

# *I*

## **A Woman Dictator?**

### **Hillary Rodham Clinton**

#### **"Madame Secretary" - Hillary Rodham Clinton**

President-elect Barack Obama is considering the New York senator, Senate Armed Services Committee member, former presidential contender and former first lady for secretary of state<sup>A</sup> - an appointment that would go a long way toward healing the wounds left by their bruising Democratic primary.

Obama plans to wait until after Thanksgiving before officially announcing the nomination because the full national security team is still being worked out, and he wanted to have all the members in place first.

After it was evident that Clinton would not have the necessary votes to secure the Democratic nomination, her aides and legions of supporters began to campaign for other top positions in the Obama administration. Clinton had much to offer, politically, as well as influencing the outcome of Obama's bid for the Presidency. Her millions of loyal supporters, especially women, Hispanics and blue collar crowd were critical to ensure Obama's victory.

Once the decision to drop out of the Presidential race was made, Hillary quickly and aggressively campaigned for Obama's election. For the past eight years Hillary has shown this type of middle-of-the-road diplomacy within the US Senate, garnering bipartisan praise repetitively. As fellow New Yorker Donald Trump might say, she knows the art of the deal – remain flexible and think big, really big.

Clinton has aggressively pursued the secretary of state slot and mounted an all-out sales campaign amid fears the job might be slipping away. Former Clinton campaign aides and some of her inner-circle advisers - aka *Hillaryland* - were part of a coordinated effort to win her the top State Department post. These Clinton allies were e-mailing and working the phones with Obama contacts, appearing on cable TV and leaking optimistic scenarios

---

<sup>A</sup> In accordance with the United States Constitution, the Secretary performs such duties as the President requires. These include negotiating with foreign representatives and instructing U.S. embassies or consulates abroad. The Secretary also serves as a principal adviser to the President in the determination of U.S. foreign policy and, in recent decades, has become responsible for overall direction, coordination, and supervision of interdepartmental activities of the U.S. Government overseas, excepting certain military activities.

As the highest-ranking member of the cabinet, the Secretary of State is fourth in line to succeed the Presidency, coming after the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the President pro tempore of the Senate.

to the media. All you have to do is pay attention and see how they are operating, and it looks like a planned-out campaign.

By Thursday, November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2008, reports were coming in that Obama had vetted and reassured Clinton that as secretary of state she would have direct access to him and could select her own staff.

"She feels like she's been treated very well in the way she's been asked," said a close associate of Clinton, who like most others interviewed asked for anonymity because the nomination will not be formally announced until after Thanksgiving, November 27, 2008. Confidants to Clinton said Friday that she had decided to give up her Senate seat to become secretary of state in the Obama administration.

[Confidants, informants, anonymous tipsters, un-cited media sources – all weapons in the Clinton arsenal, meant to influence both the general public and politicians. Hillary has learned her lessons well from husband Bill, leak your own positive information far and wide, and then attack your adversary quickly and as often as necessary to drown out their voice.]

Her appointment would be yet another vertical direction in the unlikely journey of a former political spouse in Arkansas who went on to build a political base of her own and become a symbol of achievement to many women. "At long last, the feminist icon would represent the feminist ideal of getting a room of her own, all on her own."<sup>1</sup>

The role, though a supporting one, would make her one of the most influential players on the international stage, and it would represent at least one more act for one of the nation's most prominent public families, as former President Bill Clinton would also become an ad hoc member of the Obama team.

"She's ready," one of Clinton's confidants said.

In the Obama-Clinton relationship, advisers say, the relatively smooth nature of their talks about the secretary of state job indicate that both, for now, have a working chemistry. The advisers say that Obama was clearly interested in bringing a rival under his wing, and that he also recognized that Clinton had far more discipline and focus than her husband.

At the same time, Obama's advisers said, he had the self-confidence to name a global brand as his emissary to the world. He recognizes, they said, that he will have to build the kind of relationship that ensures that foreign leaders know that when Clinton speaks, she is speaking directly for him.

*When Hillary speaks, she will be speaking as the President.*

### **A Woman Dictator? - Hillary Rodham Clinton**

Warning others of danger is not easy. *Chicken Little*<sup>2 3</sup> had an acorn fall on her head and believed it was the sky itself falling. She saw danger where none truly existed and her foolish ranting, rather than being helpful, actually caused hurt to others. *The Boy That Cried Wolf*<sup>4</sup> warned of danger so often, that when real danger arose, no one believed his warning. And in *The Emperor's New Clothes*<sup>5</sup> the young lad that spoke up about what he saw, told the King the truth about his condition, faced humiliation and possibly worse consequences – all for his forth-telling.

