Why Hillary Continues to Lie

By Roger Aronoff

Why does Hillary Clinton continue lying and covering up her various activities, whether it is her pneumonia, or the fact that she regularly sent and received classified information on a private, unsecured server, or that she traded favors, influence and access as secretary of state for large payments to her husband or her family’s foundation? It is because if she told the truth, she would never be elected president, and would almost certainly end up behind bars.

When asked why she decided to keep secret the medical diagnosis she received a few days earlier, she told CNN’s Anderson Cooper that “I just didn’t think it was going to be that big a deal. It’s just the kind of thing that if it happens to you and you’re a busy, active person, you keep moving forward.” If Hillary hadn’t been caught by a bystander’s cell-phone camera nearly collapsing as she was being helped into her limousine, we probably still wouldn’t know about her pneumonia. Her lack of transparency on this matter has forced the liberal media to acknowledge Hillary’s health issues, which have fueled much speculation about other possible ailments she may be hiding.

With the release of the notes on the FBI investigation into Mrs. Clinton’s handling of classified material, and the Bureau’s interview with her, it becomes more and more apparent that she is trying to run out the campaign clock without admitting to her many lies. When Hillary first explained the use of her private server, she said it was a matter of convenience, so that she could use just one device. But the FBI summary reveals that there were actually 13 mobile devices she used, plus several iPads. At least one, maybe two, of the phones were destroyed by a hammer.

CNN reports that Mrs. Clinton told the FBI she could not recall, or did not remember, at least 39 times during her interview. Alex Griswold, writing for Mediaite, gives more details into 40 examples of Mrs. Clinton’s unbelievable memory hole, based on what she told the FBI.

Apparently, according to Griswold, the FBI interview indicates that Mrs. Clinton “could not recall any briefing or training by State related to the retention of federal records or handling of classified information.” She also claimed that she didn’t remember what the “(C)” represented on many documents she handled, even though it is regularly used by the State Department to denote information classified at the confidential level. “Clinton stated that she did not know what the ‘(C)’ meant at the beginning of the paragraphs and speculated it was referencing paragraphs marked in alphabetical order,” states the FBI notes.

Yet Mrs. Clinton’s signature can be found on a classified information non-disclosure agreement that she signed upon taking the position of secretary of state. The agreement states, “Classified information is marked or unmarked classified information, including oral communication. I understand and accept that by being granted access to classified information, special confidence and trust shall be placed in me by the United States Government.” In other words, it doesn’t matter if there were headers or other markings. It’s her job to recognize classified information, in whatever form. Former prosecutor Andy McCarthy pointed out that this signed document indicates that Mrs. Clinton did, in fact, receive training on the use of classified information. “The simple fact, so familiar in Mrs. Clinton’s case, is that she’s lying,” writes McCarthy.

“Clinton did not recall receiving any emails she thought continued on page 3
Editor’s Message

Dear Fellow Media Watchdogs:

The lead article in this report, “Why Hillary Clinton Continues to Lie,” argues that she lies because if she admitted the truth, that would be the end of her chance to become president. She would definitely be prosecuted. The media, and the Justice Department, enable her lies, whether about her handling, or mishandling, of classified information on an unsecured server, about if she turned over all of her work related emails, and if she sent or received classified materials on her server, knowingly or otherwise. The fact that she trafficked in classified material virtually every day for her four years as secretary of state should absolutely disqualify her from becoming president. But this year, this presidential campaign, has not been like any previous campaigns. So what may have been disqualifying in the past now is just a passing blip.

When we talk about how biased and corrupt the media are in their coverage of this election, we are generally talking about the news media. But in watching other recent TV shows, it’s incredible how widespread the effort is to defeat Trump, and help Hillary, while attempting to whitewash President Obama’s legacy. It is often said that Trump benefited during the Republican primaries to the tune of some $2 billion in free, or earned, media. But what this assertion fails to take into consideration is that probably 80 to 90 percent of that coverage was negative, and extremely hostile. Hillary is a much greater beneficiary of free media.

