

# Epic Congressional Investigations Coming For Hillary Clinton

- Clinton now connected to the Solyndra Cleantech Crash and over a trillion dollars of embezzlements via her backers Larry Page, Eric Schmidt, Elon Musk, John Doerr and Steve Westly.

by Alex Seitz-Wald and Benjy Sarlin

If Donald Trump leaves the Republican Party divided after the election, a Hillary Clinton victory could bring the party back together, as the party prepares a flood of potential congressional investigations against Clinton, who is poised to be the first woman president.

The daily drip of hacked emails from Wikileaks, the exposure of Clinton's email server and pay-for-play allegations about the Clinton Foundation may not cost her a victory in the current contest, which has largely become a referendum on Trump's fitness for office. But the allegations won't magically disappear after Nov. 8 either, and Republicans are determined to cut short any potential honeymoon period.

In the last few weeks alone, dozens of House Republicans have [demanded that a special prosecutor](#) investigate the Clinton Foundation for possible conflicts of interest. Texas GOP Sen. Ted Cruz has called for a ["serious criminal investigation"](#) into a Democratic operative featured in a sting video by conservative activist James O'Keefe. And Speaker Paul Ryan has promised "aggressive oversight work in the House" of an alleged "quid pro quo" deal between the FBI and the State Department over reclassifying an email on Clinton's private server.

Utah Republican Rep. Jason Chaffetz, who would likely serve as the chief antagonist of a second Clinton White House as chair the House Oversight Committee, told Fox News last week the "quid pro quo" claim alone was worth at least "four new hearings," claiming it was a "flashing red light of potential criminality."

Both the FBI and State Department say [no quid pro quo](#) took place, and that the incident was a misunderstanding. But the episode is one of many that conservative commentators, watchdog groups and lawmakers will almost certainly return to well after election day.

"You're going to still have a clamor for a serious criminal investigation of Mrs. Clinton's conduct with respect to her emails and the [Clinton] Foundation," Tom Fitton, president of Judicial Watch, which has spearheaded legal efforts against Bill and Hillary Clinton for years, told NBC News. "There's been no systematic investigation of various issues."

Trump has spent months telling the party's base the election is rigged. As a result, Republicans in oversight roles will face tremendous pressure to expose Clinton's perceived corruption if she prevails on November 8.

At least one Hillary Clinton antagonist has floated the idea she may be impeached as president.

"I know this generation of Republican leaders is loath to exercise these tools, but impeachment is something that's relevant," said Fitton, who has criticized GOP lawmakers for failing to pre-emptively impeach Clinton. "They see [the oversight process] as an opportunity in some measure to keep their opponents off-kilter, but they don't want to do the substantive and principled work to truly hold corrupt politicians, or the administration, or anyone accountable."

A Republican House impeached Hillary Clinton's husband, Bill Clinton, in 1998 for lying about his affair with Monica Lewinsky.

Politically, there are strong incentives for Republicans to dig into Clinton, both to slow Democrats' agenda and to keep the warring factions of the GOP together while they work through tougher disagreements on policy, tone and tactics.

"I do think being a check on Clinton is an important objective to unite the party and get control of Congress back in 2018," said Republican strategist Tim Miller, a leading critic of Trump who also previously helped direct opposition research against the Democratic nominee.

GOP oversight efforts have ramped up during the campaign as Trump's poll numbers fell. Since July alone, when FBI Director James Comey announced he had recommended against prosecuting Clinton for having classified material on her email server, Republicans have issued 17 subpoenas and 54 letters of inquiry probing Clinton, according to House Democrats.

Ian Prior, of the conservative super PAC American Crossroads, said scandal has followed Clinton "like a shadow" throughout her career. "If Hillary is elected president, her willingness to bend the rules to satisfy her own ambitions make it a virtual certainty that the abuse of power and endless drama that are part of the Clinton baggage will continue," he said.

The weaponization of the oversight process has become a predictable part of the political landscape, and has thus lost some of its punch. But constant probes, even when they amount to little, can have a corrosive effect on any White House, as Clinton herself knows all too well.

"The purpose of the investigations was to discredit the president and the administration and slow down its momentum. It didn't matter what the investigations were about; it only mattered that there were investigations," Clinton wrote in "Living History," her memoir about her time as first lady. "[O]ur lives and the work of the President were disrupted over and over again."

Even President Obama, who has faced virtually no major scandal during two terms in the White House, has been bogged down at times by Congressional investigations.

More dangerous still, probes into any issue can stumble across explosive finds. The Whitewater investigation led to the exposure of President Clinton's affair with Lewinsky, while the House Oversight Committee on Benghazi helped uncover Clinton's email server.

Clinton's campaign is already girding for a potential fight with Chaffetz and his colleagues, drawing battle lines that will likely harden very quickly if Clinton takes office.

