

Why They Dislike Hillary

A few days ago on television, I asked why Senator Hillary Clinton would put herself through two years of personal attacks in her quest to be President. Is it ambition, a thirst for power, or a belief that she can help Americans in unique ways?

There is no question that Mrs. Clinton will be viciously attacked in every way imaginable. The stuff thrown at her will be malicious and unrelenting, designed to humiliate her and break her spirit. I said I felt sorry for the Senator, just as I feel sympathy for what President Bush is now going through.

Well, the mail poured in. Some of the letters vilified me for being "soft" on Hillary Clinton. There was more than a little hate contained in those missives, and I'm curious about it. What is it about Senator Clinton that causes so much animosity?

Statistically, about half the country doesn't like Hillary Clinton. Both a Fox News poll and and ABC News/Washington Post poll say the same thing: 44% of Americans disapprove of Senator Clinton. That is a very strong negative for any politician, particularly one that wants to be President.

But, again, why? Why do so many folks despise this woman?

I put that question to my radio audience and the phone lines jammed up. From Alaska to Miami, the beefs rolled in. But in the end, they all fit into three separate categories.

First, many women don't like Hillary because they believe she made a deal with her husband. That is, she'd stand by him and ignore his infidelities in return for his help in her political life. The ladies who called me did not like that alleged deal at all.

Second, many men objected to her leftist ideology. They see the Senator as a big government, limousine liberal who lives large herself, but wants to impose high taxation on those who are achieving in America.

And finally, some of the callers see Hillary as a cold, calculating woman with a sense of entitlement. There was anger that she rarely sits for tough interviews and speaks in generalities about important subjects like the war on terror.

On one level, I understand all of those opinions but they don't rise, at least for me, to the hatred level. I reserve that territory for true villains like Saddam and Fidel Castro. But there is no question that hatred towards some American politicians like President Bush and Hillary Clinton is becoming an obsession for some people. An unhealthy obsession, in my opinion.

Much of this bitterness can be laid at the doorstep of an increasingly ideological and irresponsible mainstream media which reports rumor, propaganda, and outright slander on a regular basis. Talk radio also fuels resentments. So does the Internet and cable TV. Unfortunately, many people believe what they read and hear, especially if it fits their political disposition. Thus, it is easy to demonize people these days; it is easy to sell loathing.

This, of course, hurts America because many decent, brilliant people will not enter the brutal world of elective politics. For those who do, there will be pain. But to some, like Hillary Clinton, the sought-after gain is apparently worth it.

Al and the Oscar

And the winner is... Al Gore for "An Inconvenient Truth!"

Take it to the bank—Al Gore's film will win the Academy Award for Best Documentary and high-fives will be flying in Hollywood; George Clooney may even break dance in the aisle.

Mr. Gore's warning about global warming and the consequences thereof is in competition with four other films: One about wild and crazy Christian kids at "Jesus Camp," another dealing with the Catholic church-pedophilia scandal, and two more about the chaos in Iraq. Gore wins without breaking a sweat, no pun intended.

But did you notice that all five of the nominated documentaries have left or secular themes? In general, conservatives are not rallying to Gore's hypothesis that fossil fuels are damaging the planet, although the right should keep an open mind on that strong possibility.

The two anti-Christian films are devastating. Writing in *Variety*, Ronnie Scheib says this about "Jesus Camp": "[The film] may shock viewers, especially liberals, when it shows children speaking in tongues, their faces glowing in ecstasy and tears running down their cheeks."

And Robert Koehler's review of "Deliver Us from Evil" opines, "It's hard to imagine even devout Catholics coming away from the film without a sense of rage at a religion that appears to value members of the priesthood over the well-being of children."

Of course, the priest-pedophilia scandal has nothing to do with the Catholic "religion." Theology played no part in it. The scandal happened because evil men working inside the Catholic Church did evil things. When Richard Nixon and his henchmen disgraced America, no sane person could blame it on

the Constitution. It's the same thing with the Catholic scandal.

There is no question that Hollywood continues to pour out product designed to promote a secular society and boost liberal political positions. And the entertainment industry is a powerful colossus. Millions worldwide closely follow the attitudes and themes Hollywood puts forth.

So in the interest of being "fair and balanced," I challenge Hollywood to produce the following documentaries this year.

