

Examining the Criticisms of Clinton

by [cosmicrat](#) ·

26-October-2016, 10:32 am

The Republican party and its backers and funders have spent a great deal of time and money over three decades, constructing and distributing a collection of myths designed to destroy the chances of Hillary Clinton becoming President. Obviously they consider her the most able threat to their corporate agenda, a woman who not only opposes their goals, but has the intelligence, political skill, and cunning to defeat them decisively.

Their methods are lifted from the techniques used by Hitler's Nazis and by covert intelligence operatives in any number of nations' spy agencies since then, including the CIA. It could be called psychological warfare, character assassination, propaganda, or simply The Big Lie. If you tell enough lies enough times to enough people, eventually a surprising number of people will begin to believe them, even if there is no evidence to support them, and even if they can be (or have been) proven to be distortions and misinformation.

The strategy is not to convince other Republicans, most of whom already had their own reasons to oppose her, but to spread doubt among Democrats and liberal independents who would otherwise not hesitate to endorse her. Just as with voter suppression laws, they hope to keep enough voters away from the polls to enable their candidate to win.

It appears that their plan did not include the mistake of allowing an outrageously unacceptable person like Donald Trump to be nominated. True, none of the 17 primary contenders would have appealed to anyone outside of Republican ideology. It would have been important to defeat any of them to protect and continue the progress we have made. But Trump's lack of qualifications, unprincipled hate-fueled demagoguery, and offensive personal behavior are especially repellent, even to many Republicans.

Although Hillary Clinton should win easily, we cannot afford to be complacent or to accept the error of wasting votes or not voting. We need to understand the nature, source, and falsity of the anti-Clinton propaganda. If it were a matter of just Republican ideological attacks, they would be easy to ignore, but they have spawned a liberal version that has led some to attack Clinton and threaten a "protest" vote.

It should not need to be said just how disastrous that could be. On one hand, Clinton proposes a liberal agenda that we should be happy to support. Historically, Presidents have at least attempted to fulfill pledges made. We would have a President likely to be sympathetic to further changes as need arises. On the other hand, a Trump win would assure little or no progress, and a struggle to maintain the advances we have made to date.

If Hillary had to spend her campaign rebutting allegations, she would have little time to speak her positive proposals and her vision. But we should study these issues rationally and specifically, not leave them as a nebulous cloud of doubt. There are several topics that need to be addressed:

- [1] The Clinton Foundation
- [2] The manufactured scandals
- [3] Paid speeches and donations
- [4] Foreign policy
- [5] The primary

The Clinton Foundation

Bill and Hillary Clinton's Global Initiatives represent one of the biggest attempts to improve the lives of people around the world that has ever been implemented. It is, and should be, a source of pride, not just for the Clintons and those who are helping fund and implement it, but for our country as a whole.

But Hillary's opponents are attempting to spin it into some sort of corrupt scheme, though there is no factual evidence that it is anything other than well intended and beneficial to those who need help.

Haiti

Haiti has long had systemic problems politically and socially, and has also suffered from foreign exploitation and interference. Its problems date back to the failure of the early US to support its successful overthrow of slavery. Haitians tend to distrust both its own government and foreigners, often with good reason, but that makes it more difficult for sincere and honest organizations to gain their confidence. Not everything the Initiative tried has succeeded as planned.

The Clinton Foundation has been actively engaged in Haiti since 2009, with the creation of the Clinton Global Initiative Haiti Action Network after a series of hurricanes devastated the country. In 2010, following the subsequent earthquake that struck the country, the Clinton Foundation Haiti Fund was created as an initiative of the Clinton Foundation.

Here is what it has done there:

https://www.clintonfoundation.org/sites/default/files/history_of_the_clinton_foundation_in_haiti.pdf

The Clinton Foundation has been focusing on economic diversification, private sector investment, and job creation in order to create long-term, sustainable economic development.

Overall, though, many thousands of lives have improved, and are continuing to improve. This Washington Post article describes the accomplishments, as well as the natural impatience of those still waiting for change.

How the Clintons' Haiti development plans succeed — and disappoint

https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/how-the-clintons-haiti-development-plans-succeed--and-disappoint/2015/03/20/0ebae25e-cbe9-11e4-a2a7-9517a3a70506_story.html

The Clinton Foundation is an operating foundation. The money raised by the Foundation is spent directly on our programs, and not as grants to other charitable organizations.

The majority of the Clinton Foundation's charitable work is performed and implemented by our staff and partners on the ground. We operate programs around the world that have a significant impact in a wide range of issue areas, including economic development, climate change, health and wellness, and participation of girls and women.