Trump is often labeled a racist, and worse. For example, the Emmy Awards were on ABC on September 18, and there were many award winners and presenters who viciously attacked Trump, and many who expressed their solidarity with Hillary. The late night talk shows are the same. Stephen Colbert is relentless in his attacks on Trump and his family, and again, the common theme is calling him a racist. HBO, which carries Bill Maher’s Real Time is perhaps the most outrageous show on the air. Maher regularly refers to Trump as a Nazi, most recently, an “orange Nazi,” and this is a show that is repeated dozens of times, and offered up “on demand.” HBO is owned by Time Warner, which also owns CNN. HBO will soon be adding a nightly newscast by Vice News starting a month before the election. Vice has had a series of short documentaries on HBO for four years, produced by Maher’s company.

John Oliver won the Emmy for his HBO show, which is basically another attack vehicle against the Trump campaign. Then you have shows like “Scandal” on ABC, and “Madam Secretary” on CBS. “Scandal” has an over-the-top crude hick who is clearly meant to conjure up the image of Trump. “Madam Secretary” stars a woman who looks similar to Hillary, and who is, of course, always taking principled positions on behalf of herself and the U.S. State Department. They rip their stories from the headlines, and imply that the star of the show is a Hillary Clinton-type figure. But she never used a private server for her government business, at least not in the episodes I saw.

For Accuracy in Media

Roger Aronoff

Your Letters

To the Editor:
After so many decades of lies, Clinton no longer knows what the truth is. Her supporters are conditioned to accept whatever she says at face value regardless any evidence that contradicts her. Then they will berate and insult anyone who calls her a liar.

Fred T.
The Medical Cover-Up Surrounding Hillary Clinton

By Cliff Kincaid

The media are returning to their protective mode regarding Hillary Clinton, after pretending to raise questions about her health. But very few questions have been answered. Here are some that still linger:

1) Mrs. Clinton and her media entourage have claimed in the past that her coughing fits were caused by allergies. So what really caused her to leave the 9/11 memorial and nearly collapse?

2) The video of her wobbling and almost falling down led to the claim that Mrs. Clinton was just overheated. However, the temperature was around 80 degrees with low humidity. Later, it was alleged that she had pneumonia. What is the truth?

3) If she really had pneumonia, why not disclose that information on the day she was supposedly diagnosed with pneumonia? The claim that she had pneumonia caused by a tough campaign schedule might have engendered sympathy for the Democratic candidate and would not have aroused as much controversy as her collapse after she left the 9/11 memorial.

4) Why should the public believe that the explanation for her collapse was pneumonia when the campaign had previously blamed allergies for her health problems?

5) Mrs. Clinton at first appeared to be fine at the 9/11 memorial service as she talked to various people. Why did her health take such a dramatic turn for the worse?

6) If she has pneumonia, why did she come out of Chelsea's apartment looking so chipper? What happened to her in the apartment?

7) If pneumonia is supposedly the cause of the recent coughing fit, what caused the previous coughing fits?

8) Who was the mysterious woman shown with Hillary as she left the 9/11 memorial? This is the woman who...
pears to be taking Hillary's pulse and asking her to squeeze her fingers, which appears to be a neurological test.

9) Mrs. Clinton had a concussion and blood clots in the past, including one in her brain. Where is the proof that she didn't have a stroke on 9/11?

10) Why didn't she go to the hospital, where she could have been evaluated by objective doctors and nurses?

11) If she does have pneumonia, which can be contagious, why was she exposing herself to Chelsea's children and the public?

12) Why was an email sent to Mrs. Clinton from a top aide about a drug used to treat symptoms of Parkinson's disease?

13) Why was this email disclosed by WikiLeaks rather than Clinton?