- **"Tiller the Baby Killer."** A documentary profiling Kansas abortionist George Tiller who, for \$5,000, will abort a fetus up until birth.
- **"The Streets of San Francisco."** A look at the thousands of homeless people, many addicted, who have flocked to the City by the Bay for free money and other perks the city bestows on them.
- **"Fidel Camp."** This film chronicles the plight of thousands of "subversives" who are or have been incarcerated in dungeons because Fidel Castro doesn't like them. Talk about an inconvenient truth. Maybe Oliver Stone could direct this.
- **"The Kyoto Blues."** An honest look at the Kyoto Protocol which, in order to blunt pollution, would require major economic changes in the USA, but would allow massive pollution to continue in China and India. Is Al Gore available to narrate?
- **"NBC and Me."** A peek inside a once proud network news organization that now promotes a leftwing agenda on a daily basis. I'd like Whoopi Goldberg to voice over this one.

These are all high concept, ready-to-roll subjects that are just waiting for some talented people in Hollywood to take them on. What say you, Steven Spielberg?

Who Will Save the Babies?

There is something terrible going on in Kansas and you should know about it. A doctor named George Tiller is performing hundreds, perhaps thousands, of late-term abortions using a variety of medical reasons, including the depression of the mother.

In Kansas, there is a mental health exception which allows an abortionist to terminate a fetus at any time up until birth. The exception is vague, and so is Tiller's oft-used depression diagnosis, according to documents currently under investigation by Kansas authorities. So the deal is this: If you want to walk away from your pregnancy at any time, just contact Dr. Tiller; he'll help you out.

But only if you have at least \$5,000. The doctor, known as "Tiller the Baby Killer" among some people who object to his practice, lays it all out on his website. He'll terminate your baby, and even cremate it for you if you wish. He's one-stop shopping.

According to published reports, Tiller injects the fetus with poison while in the womb, removes it, and disposes of the body. While it's true that sometimes a mother's health is severely impacted in late term, most doctors agree this is rare. Babies can now live after 22 weeks when removed by C-section. Late term abortions are almost never necessary.

Unless the mother wants out, that is. And that's what some people believe Tiller is doing—terminating viable, healthy babies because the mother simply doesn't want the child.

While the American media wails about alleged human rights violations at Guantanamo Bay, champions fetal stem cell

research in the name of compassion, and hollers aplenty at the atrocities in Darfur, the press is largely ignoring the Tiller story, with the exception of the *Los Angeles Times*. It has glorified Tiller.

An article by *Times* reporter Stephanie Simon focused on Tiller terminating babies who are seriously ill. Ms. Simon makes no mention of the "depression" factor. She does, however, report that Tiller is aborting Down Syndrome babies which, when you think about it, is kind of chilling.

George Tiller could not do what he's doing in ultra-liberal France or even in permissive Holland. In France, a baby cannot be aborted after 12 weeks unless two doctors certify a woman's physical health is endangered, or the fetus has a serious abnormality.

In the Netherlands, abortion is prohibited at all times once the baby is viable outside the mother's womb.

But in Kansas, if the mom is feeling a bit blue on Tuesday and carries a certified check, Dr. Tiller is willing and able to terminate the baby. Is this what the founding fathers had in mind when they created the Constitution?

I don't think so, but the secular press disagrees. Just this week *The New York Times*, whose editorial writers worship at the altar of abortion, called the investigation into Tiller's gruesome practice a "gross assault on privacy and legal rights [...]". You see, to the *Times* editorial board, no baby in the womb deserves any protection at any time. It's all under the secular-progressive banner of "reproductive rights."

But even the secularists who run France and Holland are not that militant. It is hard to believe that babies have more protections in Paris and Amsterdam than they do in Wichita. But that's the truth.

Saddam's Revenge

At the moment the hangman's noose tightens around Saddam Hussein's shriveled neck, he can take solace in one major unintended consequence of his defeat by coalition forces: America and the Bush administration have suffered enormously in the wake of Saddam's overthrow.

Every exit poll last Tuesday said the same thing: Most Americans do not believe the Iraq conflict is good for the country. Some believe our military action was immoral, but most simply want victory, not stalemate, in Iraq.

The thinking behind that lies in the deep respect most Americans have for the U.S. military. I mean, who in their right mind wants to see soldiers and marines killed and maimed for a campaign that is still chaotic after three and a half years? Left-wing loons aside, clear thinking Americans are willing to accept war if the violence is justified and benefits the country. But this Iraq deal remains unresolved, and there is little good news coming out of Baghdad.