<https://www.clintonfoundation.org/about>

This is important to remember when attempting to evaluate the foundation's finances. It does not exist merely to collect donations and then hand them out.

Members of the Clinton Global Initiative community have made more than 3,600 Commitments to Action, which have improved the lives of over 435 million people in more than 180 countries.

THE MANUFACTURED SCANDALS

Most everyone knows by now that the Clintons did nothing wrong in an Arkansas real-estate investment. That was investigated exhaustively, finding no wrongdoing.

So was the attack on the Benghazi US Consulate. Clinton did nothing wrong regarding that. Congress, on the other hand, failed to provide adequate security funding. Yet the House conducted some 9 investigations attempting to blame the Secretary of State.

The case on the email server is over. No harm was done by it, and neither Hillary Clinton, Colin Powell, nor Condi Rice did anything prosecutable. Hillary's use of private email would probably have gone unnoticed, as did Powell's and Rice's, if it hadn't been for the Republican attempt to use the Benghazi tragedy politically.

That won't stop Republicans from repeating accusations over and over, of course.

SPEECHES AND CONTRIBUTIONS

Both Bill and Hillary Clinton gave many speeches for which they were paid impressively high fees. It's nice work if you can get it.

Here are some other people who can do that:

\$50,000 Charlie Rose, TV talk show host

\$80,000 Malcolm Gladwell, Author: Blink, and Outliers

\$100,000+ Bill Maher

\$150,000 Condoleezza Rice

\$200,000+ Jerry Seinfeld

\$200,000+ Lady Gaga

\$200,000+ Larry The Cable Guy, comedian

\$400,000 Ben Bernanke, Ex-Fed chairman

The speaking fees the Clintons made are not unique. They are not paid only to politicians an organization wants to influence.

If the amounts seem high, so do the salaries of sports stars and corporate CEO's.

If you are offered a lot of money to speak, why would you refuse? If you don't need it all, you can donate to a worthy cause. That is what Bill and Hillary did with a large chunk of it. And a rational person would not use the occasion to criticize the audience. If the organization needs criticizing, you would use another venue to do it.

Accepting a speaking fee does not imply a promise nor an intention to treat the payer more favorably. Neither does accepting a campaign donation. Donations can mean

that the donor approves of a candidate's positions, or they can mean the donor hopes for favorable treatment. The candidate is under no obligation to a donor.

If a politician does favors as a result of a donation, that is corruption. But unless that happens, there is no basis for an accusation.

Corruption does exist in our system, and we are right to examine and scrutinize any suspicious interactions. But fairness to honest public servants requires that we do not jump to conclusions without evidence.

FOREIGN POLICY

No candidate who has not already served a term as President has been the subject of such speculation and accusation regarding her intentions in foreign policy as Hillary Clinton. There is no question that her experience has afforded her extensive knowledge in the field, and she has helped to implement policies and actions of the Obama administration. But the President has made it clear that he is the decision maker, and the Secretary of State is only one of the advisors he listens to.

Even the President cannot control or predict all the outcomes in which the US is involved. The world is full of sovereign nations and non-national groups acting according their own perceived interests. And, there are powerful interests within the country that limit the extent to which a President can determine courses of action.

Asserting that the State Secretary is responsible for unintended bad outcomes or even mistakes in foreign policy is either misguided or intentional attempts to undermine her popularity among Democrats.

[Hillary Clinton, National Security](#)

<http://foreignpolicy.com/2016/10/09/foreign-policy-endorses-hillary-clinton-for-president-of-the-united-states/>

Keeping the nation as much as possible at peace with the rest of the world is not just about saying how much you want that. Every challenge to that goal is different and often complex, with many factors and other nations to consider. Sometimes you have to emphasize the strength of your own position to make diplomacy appreciated and respected.

Because, both here and abroad, some perceive women as weaker leaders, it can be even more important for a woman President to present a tough-minded image. That doesn't mean she is less desiring of peace

NO GOOD DEED GOES UNPUNISHED

Perhaps that is an exaggeration, but in this season of overstatement, it needs to be, just to get noticed. What is clearly true is that those who do good for its own sake have enemies, and those enemies often attack. Why? There are various reasons, but one is that doing good does have its rewards, increasing the reputation and esteem of the doer, and there are those who want to prevent that effect.

The motive for the attack is quite clear, because it was initiated by a political opponent of Hillary Clinton's. The attack, however, doesn't stand up to fact checking.