"This is exactly what Americans hate about Washington. Before the election has even taken place, Jason Chaffetz is already planning to further abuse his office and waste more taxpayer dollars on political witch hunts against the potential President-elect," said Clinton campaign spokesperson Brian Fallon. "Hillary Clinton is running against this exact type of partisan gridlock. And if she wins, she intends to reach out to try to get things done, even if Congressman Chaffetz intends to ignore the public's clear desire for the two parties to work together."

Clinton's first line of defense may be Rep. Elijah Cummings, the top Democrat on both the Oversight Committee and Benghazi Committee, who has been running interference since 2011 against what he sees as the GOP majority's trumped-up attacks.

"For the past six years, they have squandered millions and millions of taxpayer dollars on partisan attacks that do absolutely nothing to improve the lives of our constituents, and now they already seem to be plotting to continue this pattern if Secretary Clinton wins the election," said Cummings.

David Brock, a former right-wing Clinton antagonist-turned-Clinton defender, is expected to continue to play a major role outside government defending her.



- Nearly a trillion dollars embezzled by Silicon Valley and the White House in the Solyndra and Cleantech scandals and not a single arrest

## **If The Media Investigated Hillary Like They Did Watergate, We Wouldn't Need WikiLeaks**

Today, mainstream publications have become willing accomplices in suppressing the same type of information they worked so tenaciously to expose all those years ago.

By [Timm Amundson](#)

It has now been more than four decades since the *Washington Post* and *New York Times* led the charge to bring down Richard Nixon and his administration's massive web of corruption and political subterfuge schemes. They did so by aggressively and tirelessly seeking out the truth, and reporting back to the American people clearly and comprehensively.

Today, both publications have become willing accomplices in suppressing the same type of information they worked so tenaciously to expose all those years ago. By openly and unapologetically acting as institutional surrogates for the Clinton campaign, these same institutions, and nearly every other mainstream media outlet in America, have gone hands-off in exposing what may very well turn out to be the most explosive and damaging corruption scandal in American politics since "Tricky Dick" was reelected back in '72.

Not by coincidence, Julian Assange and WikiLeaks have stepped in to fill the void. And boy, are the "truth seekers" mad about that!

## **My, How Times Have Changed**

On June 17, 1972, five men were arrested for breaking and entering the Democratic National Committee headquarters at the Watergate complex. Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein, both reporters for the *Washington Post* at the time, unflinchingly pursued the complete truth behind the break-in. Little did they know that summer how vast was the network of lies and corruption their investigation would eventually uncover.

The editors at the *Post* initially put the story on the back burner, while the Nixon administration deftly stonewalled the reporters' probes. By September, though, the *Post* and *New York Times* were fully on board with the investigation, and the administration had gone into full cover-up mode. Even though the FBI had confirmed that the administration had conducted a political sabotage conspiracy, it was not enough to keep Nixon from being reelected in a landslide in November. But the die was cast. The American press made it clear this story would not end until all the facts were in and Nixon and his henchmen were fully exposed.

Fast-forward to 2016. We are now two weeks away from the general election, and once again a potentially devastating story appears to be developing, related to a web of corruption and deceit that could eventually rival the Watergate scandal. Just like 1972, the *Post* and the *Times* are fully engaged. Except this time, the "two lions of journalism" have little interest in covering the avalanche of revelations pouring forth against the Clinton campaign. Instead, both publications are working around the clock to bring the Democratic nominee to power. That's not all. Nearly every other mainstream media outlet in the country has jumped on the bandwagon.

It would be incorrect to think that until now the mainstream media has been a relatively objective source for news. This has been going on for a long time. Few could argue that back in the '70s, editors Ben Bradlee at the *Post* and Abe Rosenthal at the *Times* were not absolutely salivating at the chance to

bring Nixon down. But they achieved this objective in relentless pursuit of the facts, not the willing suppression of the same.

One would think, given the self-inflicted meltdown the Donald Trump camp finds itself in right now, the media might at least feign some level of balanced reporting, but they've made it very clear they're not taking any chances. They're going to keep digging dirt on Trump, and they're going to continue to minimize, to the best of their ability, a story that may well have historic and damaging implications, both for the nation as a whole and our entire political system moving forward.

Although this may prove to be a very successful political tactic for this year's presidential election, it is likely to forever damage the reputation of mainstream American journalism, and it most certainly will continue to encourage the American public to look elsewhere for the unvarnished truth.

## **White Knight or Black Pawn?**

Enter WikiLeaks and its founder, Julian Assange. As many people know, WikiLeaks is essentially a disseminator of private, confidential, and oftentimes classified communication that belongs to both private individuals and public officials. They obtain it through the dark art of hacking.

The organization's willing violation of right-to-privacy provisions, as enumerated directly or indirectly in the First, Third, Fourth, Fifth, and even Ninth Amendments to our Constitution, should be enough for all Americans to take pause. These are not nice people, and by their actions alone they have demonstrated a blatant disregard for the American way of life.

The Clinton campaign and Obama administration have seized upon this and used it very effectively in pulverizing the credibility of Assange and his efforts. Further, they have claimed that Russia is behind all of this and that there is a very good chance Trump is working in tandem with Russian President Vladimir Putin in order to influence the general election. This has also given the media every excuse in the book to minimize reporting on the WikiLeaks revelations.