14) Why did Hillary seem to be the only person at the event wearing sun-glasses with blue lenses? The report, "Parkinson's Disease: Effects of Colored Glasses on Movement Times," cites anecdotal evidence that wearing blue tinted glasses helps relieve the symptoms of Parkinson's disease.

One day before her collapse, The Washington Post had accused Donald J. Trump of being a sexist for questioning her health. After the health debacle, the Post tried to give the impression that it was finally investigating with a story headlined, "Hillary Clinton has not been quick to share health information." The story failed to note that one of the biggest concerns involves the fact that the FBI documents released in her email investigation said she couldn't remember receiving a briefing on handling classified information. The story also didn't mention the email she received about Provigil, a drug to treat symptoms of Parkinson's.

This is not the first time that the media have covered up for a Democratic presidential nominee. The press helped John F. Kennedy and his physician cover up the fact that he was dependent on cortisone for Addison's disease, a very serious disorder, and may have been using amphetamines.

Before he ran for president on the Democratic ticket in 1988, Michael Dukakis was a candidate for governor of Massachusetts in 1982. His campaign had concocted a false cover story about his wife's drug problem. The press was told that Kitty Dukakis was recovering from hepatitis at a friend's home in Minnesota when she was actually a patient at a drug-treatment clinic.

Despite the ongoing cover-up of Mrs. Clinton's medical and health problems, some Democratic Party leaders must suspect or know she has a serious disorder and may not be able to fulfill her duties as President.

Yet the media are either trying to move on, or change the subject to Trump's tax returns.

In order to try to make us forget what the world saw in that terrifying video of her near-collapse, the giant corporate search engines like Google are stacking the deck against results that can push the public and the media to seek more definitive answers.

As Seton Motley noted, Google searches for "Hillary Clinton's he-" did not produce results about her health problems but rather about "Hillary Clinton's headquarters," "Hillary Clinton's health plan" and "Hillary Clinton's healthcare plan."

In addition to playing down the nature of Hillary's health problems, ignoring the follow-up questions or changing the subject, this is how Mrs. Clinton's supporters in the media and elsewhere hope to sabotage the public's right to know how sick she really is.

Cliff Kincaid is the Director of the AIM Center for Investigative Journalism, and can be contacted at cliff.kincaid@aim.org

By Roger Aronoff

The Terrible Lagacy of 9/11

As we approach the 15th anniversary of the 9/11 attacks on New York and Washington, D.C., the tragedy is that the Islamic jihadists are winning too many battles around the world, and have forced the West and its partners to abridge freedoms in pursuit of security. And despite the claims of the Obama administration, the U.S. is not succeeding in leading a coalition of nations to defeat the enemy, which it identifies as ISIL. In fact, ISIL, more commonly known as ISIS, is now operating fully in 18 countries—a three-fold increase in just two years—according to a National Counterterrorism Center report leaked to NBC News in August.

The fact is, after nearly eight years of Obama and Secretaries of State Clinton and Kerry, things have gotten much worse in many hot spots across the globe. Through the work of our Citizens' Commission on Benghazi (CCB), we have concluded that Obama came to the White House seeking to empower the Muslim Brotherhood in North Africa, and the Iranian Shi'ite regime in the Persian Gulf region. Because of our unsigned nuclear "deal" with Iran, we have few options when it comes to restraining their behavior. We pretend that we have a common interest with both Russia and Iran, which is to defeat ISIS. But ISIS is just one manifestation of the jihadist ideology that seeks dominance, and submission, as it slaughters tens of thousands of people in its long, drawn out death march.

When the U.S. removed its remaining troops from Iraq in 2011, President Obama announced that "we're leaving behind a sovereign, stable and self-reliant Iraq, with a representative government that was elected by its
people.” That was the same year that the so-called “Arab Spring” led to the fall of America’s ally in Egypt, the start of the Syrian civil war, and the West’s war against Libya’s Muammar Qaddafi, who had abandoned his WMD program and was fighting against al Qaeda. That is when America switched sides in the Global War on Terror, as we documented in our first CCB report, and further supported in our second report back in June. Benghazi turned out to be a pile-up of scandal, failed policy and dereliction of duty.

