lawyer David Kendall to the State Department's legal adviser pledged that Bill Clinton would disclose proposed consulting deals and, for speeches, provide "the identities of the host(s) (the entity that pay the speaker's fee)" so that the State Department "in consultation with the White House as appropriate, may conduct a review for any real or apparent conflicts of interest with the duties of the Secretary of State."³⁰⁶

However, a joint investigation by a news site and legal organization of:³⁰⁷

[T]he Clinton Foundation, Hillary Clinton's personal financial disclosure forms, and the State Department conflict-of-interest reviews shows that at least \$48 million flowed to the Clintons' personal coffers from many entities that clearly had interests in influencing the Obama administration — and perhaps currying favor with a future president as well.

It is clear that during her tenure, Hillary Clinton insured that her husband, his foundation, and their household was well taken care of, despite the appearance of ethical violations.

IV. Conclusions

Since her earliest days in public life, Hillary Clinton has been at the center of scandal. She has had her ethics and behavior questioned on numerous occasions, and while never being held legally liable for anything she was accused of doing, many believe that that is because she has been able to take advantage of, and manipulate, the legal system and various institutions of government to her advantage.

A consummate political insider, Hillary Clinton has had a penchant for secrecy since her days as first lady, evidenced by meetings held out of the public eye by her healthcare task force, which were improper. This was further demonstrated by her use of a private email server, located in the basement of her home in New York State, while she served as President Obama's secretary of state. Though once again not recommended for criminal prosecution, FBI Director James Comey nonetheless laid out what critics of his decision said was a clear case of her criminal mishandling of classified information. Lawmakers who called on Comey to testify before a congressional committee after he announced his agency's decision not to recommend charges on July 5, 2016, were baffled by it. Comey even noted during his testimony that a number of claims Clinton made over the year-long investigation – that she only used one device, there was only one server, that she turned over all emails to investigators, and that she never sent or received classified data – were untrue.³⁰⁸ Clinton also made some of those same, false claims during sworn testimony before the House of Representatives, which is illegal to do, and now some lawmakers are pressing the FBI anew to launch an investigation into that.³⁰⁹

Clinton's pattern of abuse – of the legal and political systems, of voters and constituents – is apparent throughout her professional and political career. Regardless of what she has attempted in her professional and public lives – a Watergate prosecutor; a first lady tackling Executive Branch duties and big projects like healthcare reform; legislation and judgment as a U.S. senator; foreign policy objectives and judgment as a secretary of state – Clinton has always been secretive, evasive and beholden to special interests. The selling of access is especially egregious; she and husband Bill have made more than \$153 million *just in speaking fees* since 2001; her cut of that came between 2013 and 2015 and was north of \$21 million.³¹⁰ Her average "fee" during that span, which amounted to 92 speeches, was an astounding \$235,304.35.³¹¹ Rock stars, Hollywood celebrities and other notable figures don't make that kind of money for a *speech*. That's political *access* being bought and sold.

Holding office is *experience*, of course, but that experience can take different forms. Professional politicians can either accomplish much or they can accomplish little; for Clinton, the latter is true. She was unable to pass healthcare reform as first lady; she had no major pieces of legislation authored and passed as a U.S. senator; and her failings in the Middle East are matters of public record, not opinion. Indeed, throughout her adult life, the only success she has had is in creating controversy and scandal. But through it all she has ensured that she and her family are courted and well-financed. For her part, Clinton has always denied that money given by wealthy donors, either to her campaign, to the Clinton Foundation or as compensation for a speech, has never unduly influenced her.³¹² Quite clearly, as this paper demonstrates, that very likely is not true.

Hillary Rodham Clinton claims that she is the best-qualified candidate in the current election cycle to be president. While she may have served the U.S. government for many more years than her presidential rivals, it is clear that her service has been far less than honorable and, in many cases, entirely self-serving.

Taken in sum throughout her short professional and lengthy political career, it is obvious that Americans can do much better than putting Hillary Clinton back in the White House, this time as president.

#

References

- 1 WND.com. "Here they are: Hillary's 22 biggest scandals ever." *WorldNetDaily.com*. May 18, 2015. <http://www.wnd.com/2015/05/here-they-are-hillarys-22-biggest-scandals-ever/#!>
- 2 See <http://www.history.com/topics/watergate>.
- 3 Ibid.
- 4 Ibid.
- 5 Ibid.
- 6 Tanenhaus, Sam. "How Richard Nixon Created Hillary Clinton." *Bloomberg Politics*. Nov. 5, 2015. <http://www.bloomberg.com/politics/features/2015-11-05/how-richard-nixon-created-hillary-clinton>.
- 7 Ibid.
- 8 Mikkelson, David. "Zeif-geist: Hillary Clinton was not fired from the House Judiciary Committee's Watergate investigation by Chief Counsel Jerry Zeifman." *Snopes.com*. Accessed July 3, 2016 at <http://www.snopes.com/politics/clintons/zeifman.asp>.
- 9 Calabrese, Dan. "Hillary fired for lies, unethical behavior." *Western Journalism Center*. June 13, 2013. <http://www.westernjournalism.com/hillary-clinton-fired-for-lies-unethical-behavior/>.
- 10 Hillary Clinton Biography. See: <http://www.biography.com/people/hillary-clinton-9251306>.
- 11 Ibid.
- 12 Ibid.
- 13 Ibid.
- 14 "Whitewater Timeline." *Washington Post*. July 3, 2016. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/special/whitewater/timeline.htm>.
- 15 Ibid.
- 16 Ibid.
- 17 Ibid.
- 18 Ibid.
- 19 Cornwell, Rupert. "Bill and Hillary's double trouble: Clinton's 'two for the price of one' pledge is returning to haunt him, says Rupert Cornwell." *The Independent*. March 8, 1994. <http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/bill-and-hillarys-double-trouble-clintons-two-for-the-price-of-one-pledge-is-returning-to-haunt-him-1427937.html>.
- 20 Ibid.
- 21 "Whitewater Timeline." *Washington Post*. See previous entry.
- 22 Johnston, David. "Memo places Hillary Clinton at Core of Travel Office Case." *The New York Times*. Jan. 5, 1996. <http://www.nytimes.com/1996/01/05/us/memo-places-hillary-clinton-at-core-of-travel-office-case.html?pagewanted=all>.
- 23 Ibid.
- 24 Ibid.
- 25 Hernandez, Raymond & Robert Pear. "Once an enemy, health industry warms to Clinton." *The New York Times*. July 12, 2006. http://www.nytimes.com/2006/07/12/nyregion/12donate.html?_r=0.