Despite the oft knee-jerk reactions by some conservatives (remember the tirades about Tele-Tubbies<sup>6 7</sup> and Sponge Bob<sup>8</sup> being pro-gay?), when they warn of perils that Hillary Clinton may cause our nation, maybe they have it right this time. Perhaps for the wrong reasons, but they still might be correct in saying she will bring the nation to ruin.

Hillary Clinton is an inspiration for this book; she has also been the villain, the bogey-man, the Tonton-Macoute, and the black hat of the religious right and typically conservative moral majority<sup>9</sup>.

With all the inaccurate, sensationalized diatribes about the end-of-the-world and/or the Middle East “crisis,” possibly nobody is listening anymore.<sup>10 11</sup> What a sad irony, the world at large perishes because both the secular and religious communities commissioned to warn us have prophesied falsely for so long (for their own gain), that our hearing has grown dull.

Jesus prophesied that after he left the earth false prophets and false christs would come - and both would “*deceive many.*” (Matthew 24:23-28) What is a “christ?” The term *christ, christos*, the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew *Messias*, means “anointed.” Today the term would be equivalent to charismatic, energetic, goal-driven, zealous, enthusiastic etc. Those terms could be applied to every modern leader, ruler, or religious authority that promises change, reforms or a better way of life.

“Is Hillary Clinton  
a *christ*?”

By definition, Steve Jobs could be considered as a “christ.” – Is Hillary Clinton a “christ?” Both are dynamic and charismatic leaders extremely proficient in the keeping of public opinion. Now, I do not personally know these two, but I can see them on television, hear them on the radio or audio files, and I can say they are visionary pioneers. Each has very loyal, “never surrender, never-say-die” followers.

As I said, I may not know them personally, nor have experienced a one-on-one meeting or encounter with them, but I can certainly see their effects upon the masses. In the Fall of 1993 I heard Hillary Clinton in person at the Augusta Civic Center, when she was pitching her health care reform program and her “it takes a village” approach to family and child rearing. Why did I go? I had heard about an obscure prophecy made by William Branham in 1933 and I thought to myself...maybe, just maybe...

The prophecy went like this:

"I said, 'Remember, in that day, before the end time comes, before the end time comes, that a woman... Now, you all keep this wrote down. There'll be a great powerful woman raise up, either be President, or dictator, or some great powerful woman in this United States. And [America] she'll sink under the influence of women. Now, you remember; that's THUS SAITH THE LORD.'" <sup>12</sup>

The prophecy describes this woman as cruel in heart, cold, and calculating. It says that her time of leadership might go beyond high cabinet post influence, that she would behave more like a dictator. Her presence would signal the end and would perhaps contribute to the cataclysmic destruction of the United States (a different prophecy) during the "Last Days."

I thought, "Which woman has a personality and power base to be or do this?" Former U.S. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, Geraldine Ferraro, Dianne Feinstein, Oprah Winfrey, Sarah Palin (just kidding – I couldn't resist), or U.S. House of Representatives Speaker Nancy Pelosi? All of these are successful and talented women; each a little hard or harsh at times (except Palin), but none carried enough clout or had enough popularity to rule America, especially like a dictator. But, Hillary Rodham Clinton... So I went to hear her, to see her, to experience her presence – for it would take more than words or sound bites to draw people under her spell. Nearly all contemporary leaders have been powerful public speakers, swaying people with the magic of their anointed words and believable unswerving conviction.

I went and I was conquered...until the end. Hillary held her audience spellbound; she had the audience in that large, packed indoor stadium swept up in her enthusiasm. It was not the health-care reforms (though that was and is an important issue), the magic was in *her belief* in the health care issue. She seemed crazed, angry, and passionate; she was a believer, she was anointed – she was a *christ*.

What snapped me back to reality were her actions, her ruthless behavior, and through extension, the audience's behavior towards a *non-politico* mother that questioned Clinton's "it takes a village" diatribe. This woman from the unwashed masses dared challenge *the Hillary*. She calmly, but clearly disagreed with Hillary in the open, public forum of Q & A after the speech. Hillary shut the woman down and turned all her angry zeal upon this mother that felt the family, not the community or the state was the better caretaker. Whew! It was not pretty, not presidential – it looked and felt dictatorial.