Today we have Libya as a failed state, dominated by jihadist groups; Syria as the home base of ISIS and the scene of what even The New York Times’ Nicholas Kristof called Obama’s “worst mistake,” comparing it to Rwanda, with close to a half a million dead; and an emboldened Iran, regularly humiliating America because it can, since it has received an estimated $100 billion in formerly frozen funds, and there is no signed deal for which they can be held accountable.

Fifteen years after 9/11, the frequency of terrorist and jihadist attacks is such that they are quickly forgotten in a fog of war that is rapidly enveloping the world.

Left-Wing Journalist Glenn Greenwald Criticizes Liberal Pundits for Trying to Delegitimize Negative Coverage of Clinton

By Don Irvine

Left-wing journalist Glenn Greenwald—who is no fan of Donald Trump—came down hard on liberal pundits who he believes are trying to delegitimize negative coverage of Hillary Clinton, in a lengthy piece for The Intercept.

What got Greenwald riled up was a recent column by New York Times columnist Paul Krugman, who criticized the media for their coverage of Hillary Clinton and said that neither Clinton nor her husband Bill did anything improper.

Krugman said that Trump was being graded on a curve while the coverage of the Clinton Foundation was bizarre:

“Consider the big Associated Press report suggesting that Mrs. Clinton’s meetings with foundation donors while secretary of state indicate ‘her possible ethics challenges if elected president.’ Given the tone of the report, you might have expected to read about meetings with, say, brutal foreign dictators or corporate fat cats facing indictment, followed by questionable actions on their behalf.

But the prime example The A.P. actually offered was of Mrs. Clinton meeting with Muhammad Yunus, a winner of the Nobel Peace Prize who also happens to be a longtime personal friend. If that was the best the investigation could come up with, there was nothing there.”

What Krugman didn’t say was that 85 of the 154 visitors from the portion of the records released by the State Department were Clinton Foundation donors who gave at least $156 million to the foundation, raising the specter of pay-for-play during Clinton’s tenure as secretary of state.

Greenwald criticized Krugman and other liberal pundits for their blind loyalty to Clinton, and for being so dismissive of any negative coverage of the Democratic nominee:

“[A]ggressive investigative journalism against Trump is not enough for Democratic partisans whose voice is dominant in U.S. media discourse. They also want a cessation of any news coverage that reflects negatively on Hillary Clinton. Most, of course, won’t say this explicitly (though some do), but—as the wildly adored Krugman column from yesterday reflects—they will just reflexively dismiss any such coverage as illegitimate and invalid.

The absolute last metric journalists should use for determining what to cover is the reaction of pundits who, like Krugman and plenty of others, are singularly devoted to the election of one of the candidates. Of course Hillary Clinton’s die-hard loyalists in the media will dislike, and find invalid, any suggestion that she engaged in any sort of questionable conduct. Their self-assigned role is to defend her from all criticisms. They view themselves more as campaign operatives than journalists: Their principal, overriding goal is to ensure that Clinton wins the election. They will obviously hate anything—particularly negative reporting about her—that conflicts with that goal. They will jettison even their core stated beliefs—such as the view that big-money donations corrupt politicians—in order to fulfill that goal.

But it would be journalistic malpractice of the highest order if the billions of dollars received by the Clintons—both personally and though their various entities—were not rigorously scrutinized and exposed in detail by reporters. That’s exactly what they ought to be doing. The fact that quid pro quos cannot be definitively proven does not remotely negate the urgency of this journalism...
Beyond quid pro pros, the Clintons’ constant, pioneering merger of massive private wealth and political power and influence is itself highly problematic. Nobody forced them to take millions of dollars from the Saudis and Goldman Sachs tycoons and corporations with vested interests in the State Department; having chosen to do so with great personal benefit, they are now confronting the consequences in how the public views such behavior.”