The Hillary Files

- 26 See: <https://www.britannica.com/event/United-States-presidential-election-of-1992>.
- 27 Clymer, Adam & Robert Pear, Robin Toner. "THE HEALTH CARE DEBATE: What Went Wrong?" *The New York Times*. Aug. 29, 1994. <http://www.nytimes.com/1994/08/29/us/health-care-debate-what-went-wrong-health-care-campaign-collapsed-special-report.html?pagewanted=all>.
- 28 York, Byron. "History lesson: President Hillary Clinton would be secretive, too." *The Washington Examiner*. March 5, 2015. <http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/history-lesson-president-hillary-clinton-would-be-secretive-too/article/2561137>.
- 29 Dilly, A. George. "The Failure of the Clinton Administration's Health Care Reform: A Matter of Substance or Process?: 2003. National Defense University. Pg. 9. <http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a442073.pdf>.
- 30 Flaherty, Peter. "Health care task force showed Hillary's penchant for secrecy." *National Legal and Policy Center*. March 18, 2015. <http://nlpc.org/stories/2015/03/18/heath-care-task-force-showed-secrecy-nothing-new-hillary>.
- 31 Ibid.
- 32 Ibid.
- 33 Ibid.
- 34 Ibid.
- 35 Ibid.
- 36 Ibid.
- 37 Ibid.
- 38 Ibid.
- 39 "Here they are: Hillary's 22 biggest scandals ever." *WorldNetDaily.com*. May 18, 2015. <http://www.wnd.com/2015/05/here-they-are-hillarys-22-biggest-scandals-ever/#!>.
- 40 Ibid.
- 41 Ibid.
- 42 "Over 60 major Judicial Watch victories." *Judicial Watch* web site. Accessed July 3, 2016 at <http://www.judicialwatch.org/archive/2001/966.shtml>.
- 43 Klayman, Larry. "Proof Hillary isn't fit to be president." *WorldNetDaily.com*. Jan. 25, 2016. <http://www.wnd.com/2013/01/proof-hillary-isnt-fit-to-be-president/>.
- 44 "Marc Rich dies at 78; his pardon by Clinton stirred controversy." *The Associated Press*. June 27, 2016. <http://www.latimes.com/local/obituaries/la-me-marc-rich-20130627-story.html>.
- 45 Ibid.
- 46 Ibid.
- 47 Gold, Matea & Tom Hamberger, Anu Narayanswamy. "Two Clintons. 41 Years. \$3 billion." *The Washington Post*. Nov. 19, 2016. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/politics/clinton-money/>.
- 48 Open Secrets. See: <http://www.opensecrets.org/politicians/summary.php?cid=N00000019&cycle=2002#cont>.
- 49 Ibid.
- 50 Open Secrets. See: <http://www.opensecrets.org/politicians/contrib.php?cycle=2002&cid=N00000019&type=I>.
- 51 Open Secrets. See: <http://www.opensecrets.org/politicians/contrib>.

The Hillary Files

[php?cycle=2006&type=1&cid=N00000019&newMem=N&recs=20.](#)

- 52 McIntire, Mike & Raymond Hernandez. “Company Finds Clinton Useful, and Vice Versa.” *The New York Times*. April 12, 2006. <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/04/12/nyregion/company-finds-clinton-useful-and-vice-versa.html>.
- 53 Ibid.
- 54 Ibid.
- 55 Ibid.
- 56 Hernandez, Raymond & Robert Pear. “Once an Enemy, Health Industry Warms to Clinton.” *The New York Times*. July 12, 2006. <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/07/12/nyregion/12donate.html>.
- 57 Ibid.
- 58 Ibid.
- 59 Ibid.
- 60 Riddell, Kelly. “Favors to foundation donors stretch back to Hillary Clinton’s Senate days.” *The Washington Times*. June 10, 2015. <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2015/jun/10/hillary-clintons-favors-to-foundation-donors-stret/>.
- 61 Ibid.
- 62 Ibid.
- 63 Ibid.
- 64 Ibid.
- 65 Ibid.
- 66 Ibid.
- 67 Ibid.
- 68 Ibid.
- 69 Staff. “Flashback: Elizabeth Warren Tells a Story About Hillary Clinton, Wall Street and Lobbying.” *BillMoyers.com*. Updated Feb. 7, 2016. <http://billmoyers.com/2015/11/18/flashback-elizabeth-warren-tells-a-story-about-hillary-clinton-wall-street-and-lobbying/>.
- 70 Ibid.
- 71 See: http://www.ontheissues.org/Hillary_Clinton.htm#Free_Trade.
- 72 Ibid.
- 73 Wallison, Peter J. “The true origins of this financial crisis.” *American Spectator*. Feb. 6, 2009. http://spectator.org/42211_true-origins-financial-crisis/.
- 74 Gerth, Jeff. “Hillary Clinton Told Wall Street to ‘Cut it Out’ – Not so Much, the Record Shows.” *Politico Magazine*. Nov. 15, 2015. <http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2015/11/hillary-clinton-told-wall-street-to-cut-it-out-not-so-much-the-record-shows-213363>.
- 75 Ibid.
- 76 Ibid.
- 77 Ibid.
- 78 Helderman, Rosalind S. & Tom Hamburger. “Foreign governments gave millions to foundation while Clinton was at State Dept.” *The Washington Post*. Feb. 25, 2015. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/foreign-governments-gave-millions-to-foundation-while-clinton-was-at-state->