At that moment I could close my eyes and imagine Idi Amin, or Hitler or any other ruler that truly cannot stand being opposed. I know that is strong and harsh and maybe unwarranted, but it is how I felt at the moment and all that I read currently and objectively leads me to believe she has the temperament and potential to fulfill this prophecy.

### **The Need to Believe**

I think it is in our nature to believe in something, and in someone. We want to believe in our parents, our civic and religious leaders, a God or Higher Power. It is such a deep instinct that for most people it takes a lot of associated negative events to shake us from a belief or from believing in a person or an institution. Even when our “faith” is shaken, we do not stop “believing”-period. No, our loyalties simply change.

If my PC computer crashes too many times, or Microsoft comes out with one too many version updates and I really get fed up, I will switch to Apple and become a Mac convert. I will swear by the uncrashable Mac OS system, tell how even the “Windows” and other graphical aspects of the user interface (UI) was an Apple idea (true).<sup>13 14</sup> I will talk about the freshness and relativity of Apple products (the iPod and the iPhone etc.), and I will point you to my helmsman, the charismatic visionary and *christ* Steve Jobs.

Yes, we not only *want* to believe, I think we *need* to believe.

Is Hillary Clinton evil, like say, Hitler or Pol Pot was evil? No, I do not think so. But is she cruel-hearted, calculated, obsessive, vindictive, domineering, and possibly unscrupulous in her progress to achieve her quest? In my opinion – Yes! Emphatically, Yes!

Hitler had a platform that pandered to only a few people or a certain group, many of his ideas and delusions were beyond bizarre. Why did people believe him? Simply, *he believed*, and therefore was believable.

Mark Twain said “The most outrageous lies that can be invented will find believers if a man only tells them with all his might.”<sup>15</sup> It is classic, basic psychology of human behavior, much like the story *Chicken Little*. “The sky is falling, the sky is falling” said Chicken Little with complete conviction. She believed, and soon she had a following.

“We believe whatever we want to believe.”<sup>16</sup>

Mass hysteria is not solely isolated to past history; there are plenty of modern occurrences as well. The Jewish Question, the Salem Witch Trials, The Stanford Prison Experiment, the original “War of the Worlds” broadcast, and more recently the Duke Lacrosse gang-rape frenzy – all examples of mass action based on erroneous or harmful beliefs. It is not too difficult to visualize the current Hillary Rodham Clinton or Barak Obama for President Movements.

### **The Effects of a Hillary Clinton Presidency**

How will Hillary Clinton ruin or destroy America? I really cannot specifically say. Some say that she concurred with much, if not all of the executive decisions made by her husband and former President Bill Clinton. If that is so, then she will continue what some believe to have been a conspiracy by her husband, to systematically weaken the nation though the *1991 Presidential Nuclear Initiative*,<sup>17 18</sup> by:

- **Eliminating the entire inventory of ground-launched non-strategic nuclear weapons (nuclear artillery and Lance surface-to-surface missiles).**
- **Removing all nonstrategic nuclear weapons from surface ships, attack submarines and land-based naval aircraft bases.**
- **Removing strategic bombers from alert.**
- **Standing down the Minuteman II ICBMs scheduled for deactivation under Start I.**
- **Terminating the mobile Peacekeeper and mobile small ICBM programs.**
- **Terminating the SCRAM-II nuclear short-range attack missile.**
- **Limiting B-2 production to 20 bombers.**
- **Cancelling the entire small ICBM program.**
- **Ceasing production of W-88 Trident SLBM (submarine-launched missile) warheads.**
- **Halting purchases of advanced cruise missiles.**
- **And stopping new production of Peacekeeper missiles (our biggest MIRV-warhead ICBM).**

A conspiracy? Research (detailed later in this section) indicates that the Clinton *presidencies* (plural) were planned, and therefore by definition is a conspiracy. Not necessarily a conspiracy in legal terms, but when people plan, plot, scheme or enter into a semi-secret accord, it is a *conspiracy*.

