





Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on March 16, 2015

---

That memo was signed by then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton.

... And it's not like that policy wasn't enforced. Former Ambassador to Kenya Scott Gration told [The Daily Caller](#) on March 6 that he was fired by Clinton Chief of Staff Cheryl Mills in 2012 in part because of his "use of private email for public work."

Clearly, Clinton doesn't like it when others can control the flow of information; she reserves that power for herself. That's why her own rule didn't apply to her: Rules are for the little people in the Clinton world — as in the former USSR.

This isn't the first time Clinton has signaled that she should be above scrutiny. The May 8, 2012 U.S. House Oversight Committee hearing on the 2012 attack on our Benghazi consulate was another. When pressed on whether she'd taken the necessary steps to ascertain if the event was the result of a spontaneous protest or a planned terrorist attack, she petulantly replied, "What difference at this point does it make?!" She followed up with, "It is our job to figure out what happened and do everything we can to prevent it from ever happening again." In other words, butt out.

The problem? The Obama administration apparently lied about Benghazi, blaming a spontaneous protest supposedly inspired by a hapless Coptic Christian filmmaker who had created an obscure movie critical of Islam. And it is the job of the opposing political party — and of the rest of us — to find out what happened with respect to the peddling of a false story and "do everything we can to prevent it from ever happening again."

So "what difference at this point does it make?" The answer to Clinton was simple: You're not working for a king. You don't get to act without scrutiny under our form of government. If you find that aspect of your job unpalatable, there's a simple solution: resign.

But Clinton has always been defined by secrecy. When her 1993 healthcare-reform initiative failed, liberal columnist Maureen Dowd [wrote](#) that "it was the first lady's secrecy and righteousness in trying to push through her 1,364-page bill that doomed the effort." Her almost unparalleled desire and capacity to keep secrets may be limited to Americans, however, if her husband's [release](#) of nuclear secrets to the Chinese is any indication.

That Clinton resists scrutiny is telling. When I have personal dealings with people in which, let's say, I purchase an item for them, I'm sure to enthusiastically present the receipt even when they don't request it. It's a sign of good will, puts their mind at ease, and is the honorable thing to do. Ronald Reagan once made the oxymoronic statement "Trust, but verify." Well, if you're trustworthy, you'll offer verification.

Official scrutiny is nothing to which the rest of us aren't subject, either. For example, the IRS — despite its "the dog ate my e-mails" excuse — still demands chapter and verse when auditing a citizen.

Having said this, Clinton's e-mail scandal won't have the effect many pundits suppose. Most commentators, like most everyone, fall victim to the mistake of "mirroring," which is when people naturally ascribe their own motivations, priorities, and perspectives to others. But only a minority of citizens pays attention to the news; the average voter is better epitomized by the Americans who signed a petition to [repeal the First Amendment](#) than by the McLaughlin Group. And as for majority of that minority, what news will it get, anyway? The media have been whitewashing the Clintons and other leftists for decades. And if they decide to stop covering an issue and send it down that black memory hole, then, in terms of practical effect, it never happened.



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on March 16, 2015

---

Thus, there's only one thing that can sink Clinton's presumptive presidential candidacy: fellow liberals. She [has a reputation](#) for being a mean, nasty, vulgar woman behind the scenes, and I understand she isn't well liked. She's also a relatively unappealing candidate and mediocre campaigner who, known as the "Ice Maiden" in high school, even had to learn to smile. It's entirely conceivable the powers-that-be might decide to cast her to the winds in favor of a more effective demagogue such as Massachusetts Senator Elizabeth Warren. How might we know when this is happening?

If the media resurrects E-mailGate — and perhaps some other things — during the 2016-election primary season, it'll be a strong indication they have decided to back a different horse.



## Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

### What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.