The Hillary Files

dept/2015/02/25/31937c1e-bc3f-11e4-8668-4e7ba8439ca6_story.html.

79 Ibid.

80 Ibid.

81 Ibid.

82 Editorial. "Hillary Email Gaps Hide 'Pay for Play' Benghazi Truth." *Investors Business Daily*. March 10, 2015. http://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/months-an-months-gaps-hillary-emails/?ven=rss&utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A%20EditorialRss%20%28Editorial%20RSS%29.

83 Sirota, David. "The cash donations Hillary simply has no answer for." *Salon.com*. May 31, 2015. http://www.salon.com/2015/05/31/the_cash_donations_hillary_simply_has_no_answer_for_partner/.

84 Ibid.

85 Ibid.

86 Ibid.

87 Ibid.

88 Ibid.

89 Sirota, David & Andrew Perez. "Clinton Foundation Donors Got Weapons Deals From Hillary Clinton's State Department." *International Business Times*. May 26, 2015. <http://www.ibtimes.com/clinton-foundation-donors-got-weapons-deals-hillary-clintons-state-department-1934187>.

90 State Department. April 8, 2011. See: <http://www.state.gov/j/drl/rls/hrrpt/2010/nea/154472.htm>.

91 Sirota, David & Andrew Perez. "Clinton Foundation Donors Got Weapons Deals From Hillary Clinton's State Department." *International Business Times*. See earlier entry.

92 Ibid.

93 Ibid.

94 Pollock, Richard. "EXCLUSIVE: Persian Gulf Sheikhs Gave Bill & Hillary \$100 Million." *The Daily Caller News Foundation*. May 11, 2016. <http://dailycaller.com/2016/05/11/exclusive-persian-gulf-sheikhs-gave-bill-hillary-100-million/>.

95 Ibid.

96 Ibid.

97 Swift, Art. "Opposition to fracking mounts." *Gallup.com*. March 30, 2016. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/190355/opposition-fracking-mounts.aspx>.

98 Leahy, Michael Patrick. "Clinton Foundation hiding names of secret foreign donors to its shell charity in Sweden." *Breitbart.com*. June 5, 2016. <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/06/05/clinton-foundation-hiding-names-of-secret-foreign-donors-to-its-shell-charity-in-sweden/>.

99 Solomon, John & Kelly Riddell. "Bill Clinton's foundation cashed in as Sweden lobbied Hillary on sanctions." *The Washington Times*. June 2, 2015. <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2015/jun/2/clinton-foundations-sweden-fundraising-arm-cashed-/>.

100 Ibid.

101 Leahy, Michael Patrick. "Clinton Foundation hiding names of secret foreign donors to its shell charity in Sweden." *Breitbart.com*. See earlier entry.

102 Allen, Jonathan. "Hillary Clinton personally took money from companies that sought to influence her." *Vox*. May 16, 2015. <http://www.vox.com/2015/5/16/8614881/Hillary-Clinton-took-money>.

The Hillary Files

- 103 Allen, Jonathan. "181 Clinton Foundation donors who lobbied Hillary's State Department." *Vox*. April 28, 2015. <http://www.vox.com/2015/4/28/8501643/Clinton-foundation-donors-State>.
- 104 Becker, Jo & Mike McIntire. "Cash Flowed to Clinton Foundation Amid Russian Uranium Deal." *The New York Times*. April 23, 2015.
- 105 Ibid.
- 106 Ibid.
- 107 Ibid.
- 108 Ibid.
- 109 Ibid.
- 110 "Clinton Cash." See: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=td2ppyCau30>.
- 111 "Mortality, crime and access to basic needs before and after the Haiti earthquake." *Medicine, Conflict and Survival* Vol. 26, Issue 4, 2010. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13623699.2010.535279>.
- 112 Landler, Mark. "In show of support, Clinton goes to Haiti." *The New York Times*. Jan. 16, 2010. http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/17/world/americas/17diplo.html?_r=0.
- 113 Ibid.
- 114 "Clinton Cash." See: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=td2ppyCau30>.
- 115 "Former US President Clinton appointed UN special envoy for Haiti." *UN News Centre*. May 19, 2009. <http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=30843#.V5d6kFdlkck>.
- 116 "Clinton Cash." See: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=td2ppyCau30>.
- 117 Ibid.
- 118 Ibid.
- 119 Katz, Jonathan M. "The King and Queen of Haiti." *Politico*. May 4, 2015. http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2015/05/clinton-foundation-haiti-117368_Page4.html#.V5eF51dlkck.
- 120 "Clinton Cash." See: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=td2ppyCau30>.
- 121 Ibid.
- 122 Ibid.
- 123 Corsi, Jerome. "Clinton Foundation 'fraud began with exploiting earthquake.'" *WorldNetDaily*. Oct. 28, 2015. <http://www.wnd.com/2015/10/clinton-foundation-fraud-began-with-exploiting-earthquake/>.
- 124 Katz, Jonathan M. "The Clintons' Haiti screw-up, as told by Hillary's emails." *Politico*. Sept. 2, 2015. <http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2015/09/hillary-clinton-email-213110>.
- 125 Ibid.
- 126 "Clinton Cash." See: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=td2ppyCau30>.
- 127 Ibid.
- 128 See: <http://www.jarchcapital.com/aboutjarch.html>.
- 129 Sexton, John. "Joe Wilson blames President Bush for Hillary's vote on Iraq war." *Breitbart.com*. Feb. 16, 2016. <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2016/02/16/joe-wilson-blames-president-bush-for-hillarys-vote-on-the-iraq-war/>.
- 130 Ibid.
- 131 "Clinton Cash." See: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=td2ppyCau30>.