Despite Hillary's flat, cold, even off-putting demeanor, on January 20, 2009, many believed and feared that Hillary Rodham Clinton would be sworn in as the 44th President of the United States. Though that will not happen in 2009, she will keep her ambitions alive and her chances even greater by becoming Obama's Secretary of State. Her future Presidential election will be due to her Machiavellian determination to surmount all the obstacles between her and the Oval Office, by any means necessary. She will continue to reinvent herself as much and as often as necessary to insure political survival and her run for the presidency.

In the introduction of *Her Way* - a new biography on Hillary Clinton by Jeff Gerth and Don Van Natta<sup>19</sup> - the authors report:

*More than three decades ago, in the earliest days of their romance, Bill and Hillary struck a plan, one that would become both the foundation and the engine of their relationship. They agreed to work together to revolutionize the Democratic Party and ultimately make the White House their home. Once their "twenty-year project" was realized, with Bill's victory in 1992, their plan became even more ambitious: eight years as president for him, then eight years for her. Their audacious pact has remained a secret until now.*

What is the source for this claim? According to the authors, it is renowned historian Taylor Branch:

*By the summer of 1993, the ways of Washington, sometimes, called Potomac fever, had not dissuaded Bill or Hillary. According to one of their closest friends, Taylor Branch, they still planned two terms in the White House for Bill and, later, two for Hillary. Branch described the plan to two Washington friends, John Henry and Ann Crittenden, over a barbeque dinner at a rodeo in Aspen, Colorado, that summer.*

One reviewer of the book *The Vast Right-wing Conspiracy's Dossier on Hillary Clinton*<sup>20</sup> said, "Hillary and her sponsors want to install her as ruler of America."

Later Taylor Branch back-pedaled, "did a crawdad" or just plain lied, when asked by The Washington Post to verify this remark.<sup>21</sup> He did what most politicians do, the infamous *2-step Potomac Shuffle* – privately saying one thing, publically stating another. It appears that someone remembered a candid conversation made in private from which Mr. Branch wanted to distance himself. That sounds vaguely familiar to "Senator, I have no recollection of that!" "No recollection" is typically invoked by governmental officials during sworn testimony to the U.S. Congress denying potentially damaging -- political and/or criminal -- behavior.

Even if Hillary never becomes a sitting president, she has already wielded unbelievable power and influenced countless cabinet-level decisions as First Lady for eight years. Apart from her vicarious decision making, in the near future she stands to become the international representative of the United States and *the* voice of the President as U.S. Secretary of State. Did that prophecy by William Branham suggest that a woman might go beyond sanctioned political roles and raise up to be a *dictator*? Can you imagine how preposterous that must have sounded in 1933? Morality and conventionality were still the norm - During the 1930's, in many parts of the country men were arrested for indecent exposure for going bare-chested in public.<sup>22 23</sup> The majority of women did not even work outside of the home, still wore dresses, not pants or shorts or their underwear outside of their clothes.<sup>24 25</sup>

Women were for the most part considered someone's daughter, wife or mother<sup>26 27</sup> – not leaders of nations, especially not having such power and authority to become a dictator! During this time even the Motion Picture Association lived by a code (The Hays Code)<sup>28</sup> that strongly restricted immorality, indecency, profanity and even forbad taking God's name in vain. It also forbad any behavioral representation that might denigrate or injure the "institution of marriage and the home."<sup>29</sup>

Let's forget about a dictatorship for a moment. A Gallup Poll was taken in 1937 asking Americans if "a qualified woman ran for office, would you vote her?" Only 33% said they would.<sup>30</sup>

How could a prophecy like this be made, except were it not for the inspiration and direction of the Spirit of God? I think the Almighty provided a warning that would be needed at a later time and in a day of such moral breakdown.

Hillary Clinton may directly destroy America or she may only be one insignificant piece of the Last Days puzzle. Her political leadership and/or possible future presidency could be events in a series of events that act like a chain reaction. *What more obvious of a sign could God give in warning America and even the world than a woman rising to power in a patriarchal society, with an all-male presidential club? It is so unique, it catches your attention, and it forces you to think.*

This is not 1933 or 1937 - Seventy years have transpired since the initial prophecy and a massive shift in popular opinion has occurred. Our politicians are no longer held to a high standard of morality, nor are the norms of a traditional Judea-Christian nation observed. Seventy years have erased the 33% polling opinion and in two recent polls conducted, nearly ninety percent (90%) of respondents today said they would vote for a woman commander in chief.<sup>31 32</sup>