That said, a paradox exists that cannot be ignored. Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton, and the mainstream media are all telling us that Putin and Assange are the bad guys. Bad guys they might be, but in effect they are providing information to the American people that Clinton and Obama do not want them to have, because if the American people have this information, they would not approve of what Clinton and President Obama have done.

Color me reactionary, but I don't think Putin and Assange are the folks we should be most concerned about right now. They are only influencing the election based upon larger disclosure of the facts. Clinton, Obama, and the media are influencing the election based on attempts to suppress and distort the facts.

There is no doubt that, whatever his reasons, if Putin is involved he is not acting on behalf of or for the benefit of the American people. But it is also certain that, given what we know now, Obama, Clinton,

and their loyal propaganda corps are not reacting to his maneuvers on behalf of or for the benefit of the American people. They are doing what benefits themselves, which is to maintain power, and they will do whatever is necessary to accomplish that objective.

To think they are taking such a hard line against Putin's Russia and Assange's WikiLeaks solely to protect our constitutional liberties and national security would be naïve. They are working tirelessly to deflect and delegitimize a substantial amount of very incriminating evidence by attempting to destroy the reliability of the originators of that evidence. This is a standard progressive tactic straight out of the Saul Alinsky playbook.

## **Some Things Never Change**

Lest we mistakenly assume that the sanctimony and righteous indignation that mainstream outlets are spewing against Assange and Putin somehow gives the moral high ground to a revered and prestigious publication like the *Washington Post*, a further reflection on Watergate and the Nixon downfall might be helpful.

Many would agree that Woodward and Bernstein put "investigative journalism" on the map. They didn't invent it, but they certainly raised the craft to a respected level. It would be a mistake, however, to assume that investigative journalism, at least as the two tenacious *Post* reporters practiced it, was anything less than hardball reporting. When the individual who was primarily responsible for revealing the full range of corruption behind the Nixon administration is surreptitiously referred to as "Deep Throat," you know you're not operating on the same plain as Walter Cronkite or Edward R. Murrow. There was some very dark matter rising to the surface.

Few people still alive know just how sordid this investigation really got, although several written accounts have been published that go far beyond the glorified portrayal in the film version of that period, titled "All The President's Men." One thing is certain: reporters didn't always adhere to standard journalism protocols when attempting to get to the bottom of this vital story. Few people then or now were concerned about the privacy rights of John Erlichman, Bob Haldeman, G. Gordon Liddy, or any other of Nixon's merry pranksters. The stakes were too high. The rules were off the table.

Whether we like it or not, in many ways, when we measure the tactics WikiLeaks employs today against those of many mainstream news organizations back then, the game has never really changed. It has just switched from analog to digital.

I realize this presents a moral equivalence that many principled, thoughtful Americans would find unacceptable. That is fair and understandable. But there have been times in our nation's history when we found it necessary to do whatever was required to protect the safety and freedom of our republic. The measures taken back in the '70s to expose the corruption of the Nixon administration is an example of that. I think this is another one of those times.

## **The Truth Shall Set Her Free—From The White House**

On July 30, 1974, Nixon was forced to turn over a series of taped recordings related to numerous meetings and conversations conducted at the White House. These tapes included enough damaging evidence to put the final nail in the coffin on Nixon's administration. It was also revealed that 18.5 minutes of tape had been erased. The furor that erupted from all corners, including the media, was enormous. It was considered one of the most reprehensible single acts in the history of American politics. Unforgivable, unconscionable, disgusting—all of those outcries were fair and appropriate.

The mainstream media has done an excellent job thus far in suppressing the real case against Hillary Clinton.

But this is no longer 1974, and we are no longer talking about Richard Nixon. It is 2016, and we are talking about Hillary Clinton. Her staff and their accomplices have erased some 33,000 emails; they have had hard drives acid-washed; they have crushed multiple cell phones with hammers; with the help of the FBI, they have had laptops destroyed. The reaction to all of this from our esteemed mainstream media? "She's answered all of these questions. It's time to move on."

The investigative journalism big media outlets employed in the '70s to expose widespread political corruption and deceit is now being used to uncover the past moral transgressions of a flawed Republican candidate. It's juicy stuff indeed that certainly warrants publication if the facts support the allegations. But to use this tabloid-worthy information to at least partly deflect from an already overwhelming amount of damaging evidence, as verified by the actual words of the perpetrators themselves, is—how should I say it—deplorable.

The mainstream media has done an excellent job thus far in suppressing the real case against Hillary Clinton. But as the avalanche of evidence against her continues to mount, the truth will overwhelm their effort to limit the reporting. By that time, even they will be forced to abandon the charade.

The way things stand right now, it might be too late to keep Hillary Clinton out of the White House, but, as Richard Nixon learned back in 1974, it will never be too late to show her the door.

To that, I say to Assange, go for it! We'll deal with you later.