The Hillary Files

- 132 Ibid.
- 133 Ibid.
- 134 Ibid.
- 135 “Climate Change.” Hillary Clinton for President campaign website. <https://www.hillaryclinton.com/issues/climate/>.
- 136 “Clinton Cash.” See: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=td2ppyCau30>.
- 137 Ibid.
- 138 Green, Joshua. “The Billionaire Whose Clinton Foundation Ties Could Be Trouble for Hillary Clinton.” *Bloomberg Politics*. May 7, 2015. <http://www.bloomberg.com/politics/articles/2015-05-07/the-billionaire-whose-clinton-foundation-ties-could-be-trouble-for-hillary-clinton>.
- 139 “Clinton Cash.” See: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=td2ppyCau30>.
- 140 Earle, Geoff & Calr Campanile. “Clinton Cash’ questions India politician’s \$5 million donation.” *New York Post*. April 28, 2015. <http://nypost.com/2015/04/28/clinton-cash-questions-india-politicians-5m-donation/>.
- 141 Sirota, David. “The cash donations Hillary simply has no answer for.” *Salon.com*. See previous entry.
- 142 Ibid.
- 143 Ibid.
- 144 Harris, Shane & Jackie Kucinich. “Revealed: The State Department’s Hidden Hillary Donors.” *The Daily Beast*. May 26, 2016.
- 145 Ibid.
- 146 Ibid.
- 147 Ibid.
- 148 Davis, Sean. “In 2013, The Clinton Foundation Only Spent 10 Percent Of Its Budget On Charitable Grants.” *The Federalist*. April 27, 2015. <http://thefederalist.com/2015/04/27/in-2013-the-clinton-foundation-only-spent-10-percent-of-its-budget-on-charitable-grants/>.
- 149 Calvert, Rachel. “Fox Correspondent Debunks Colleagues on Clinton Foundation Charitable Spending.” *Media Matters*. May 7, 2015. <http://mediamatters.org/blog/2015/05/07/fox-correspondent-debunks-colleagues-on-clinton/203567>.
- 150 Davis, Sean. “In 2013, The Clinton Foundation Only Spent 10 Percent Of Its Budget On Charitable Grants.” *The Federalist*. <http://thefederalist.com/2015/04/27/in-2013-the-clinton-foundation-only-spent-10-percent-of-its-budget-on-charitable-grants/>.
- 151 Schmidt, Michael. “Hillary Clinton Used Personal Email Account at State Dept., Possibly Breaking Rules.” *The New York Times*. March 2, 2016. http://www.nytimes.com/2015/03/03/us/politics/hillary-clintons-use-of-private-email-at-state-department-raises-flags.html?_r=0.
- 152 Hensch, Mark. “New emails highlight interaction between State, Clinton Foundation.” *The Hill*. March 22, 2016. <http://thehill.com/blogs/ballot-box/presidential-races/273930-documents-show-coordination-between-state-clinton>.
- 153 See: <http://www.judicialwatch.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/JW-v.-State-Clinton-conflicts-00772-pg-4-6.pdf>.
- 154 Hensch, Mark. “New emails highlight interaction between State, Clinton Foundation.” *The Hill*. See previous entry.
- 155 Ibid.