William Branham said that God had been warning America since 1933 and that America had “rejected” God in 1956.<sup>33</sup> It has been fifty years since that time. Fifty years in the Bible represented a *Jubilee*.<sup>34</sup> A jubilee was when all slaves were offered their freedom, they had the choice to go free or remain slaves. Yes, they could actually choose to remain slaves! If they chose to remain with their “master” a ceremony took place where the slave was taken to a wooden post and an awl (or sharp nail) pierced through an earlobe. This symbolized that the slave could no longer “hear” any future calls for freedom. The slave would remain a slave forever.<sup>35</sup>

Is God offering this great nation an opportunity to be set free, only to have her refuse His freedom, to remain servants of sin and to corrupt systems and institutions? Hillary Clinton’s election signifies an acceptance of an immoral leadership and lifestyle and a rejection of morality, integrity and ultimately God; and it would appear America through her choice, is setting a course for her own destruction.

Interestingly, there are many people today from diverse camps that are writing about Hillary Clinton as a Dictator, Empress and the like, either directly through factual analysis or indirectly as the subject for a fictional character. In Chuck Slate’s book, *Caution! Hillary – America’s First Dictator* he says that he had done extensive research into the dynamics of dictatorships and felt that the actions and character of Hillary Clinton were suggestive of a dictator. He says; “DO NOT underestimate the tenacity, the ruthlessness, the need for power and the lack of conscience of Hillary Clinton!” (emphasis by author). He goes on to say that she has “the backbone” for a dictatorship. The works of Carl Limbacher (*Hillary’s Scheme*) and Anne Coulter (*Treason*) provide additional reference material and a factual basis to Mr. Slate’s assertions of a pending dictatorship.<sup>36</sup>

Look what others in the political realm say about Hillary Clinton:

“She’s the most calculating person in modern politics...”<sup>37</sup>

“[Voters] are likely to see her for what she is: an aggressive, calculating, insincere, opportunistic, and exceptionally liberal woman.”<sup>38</sup>

“She’s cold, scarily calculating...”<sup>39</sup>

When I say a dictatorship, it is not meant to imply the establishment of one person through the use of force. Rather a quasi-totalitarian dictatorship form of government; a dictatorship by and of someone that wields the power of Head of State with unyielding inflexibility and myopia.

In her book *The Vast Right-Wing Conspiracies Dossier on Hillary Clinton* and during both a *Hannity & Colmes* interview (October 13, 2006)<sup>40</sup> and *The Big Story with John Gibson* on Fox News (October 16, 2006)<sup>41</sup> author Amanda Carpenter describes the abuses of power Hillary and Bill Clinton participated in during his White House years, as well as their post-Presidency years. In the October 13, 2006 interview, guest host and *National Review* editor Rich Lowry makes this observation; “Everything she [Hillary Clinton] does seems so calculated.”

The Clintons have been in government most of their adult lives and are experts at playing the political system. None of their machinations seems to have "just happened" by accident. As Peggy Noonan wrote, “they have learned a number of things in their life in politics, but one of the biggest is this: They can do anything.”<sup>42</sup> They have learned that if they are willing to let any dirty secret be aired out publically, after a short while people forget. They have learned the key to modern political survivability. Hillary is putting all her hard-earned lessons into use for her presidential election. Her election campaign has the look and feel of something meticulously planned, long ago, at the highest levels. Franklin Roosevelt is attributed to saying, "*If anything happens in politics, you can bet it was planned that way in a smoke-filled room*".<sup>43</sup>

How far will Hillary Clinton go in obtaining the presidency? In a fictional work, Dr. Richard Little, author of *The Empress Project*, says “An American woman, guided to evil by Satan, secretly becomes the willing agent of the Red Chinese, infiltrates and subverts the American Government at the highest levels, and with active guidance and assistance of her Chinese Communist masters plots to completely take over America's government from within and become the Empress of America.”<sup>44</sup> How far will she go? As far as she needs to and, according to Dr. Little, she’ll even sell her soul to the devil if need be.

Though *The Empress Project* is a fictionalization of the influences that shape contemporary political figures, it has the breadth of an op-ed essay well versed in political affairs at the national and international level. It provides in-depth fly-on-the-wall characterizations of pivotal contemporary events affecting our nation at its core; the author weaves a plausible scenario that leaves the reader stunned and wanting to know more. At one level the book operates as a crime novel played out on the grand stage of Presidential politics, and at another level the book provides a study in the psychoanalysis of deceit. After reading this book one would have to say that Thomas Jefferson was correct – “eternal vigilance”<sup>45</sup> against the excesses of tyrants is fully warranted.