This article was published before the media went ballistic over fellow liberal Matt Lauer’s grilling of Clinton about her emails on Wednesday night, which only bolsters Greenwald’s argument on just how far they are willing to go to delegitimize anything that portrays Hillary in a negative light.

**He’s Baack! Keith Olbermann Takes on Trump at GQ**

By Don Irvine

With 56 days left until the election, GQ is throwing its hat into the ring of political coverage by giving former ESPN, Current, and MSNBC host Keith Olbermann a bi-weekly web series called The Closer with Keith Olbermann, on which he will provide commentary on the election, with GOP presidential nominee Donald Trump being his main target. “It’s after Labor Day and he still hasn’t fled for the Cayman Islands yet,” Olbermann said, seated in the GQ version of the Oval Office. “He still could wind up in a place that looks just like this. Not if I can help it.”

Olbermann, who used to live in a Trump building, has seen his career slide into oblivion after he was fired from MSNBC. Unless he has undergone a major personality change, this web foray will do nothing to revive it.

**NBC’s Andrea Mitchell: Clinton’s Handling of Health Scare Made Things a Lot Worse**

By Don Irvine

NBC’s Andrea Mitchell said on the Today show that the secrecy surrounding Hillary Clinton’s diagnosis of pneumonia has made the issue of her health a much bigger issue than it previously was.

Clinton was forced to leave a September 11 memorial event in New York City after becoming “overheated,” according to her campaign. Video footage shows Clinton nearly fainting as she was being helped into a van with her feet dragging on the ground. Mitchell said: “There’s never a good time for a candidate to get sick in the middle of a campaign, of course, but the way Clinton has handled this has likely made it a lot worse, especially since Donald Trump has been trying to make such a big issue out of her health.”

Mitchell said that reporters didn’t know the whereabouts of Clinton, nor what had happened, until the campaign issued a statement 90 minutes after she had left the event.

It was later revealed that Clinton’s doctor, Lisa Bardack, had diagnosed her with pneumonia two days earlier, something that hadn’t been previously disclosed, raising questions in the media about her health.

The Washington Post’s Chris Cillizza, who just six days ago had penned a column entitled “Can we just stop talking about Hillary Clinton’s health now?”, wrote a follow-up column that carried the headline, “Hillary Clinton’s health just became a real issue in the presidential campaign,” in which he said that taking Team Clinton’s word for it on her health is not good enough.

Up until now the liberal media had dismissed concerns about Clinton’s health as nothing more than right-wing conspiracy theories, but the “overheating”—along with her coughing spell last week—has now made this a major campaign issue and a real problem for Clinton, at least until she releases a more complete record of her medical history.

**Hillary Clinton’s New Book “Stronger Together” Flops**

By Don Irvine

Hillary Clinton’s newest book, Stronger Together, has become a major flop, with sales of just 2,912 copies according to Nielsen Bookscan.

The sales are particularly disappointing since Clinton and her running mate, Senator Tim Kaine (D-VA), have been promoting the book on the campaign trail—a strategy that obviously hasn’t worked.

According to The New York Times, first-week-sales typically account for roughly one-third of total sales, thanks to the initial publicity blitz that accompanies book launches. By comparison, Clinton’s 2014 memoir Hard Choices sold 85,000 copies in its first week of release, and just 280,000 total.

Simon and Schuster lost a bundle on that book after giving Clinton an advance of $14 million.

Clinton’s book sales pale when compared to Barack Obama’s The Audacity of Hope, which sold an average of 35,000 copies a week while he was running against Clinton in 2008. Sarah Palin, who was Senator John McCain’s (R-AZ) running mate in 2008, sold a whopping 469,000 copies of her book, Going Rogue: An American Life, one year after she and McCain lost the election.

The Clinton campaign has been struggling with a lack of enthusiasm from Democrats. The poor sales of her latest book only underscore just how unexcited they are about her candidacy.

Don Irvine Chairman of Accuracy in Media.