The Hillary Files

- 156 Ibid.
- 157 Hamburger, Tom & Rosalind S. Helderman. "Clinton Foundation received subpoena from State Department investigators." *The Washington Post*. https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/clinton-foundation-received-subpoena-from-state-department-investigators/2016/02/11/ca5125b2-cce4-11e5-88ff-e2d1b4289c2f_story.html.
- 158 Herridge, Catherine & Pamela K. Browne. "FBI's Clinton probe expands to public corruption track." *Fox News*. Jan. 11, 2016. <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2016/01/11/fbis-clinton-probe-expands-to-public-corruption-track.html?intcmp=hpbt3>.
- 159 Ibid.
- 160 Hattem, Julian. "FBI won't rule out probe into Clinton Foundation." *The Hill*. July 7, 2016. <http://thehill.com/policy/national-security/286900-fbi-wont-rule-out-probe-into-clinton-foundation>.
- 161 Sainato, Michael. "Clinton Foundation Corruption Should Be Next for the FBI." *New York Observer*. July 13, 2016. <http://observer.com/2016/07/up-next-for-the-fbi-clinton-foundation-corruption/>.
- 162 Parnass, Sarah & Dana Hughes. "Hillary Clinton Steps Down From State Department, Ending Three Decades of Public Service." *ABC News*. Feb. 1, 2016. <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/OTUS/hillary-clinton-leaves-state-department-decades-public-service/story?id=18377363>.
- 163 Chozik, Amy. "Hillary Clinton Announces 2016 Presidential Bid." *The New York Times*. April 12, 2016. http://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/13/us/politics/hillary-clinton-2016-presidential-campaign.html?_r=0.
- 164 Daily Mail Editors. "Publishing executives 'on notice' after Hillary Clinton's \$14million memoir sells just 161,000 copies in first three weeks." *Daily Mail*. July 9, 2014. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2686300/Publishing-executives-notice-Hillary-Clintons-14M-memoir-sells-just-161k-copies.html>.
- 165 Helderman, Rosalind S. & Tom Hamburger. "Clinton Foundation reveals up to \$26 million in additional payments." *The Washington Post*. May 21, 2015. https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/clinton-foundation-reveals-up-to-26million-in-additional-payments/2015/05/21/e49da740-0009-11e5-833c-a2de05b6b2a4_story.html.
- 166 Fang, Lee & Steve Horn. "Hillary Clinton's Energy Initiative Pressed Countries to Embrace Fracking, New Emails Reveal." *The Intercept*. May 23, 2016. <https://theintercept.com/2016/05/23/hillary-clinton-fracking/>.
- 167 Ibid.
- 168 Ibid.
- 169 Ibid.
- 170 Blake, Mariah. "How Hillary Clinton's State Department Sold Fracking to the World." *Mother Jones*. September/October 2014. <http://www.motherjones.com/environment/2014/09/hillary-clinton-fracking-shale-state-department-chevron>.
- 171 Ibid.
- 172 State Department transcript. See: <http://www.state.gov/secretary/20092013clinton/rm/2012/02/183342.htm>.
- 173 Blake, Mariah. "How Hillary Clinton's State Department Sold Fracking to the World." *Mother Jones*. See previous entry.
- 174 Ibid.
- 175 Ibid.
- 176 Ibid.
- 177 Ibid.

The Hillary Files

- 178 State Department transcript. See: <http://www.state.gov/secretary/20092013clinton/rm/2012/02/183342.htm>.
- 179 Coleman, Jesse. "Hillary Clinton's connections to the oil and gas industry." *Greenpeace.org*. April 21, 2016. <http://www.greenpeace.org/usa/campaign-updates/hillary-clintons-connection-oil-gas-industry/>.
- 180 Ibid.
- 181 Ibid.
- 182 Ibid.
- 183 State Department transcript. See: <http://translations.state.gov/st/english/texttrans/2012/10/20121018137692.html#axzz4EQTQJv3>.
- 184 Miller, S.A. "Hillary's agribusiness ties give rise to nickname in Iowa: 'Bride of Frankenfood.'" *Washington Times*. May 17, 2016. <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2015/may/17/hillary-clinton-gmo-support-monsanto-ties-spark-ba/>.
- 185 Batts, Vicki. "Most fresh produce are contaminated with toxic sludge." *Natural.news*. Nov. 23, 2015. <http://www.natural.news/2015-11-23-most-fresh-produce-are-contaminated-with-toxic-sludge.html/>.
- 186 Miller, S.A. "Hillary's agribusiness ties give rise to nickname in Iowa: 'Bride of Frankenfood.'" *Washington Times*. May 17, 2016. <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2015/may/17/hillary-clinton-gmo-support-monsanto-ties-spark-ba/>.
- 187 Batts, Vicki. "Most fresh produce are contaminated with toxic sludge." *Natural.news*. Nov. 23, 2015. <http://www.natural.news/2015-11-23-most-fresh-produce-are-contaminated-with-toxic-sludge.html/>.
- 188 See: http://www.truthwiki.org/jon_entine/.
- 189 See: http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=American_Council_on_Science_and_Health.
- 190 Ibid.
- 191 Ruskin, Gary. "Jon Entine: The Chemical Industry's Master Messenger." *USRTK.org*. Feb. 16, 2016. <http://usrtk.org/hall-of-shame/jon-entine-the-chemical-industrys-master-messenger/>.
- 192 Huff, Ethan A. "WHO admits Monsanto's glyphosate 'probably' causes cancer; chemical found in 75% of air and rain samples." *NaturalNews.com*. March 25, 2015. http://www.naturalnews.com/049120_glyphosate_exposure_WHO_admission_cancer.html.
- 193 Ibid.
- 194 Ibid.
- 195 Henry, Thomas. "Agriculture experts sounding the alarm over massive spread of superweeds due to GMOs, glyphosate." *NaturalNews.com*. Sept. 24, 2013. http://www.naturalnews.com/042192_herbicide-resistant_superweeds_GMOs_glyphosate.html.
- 196 Ibid.
- 197 Ji, Sayer. "New Study Finds GM Corn and Roundup Causes Cancer In Rats." *GreenMedInfo.com*. Sept. 19, 2012. <http://www.greenmedinfo.com/blog/alert-gmo-corn-and-roundup-caused-cancer-and-killed-rats/>.
- 198 Ibid.
- 199 Ibid.
- 200 See: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0278691512005637>.
- 201 Adams, Mike. "Bride of Frankenfood: Hillary Clinton pushes GMO agenda... hires Monsanto lobbyist... takes huge dollars from Monsanto." *NaturalNews.com*. May 18, 2015. http://www.naturalnews.com/049755_Bride_of_Frankenfood_Hillary_Clinton_Monsanto.html.