One reviewer (Christopher N. Hatley)<sup>46</sup> says this about *The Empress Project*; “a must read for any American who wants to know about the inner workings of the Hillary Clinton political machine.” Mr. Hatley says that he has conversed with the author Dr. Little and that his work was offered as fiction for several reasons. The answer is because those who provided him with his information based it on their intimate/firsthand knowledge of that which Hillary and her cronies have been doing.

Thus, the author's contributors are unwilling to put their names into the public forum, in association with this project, for fear of retribution or retaliation. Once you read the book, you will understand that their apprehensions are not only justified but also very prudent.

However, it is readily obvious, if you know anything about the events of the Clintons' continuing rise to power (namely Hillary's), that there is very little of a fictitious nature in what Richard Little conveys to the reader. The author stated to Mr. Hatley that, "The book is probably about 95% fact."<sup>47</sup>

Edward Gibbons, said in his *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, the major reason for the fall of the 1,200-year-old Roman Empire was a secret conspiracy within government itself. All the while the conspirators were wreaking their damage, they masterfully deceived the citizens of the Empire through lies, scoffing at the stupidity of anyone who would dare suggest conspiracy.<sup>48</sup> Ms. Clinton has been very vocal in diverting attention away from herself and accusing others, especially the “Right-Wing Conspiracy groups” of trying to damage her and her husband’s reputation.<sup>49</sup>

She certainly appears to have the personality to fit the characteristics of this cruel, cold-hearted, dictator-like leader.

Researchers at Saint John’s University and the College of Saint Benedict performed an indirect personality assessment on Hillary Clinton in April 2000 using the Millon Inventory of Diagnostic Criteria and identified her primary personality patterns to be “Ambitious/superior and Dominant/controlling,” she also has had some situation-specific “Contentious and Distrusting features.” Her major personality strengths in a political role are her “confident assertiveness and commanding presence”. Her major personality-based shortcomings are a “lack of empathy and congeniality, uncompromising assertiveness, and cognitive inflexibility”.<sup>50</sup>

Theodore Millon, the distinguished contemporary personality theorist, asserts that dominant personalities enjoy the power to direct others and to evoke obedience and respect from them. They tend to be tough and unsentimental, and derive satisfaction from acts that *dictate* and direct the lives of others. Millon's theory illuminates the darker recesses of Clinton's dominant, controlling character type: a penchant for perceptual and cognitive distortion; a demeaning of cooperative behavior and affection.



*Hillary Clinton as the Dictator in YouTube Spoof (from Apple's 1984 commercial)<sup>51</sup>*

This video is a spoof of Apple's famous 1984 Super Bowl ad, this time with Hillary Clinton portrayed as the monotonous dictator droning on and on. In the end, the video plugs Barack Obama.

Jacob Weisberg said that Hillary faces a genuine electability<sup>52</sup> issue, one that has little to do with ideology, woman-hating, or her choice of life partner. Plainly put, it is her personality. In her four years in the Senate, Hillary has proven herself to be capable, diligent, formidable, effective, and shrewd. She can make Republican colleagues sound like star-struck teenagers. But she still lacks a key quality that a politician cannot achieve through hard work: likability. As hard as she tries, Hillary has little facility for connecting with ordinary folk, for making them feel that she understands, identifies, and is at some level one of them. You may admire and respect her. But it is hard not to find Hillary a bit inhuman. Whatever she may be like in private, her public persona is calculating, clenched, relentless—and a little robotic.

Then how does one explain the fact that despite her many, many documented faults and flaws, Hillary Clinton at one point was the Democratic frontrunner and the candidate to beat from both major Parties; Or that in her quest for the 2008 presidency she was able to garner the support of millions of primary voters and win 23 states? Or on a much more recent note, how does she go from being a junior Senator with little actual experience or personal accomplishment, to forth in line to the presidency?

I know she has tremendous press corps connections and a vast network of political savvy supporters. I know she is a political survivor and a political chameleon. But, the only explanation I can offer that fully accounts for her ascendancy to the pinnacle of our political system is that a spiritual blindness is upon the hearts and minds of the populace.