As I mentioned in this space a few weeks ago, the Iraqi people have not stepped up to control the terrorists in their midst. It does not take three years to train a national police force or even a standing army for that matter. Corruption and religious hatred is rife in Iraq. A country that was deemed "secular" and desiring of freedom by U.S. intelligence has turned out to be a place of ancient hatreds and incredible, mindless violence.

You don't see the Muslims of Afghanistan, as primitive as that country is, drilling holes in each other's heads and forming roving death squads. At least the Afghans are giving

democracy a chance by not embracing the Taliban uprising coming out of Pakistan, or protecting homicide bombers who can paralyze any free society.

But millions of Iraqis are either too afraid or too apathetic to join their countrymen who simply want to live in peace and freedom. How many hateful Iraqi Mullahs are ordering their brainwashed minions to kill innocent people? How many crooked cops and military people are creating fear and loathing by committing loathsome crimes?

There is no army in the world that can impose democracy or any other kind of government on an unwilling population. Remember, the Soviets brutalized Afghanistan using hundreds of thousands of troops and a ruthless secret police, but could not make communism acceptable there.

So the Bush administration is caught in a situation that once looked like a "slam dunk," to use former CIA Director George Tenet's phrase, but has now evolved into an election-turning debacle.

However, a bad situation could rapidly become worse if ideologically crazed politicians implement policies that give the terrorists a major victory. Remember, Iraq is a stalemate, not a defeat. The terrorists can strut around all they want, but Saddam is facing the gallows and Iran is not controlling the Gulf oil flow—at least not yet.

President Bush is correct when he says that Iraq is now the central battlefield in the war on terror. And the demise of Donald Rumsfeld finally signals that a new strategy might be on horizon.

All Americans should hope so. Fighting Islamic fascism is the most important issue in the world today. We'll now see if the Democrats have a better idea as to how to do that.

Saddam's Revenge

At the moment the hangman's noose tightens around Saddam Hussein's shriveled neck, he can take solace in one major unintended consequence of his defeat by coalition forces: America and the Bush administration have suffered enormously in the wake of Saddam's overthrow.

Every exit poll last Tuesday said the same thing: Most Americans do not believe the Iraq conflict is good for the country. Some believe our military action was immoral, but most simply want victory, not stalemate, in Iraq.

The thinking behind that lies in the deep respect most Americans have for the U.S. military. I mean, who in their right mind wants to see soldiers and marines killed and maimed for a campaign that is still chaotic after three and a half years? Left-wing loons aside, clear thinking Americans are willing to accept war if the violence is justified and benefits the country. But this Iraq deal remains unresolved, and there is little good news coming out of Baghdad.

As I mentioned in this space a few weeks ago, the Iraqi people have not stepped up to control the terrorists in their midst. It does not take three years to train a national police force or even a standing army for that matter. Corruption and religious hatred is rife in Iraq. A country that was deemed "secular" and desiring of freedom by U.S. intelligence has turned out to be a place of ancient hatreds and incredible, mindless violence.

You don't see the Muslims of Afghanistan, as primitive as that country is, drilling holes in each other's heads and forming roving death squads. At least the Afghans are giving

democracy a chance by not embracing the Taliban uprising coming out of Pakistan, or protecting homicide bombers who can paralyze any free society.

But millions of Iraqis are either too afraid or too apathetic to join their countrymen who simply want to live in peace and freedom. How many hateful Iraqi Mullahs are ordering their brainwashed minions to kill innocent people? How many crooked cops and military people are creating fear and loathing by committing loathsome crimes?

There is no army in the world that can impose democracy or any other kind of government on an unwilling population. Remember, the Soviets brutalized Afghanistan using hundreds of thousands of troops and a ruthless secret police, but could not make communism acceptable there.

So the Bush administration is caught in a situation that once looked like a "slam dunk," to use former CIA Director George Tenet's phrase, but has now evolved into an election-turning debacle.

However, a bad situation could rapidly become worse if ideologically crazed politicians implement policies that give the terrorists a major victory. Remember, Iraq is a stalemate, not a defeat. The terrorists can strut around all they want, but Saddam is facing the gallows and Iran is not controlling the Gulf oil flow—at least not yet.

President Bush is correct when he says that Iraq is now the central battlefield in the war on terror. And the demise of Donald Rumsfeld finally signals that a new strategy might be on horizon.

All Americans should hope so. Fighting Islamic fascism is the most important issue in the world today. We'll now see if the Democrats have a better idea as to how to do that.