The Hillary Files

- 202 Miller, S.A. "Hillary's agribusiness ties give rise to nickname in Iowa: 'Bride of Frankenfood.'" *The Washington Times*. <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2015/may/17/hillary-clinton-gmo-support-monsanto-ties-spark-ba/>.
- 203 See: <http://www.truthwiki.org/hillary-clinton/>.
- 204 Ibid.
- 205 Adams, Mike. "Bride of Frankenfood: Hillary Clinton pushes GMO agenda... hires Monsanto lobbyist... takes huge dollars from Monsanto." See previous entry.
- 206 Ibid.
- 207 See: <http://www.truthwiki.org/hillary-clinton/>.
- 208 Grens, Kerry. "Snyder, sludge fighter." *The Scientist*. Nov. 1, 2006. <http://www.the-scientist.com/?articles.view/articleNo/24423/title/Snyder--sludge-fighter/>.
- 209 Dykes, Aaron & Melissa Melton. "Eat Sh*t: Human biosludge sold as 'organic' compost." *Truthstream Media*. Oct. 29, 2013. <http://truthstream-blog.tumblr.com/post/65445801149/eat-sht-human-biosludge-sold-as-organic>.
- 210 Hillary Clinton campaign website. "Issues: Climate change." See: <https://www.hillaryclinton.com/issues/climate/>.
- 211 Ibid.
- 212 Ibid.
- 213 Ibid.
- 214 Adams, Mike. "Global warming HOAX unravels... globalist science fraud engineered to control humanity, not save it." *NaturalNews.com*. Dec. 2, 2015. http://www.naturalnews.com/052179_global_warming_science_fraud_globalist_control_agenda.html.
- 215 Ibid.
- 216 Easterbrook, Don J. "Global cooling is here." *Global Research Center*. Sept. 25, 2015. <http://www.globalresearch.ca/global-cooling-is-here/10783>.
- 217 Adams, Mike. "Global warming HOAX unravels... globalist science fraud engineered to control humanity, not save it." *NaturalNews.com*. See earlier entry.
- 218 Ibid.
- 219 Ibid.
- 220 Ibid.
- 221 Delingpole, James. "German professor: NASA has fiddled climate data on 'unbelievable' scale." *Breitbart.com*. Nov. 24, 2015. <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/11/24/german-professor-nasa-fiddled-climate-data-unbelievable-scale/>.
- 222 Harper, Jennifer. "An inconvenient truth: 'Climate change industry' now a \$1.5 trillion business." *Washington Times*. Aug. 11, 2015. <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2015/aug/11/climate-change-industry-now-15-trillion-global-bus/>.
- 223 Ibid.
- 224 Ibid.
- 225 Bell, Larry. "The Alarming Cost of Climate Change Hysteria." *Forbes.com*. Aug. 23, 2011. <http://www.forbes.com/sites/larrybell/2011/08/23/the-alarming-cost-of-climate-change-hysteria/#14e72b786f70>.
- 226 Ibid.

The Hillary Files

- 227 Heyes, J.D. “Hillary Clinton’s choices for campaign’s strategists spotlights her ties to Big Pharma.” *Collapse.news*. March 14, 2016. <http://www.bugout.news/2016-03-14-judging-by-her-campaigns-strategists-a-vote-for-hillary-clinton-is-a-vote-for-big-pharma.html>.
- 228 Hillary for President campaign website. “Issues: Health care.” See: <https://www.hillaryclinton.com/issues/health-care/>.
- 229 Ibid.
- 230 Merica, Dan. “Clinton takes on ‘profiteering’ drug companies.” *CNN*. Sept. 22, 2015. <http://www.cnn.com/2015/09/22/politics/hillary-clinton-drug-companies-obamacare/>.
- 231 Sullivan, Peter. “Clinton rails against ‘predatory’ drug pricing in new campaign ad.” *The Hill*. March 1, 2016. <http://thehill.com/policy/healthcare/271281-clinton-attacks-drug-price-hike-in-new-ad>.
- 232 Wiczner, Jen. “This Is Why Hillary Clinton’s Attack on Drug Price Hikes Doesn’t Add Up.” *Fortune*. March 4, 2016. <http://fortune.com/2016/03/04/hillary-clinton-drug-prices-valet/>.
- 233 Ibid.
- 234 Center for Responsive Government. See: <http://www.opensecrets.org/pres16/indus.php?id=N00000019>.
- 235 Gulfo, Joseph. “Medicare negotiating with pharma is not the answer.” *The Hill*. Dec. 4, 2015. <http://thehill.com/blogs/pundits-blog/healthcare/262077-medicare-negotiating-with-pharma-is-not-the-answer>.
- 236 Kodjak, Alison. “Hillary Clinton hitches her health care wagon to Obamacare.” *NPR*. Feb. 23, 2016. <http://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2016/02/23/467736627/hillary-clinton-hitches-her-health-care-wagon-to-obamacare>.
- 237 Hillary for President campaign website. “Issues: Health care.” See *previous entry*.
- 238 Kodjak, Alison. “Hillary Clinton hitches her health care wagon to Obamacare.” *NPR*. See *previous entry*.
- 239 Ibid.
- 240 Ibid.
- 241 Ibid.
- 242 Cox, Cynthia et al. “Analysis of 2017 Premium Changes and Insurer Participation in the Affordable Care Act’s Health Insurance Marketplaces.” *Kaiser Family Foundation*. June 15, 2016. <http://kff.org/health-reform/issue-brief/analysis-of-2017-premium-changes-and-insurer-participation-in-the-affordable-care-acts-health-insurance-marketplaces/>.
- 243 Ibid.
- 244 Meyer, Ali. “Most Obamacare Co-Ops Have Now Failed.” *Washington Free Beacon*. July 12, 2016. <http://freebeacon.com/issues/most-obamacare-coops-have-now-failed/>.
- 245 Morrissey, Edward. “It’s Time to Blame Obamacare for Losing So Many Full-Time Jobs.” *The Fiscal Times*. June 9, 2016. <http://www.thefiscaltimes.com/Columns/2016/06/09/It-s-Time-Blame-Obamacare-Losing-So-Many-Full-Time-Jobs>.
- 246 Ibid.
- 247 Ibid.
- 248 Lawler, Joseph. “Involuntary part-time employment soars in May.” *Washington Examiner*. June 3, 2016. <http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/involuntary-part-time-employment-soars-in-may/article/2592914>.
- 249 Morrissey, Edward. “It’s Time to Blame Obamacare for Losing So Many Full-Time Jobs.” *The Fiscal Times*. See *previous entry*.
- 250 Hillary for President campaign website. “Issues: Health care.” See *previous entry*.

The Hillary Files

- 251 Cohen, Rebecca. “Hillary Clinton says all kids should get vaccinated – but she wasn’t always so certain.” *Mother Jones*. Feb. 3, 2015. <http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2015/02/hillary-clinton-vaccine-tweet>.
- 252 Ibid.
- 253 Cohen, Rebecca. “Hillary Clinton Says All Kids Should Get Vaccinated—But She Wasn’t Always So Certain.” *Mother Jones*. Feb. 3, 2015. <http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2015/02/hillary-clinton-vaccine-tweet>.
- 254 Adams, Mike. “Governor Jerry Brown mandates a mass medical vaccine experiment on blacks by signing SB 277 into law... total violation of medical ethics... brings back Tuskegee era medical crimes.” *NaturalNews.com*. June 30, 2015. http://www.naturalnews.com/050252_SB_277_Jerry_Brown_medical_experiments.html.
- 255 Wilson, Julie. “Should healthcare companies be forced by govt. to provide transition-related care for transgenders?” *NaturalNews.com*. June 14, 2016. http://www.naturalnews.com/054345_Obamacare_transgenders_healthcare_costs.html.
- 256 Ibid.
- 257 Hillary for President website. See: <https://www.hillaryclinton.com/issues/lgbt-equality/>.
- 258 Hillary for President website. Healthcare issues. See previous entry.
- 259 Goodrich, Amy. “Hillary Clinton backs industries responsible for miscarriages and infertility while claiming to support ‘reproductive rights.’” *NaturalNews.com*. http://www.naturalnews.com/054573_Hillary_Clinton_Monsanto_womens_health.html.
- 260 Ibid.
- 261 Ibid.
- 262 Sainato, Michael. “Why Bernie Sanders Cares More About Women’s Issues Than Hillary Clinton.” *New York Observer*. Nov. 6, 2015. <http://observer.com/2015/11/why-bernie-sanders-cares-more-about-womens-issues-than-hillary-clinton/>.
- 263 Hillary for President campaign website. “Immigration Reform.” See: <https://www.hillaryclinton.com/issues/immigration-reform/>.
- 264 Ibid.
- 265 Ibid.
- 266 “A ruling against the Obama Administration on Immigration.” *The Atlantic*. Nov. 10, 2015. <http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2015/11/fifth-circuit-obama-immigration/415077/>.
- 267 de Vogue, Ariane & Tal Kopan. “Deadlocked Supreme Court deals big blow to Obama immigration plan.” *CNN*. June 23, 2016. <http://www.cnn.com/2016/06/23/politics/immigration-supreme-court/>.
- 268 “Examples of Serious Crimes by Illegal Aliens.” *Federation for American Immigration Reform*. Updated July 2016. <http://www.fairus.org/issue/examples-of-serious-crimes-of-illegal-aliens>.
- 269 Zimmerman, Cindy. “Hillary Clinton talks Ag Biotechnology.” *AgWired.com*. June 27, 2014. <http://agwired.com/2014/06/27/hillary-clinton-talks-ag-biotechnology/>.
- 270 Murphy, Dave. “Tell Hillary to give back the \$335,000 she received from Monsanto’s top GMO lobby group.” *Food Democracy Now*. Feb. 1, 2016. <http://www.fooddemocracynow.org/blog/2016/feb/1>.
- 271 Ibid.
- 272 “U.S. State Department Promotion of Agricultural Biotechnology.” See: http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=U.S._State_Department_Promotion_of_Agricultural_Biotechnology.
- 273 Ibid.

The Hillary Files

- 274 Murphy, Dave. "Breaking: Copy of Hillary Clinton's Fundraiser with Monsanto's Law Firm "Rural Americans for Hillary" 2007." *Food Democracy Now*. Jan. 30. 2016. <http://www.fooddemocracynow.org/blog/2016/jan/30>.
- 275 Ibid.
- 276 Edwards, Joel. "GMOs are dangerous to our health, according to latest independent research." *NaturalNews.com*. July 19, 2015. http://www.naturalnews.com/050454_GMO_research_biotech_dangers_health_issues.html.
- 277 Adams, Mike. "Shock findings in new GMO study: Rats fed lifetime of GM corn grow horrifying tumors, 70% of females die early." *NaturalNews.com*. Sept. 19, 2012. http://www.naturalnews.com/037249_gmo_study_cancer_tumors_organ_damage.html.
- 278 Ibid.
- 279 Huff, Ethan. "Monsanto supported GMO labeling in Europe, but not in US." *NaturalNews.com*. Sept. 16, 2012. http://www.naturalnews.com/037222_GMO_labeling_Monsanto_Europe.html.
- 280 Ibid.
- 281 Adams, Mike. "Vermont says NO to GMO ignorance, oppression and slavery of consumers with new mandatory GMO labeling law." *NaturalNews.com*. April 25, 2014. http://www.naturalnews.com/044870_Vermont_GMO_labeling_consumer_slavery.html.
- 282 "Bernie Sanders and Hillary Clinton on GMOs and GMO labeling." *CookForGood.com*. Jan. 14, 2016. <http://cookforgood.com/blog/2016/1/14/bernie-sanders-and-hillary-clinton-on-gmos-and-gmo-labeling.html>.
- 283 Ibid.
- 284 Ibid.
- 285 Lerner, Adam B. "Hillary Clinton says her Iraq war vote was a 'mistake.'" *Politico*. May 19, 2015. <http://www.politico.com/story/2015/05/hillary-clinton-iraq-war-vote-mistake-iowa-118109>.
- 286 Zunes, Stephen. "Hillary Clinton's vote to invade Iraq." *Foreign Policy in Focus*. Jan. 26, 2016. <http://fpif.org/five-lamest-excuses-hillary-clintons-vote-invade-iraq/>.
- 287 Ibid.
- 288 Ibid.
- 289 Zunes, Stephen. "Hillary Clinton's vote to invade Iraq." *Foreign Policy in Focus*. See previous entry.
- 290 Ibid.
- 291 Sen. Hillary Clinton. March 17, 2003. https://votesmart.org/public-statement/5906/statement-of-senator-hillary-rodham-clinton-on-the-presidents-remarks-to-the-nation#.V4_loFdlkck.
- 292 See: <https://www.congress.gov/bill/108th-congress/house-concurrent-resolution/104/text>.
- 293 Zunes, Stephen. "Hillary Clinton's vote to invade Iraq." *Foreign Policy in Focus*. See previous entry.
- 294 Ibid.
- 295 Federal of American Scientists. See: <http://fas.org/irp/cia/product/iraq-wmd.html>.
- 296 Zunes, Stephen. "Hillary Clinton's vote to invade Iraq." *Foreign Policy in Focus*. See previous entry.
- 297 Ibid.
- 298 Taylor, Adam. "The failure of the U.S.-Russia reset in 9 photos." *Washington Post*. March 17, 2014. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2014/03/17/the-failure-of-the-u-s-russia-reset-in-9-photos/>.

The Hillary Files

- 299 Quinn, Andrew. "Clinton says U.S. must embrace Arab Spring despite dangers." *Reuters*. Oct. 12, 2012. <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-mideast-idUSBRE89B19Z20121012>.
- 300 Corsi, Jerome. "Judicial Watch obtains 'smoking gun' Benghazi documents." *WorldNetDaily.com*. Jan. 26 2015. <http://www.wnd.com/2015/01/judicial-watch-obtains-smoking-gun-benghazi-documents/>.
- 301 Howley, Patrick. "Hillary Clinton was warned not to blame Benghazi on YouTube video." *Breitbart.com*. Oct. 31, 2015. <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/10/31/hillary-clinton-warned-not-blame-benghazi-youtube-video/>.
- 302 Corsi, Jerome. "Judicial Watch obtains 'smoking gun' Benghazi documents." *WorldNetDaily.com*. See previous entry.
- 303 Friedersdorf, Conor. "Hillary defends her failed war in Libya." *The Atlantic*. Oct. 14, 2015. <http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2015/10/hillary-clinton-debate-libya/410437>.
- 304 Rosiak, Luke & Micah Morrison. "State Department approved 215 Bill Clinton speeches controversial consulting deal, worth \$48m; Hillary Clinton's COS copied on all decisions." *Washington Examiner*. July 30, 2014. <http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/state-department-approved-215-bill-clinton-speches-controversial-consulting-deal-worth-48m/article/2551428>.
- 305 Ibid.
- 306 Ibid.
- 307 Ibid.
- 308 "Comey testifies Clinton email claims 'not true' at heated Hill hearing." *Fox News*. July 7, 2016. <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2016/07/07/chaffetz-claims-double-standard-in-clinton-case-as-comey-testifies.html#>.
- 309 Lichtblau, Eric & Michael S. Schmidt. "G.O.P. seeks criminal inquiry of Hillary Clinton's testimony to Congress." *The New York Times*. July 11, 2016. <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/12/us/politics/gop-seeks-criminal-inquiry-of-hillary-clintons-testimony-to-congress.html>.
- 310 Yoon, Robert. "\$153 million in Bill and Hillary Clinton speaking fees, documented." *CNN*. Feb. 6, 2016. <http://edition.cnn.com/2016/02/05/politics/hillary-clinton-bill-clinton-paid-speeches/>.
- 311 Ibid.
- 312 Perez, Andrew & David Sirota. "Election 2016: Hillary Clinton Pledges To End Tax Move Her Donors Have Used." *International Business Times*. Feb. 4, 2016. <http://www.ibtimes.com/political-capital/election-2016-hillary-clinton-pledges-end-tax-move-her-donors-have-used-2293636>.