Our culture is riddled with deception. It is everywhere, as illustrated by outlandish advertising claims like diet loss programs, wrinkle removers, sexual enhancers, "how to play the piano instantly"<sup>53</sup>, etc. Sometimes it is easy to see through the falsehood (as in the claim that one can play the piano instantly). Unfortunately, however, most deception is not quite so easy to detect.

Satan deceived Eve by causing her to make her decision based on what she could see and on what her emotions and her flawed reasoning told her to be right, even though it was not established with facts or actually truthful.

Deception was....and still is....crucial to Satan's strategy. According to Jesus, it is the devil's very nature to deceive:

*[The devil] was a murderer from the beginning, not holding to the truth, for there is no truth in him. When he lies, he speaks his native language, for he is a liar and the father of lies. (John 8:44)*

For reasons we cannot fully understand, Satan chose to target the woman for his strategy of deception. Twice in the New Testament the apostle Paul points out that it was the woman who was deceived: *“The serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty”* (2 Corinthians 11:3); *“Adam was not the one deceived; it was the woman who was deceived”* (1 Timothy 2:14).

Some theologians believe there was something in the way Eve was created that made her more vulnerable to deception...that she was inherently more “tempt-able,” or “seducible.” Others suggest that because God had given her a specific role within the male-female relationship and after her fall had placed her under the authority of her husband, once she stepped out from under that spiritual covering and away from authority, she was more easily deceived.

Regardless, the point is that women seem to be primary targets of Satan’s deception. Remember that he did not first approach the man; he deliberately approached and deceived the woman. It was the woman who led her husband into sin, and together they led the whole human race into sin (though Adam, as head or leader, was held ultimately responsible). I believe there is something significant about that progression and that, to this day, there is a unique sense in which Satan targets women for deception. This is part of his strategy. He knows that if women accept his deception, they can then influence the men (and other women) around them towards wrong and harmful things, and those choices will set a pattern for subsequent generations to follow.

Sometimes, as was the case with Eve, Satan deceives directly. Sometimes, however, he uses other people as instruments of deception.

In the fifth chapter of Ephesians, Paul warns, *“Let no one deceive you with empty words”* (v. 6). Repeatedly, he challenges God’s people to speak truth to one another. When we are not honest with each other, we actually do Satan’s work for him, acting as his agents, deceiving and destroying each other.

There are no harmless lies. We cannot expose ourselves to the world’s false, deceptive way of thinking and come out unscathed. Eve’s first mistake was not eating the fruit from the tree of knowledge; her first mistake was listening to the Serpent, a.k.a. the Devil.

Listening to counsel or ways of thinking that are not truthful is the first step in developing wrong beliefs that will ultimately impact our behaviors. Hillary Clinton employs a similar strategy as Joseph Goebbels, Hitler's propaganda director did, "Tell a lie big enough and keep repeating it, people will eventually come to believe it."<sup>54</sup> Once we have listened to a lie enough, we can begin to believe it and then we are on the road to mental and oftentimes spiritual slavery.

Believe the lie and finally we become damned. This is how the Bible describes the chain of consequences for believing lies. More specifically this passage describes key events in what many Christians call “The Last Days” or “End Times.”

2 Thessalonians 2: 7-12

*For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved.*

*And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: That they all might be damned who believed not the truth...*

I am not implying that Hillary Clinton is THE Antichrist. Her career happens to co-exist with a powerful spiritual influence prevalent in the earth to believe lies, and a deception that clouds mankind’s reasoning. She benefits from this spirit of deception upon the world. This spirit is inevitably and ultimately going to deceive the majority of the world’s inhabitants to believe in a grand and final leader who promises peaceful solutions to conflicts, famine and other major calamities.

Surprisingly, believing lies is easier than you might imagine. Dr. Anthony P. Young, national president of the Association of Black Psychologists and a specialist in forensic psychology, says "Individuals construct reality in their own mind. If you believe something is true, it becomes true regardless of what the facts are."

He says that lies are often more believable than the truth because people have a huge capacity for denial. "It's easier for a person to accept something when it is similar to what they believe. Individuals tend to deny certain facts which contradict what they want to believe."<sup>55</sup>

For a long time our society has held the belief that women are the gentler, nurturing, more caring gender of the human species. To believe the truth that women lie, cheat, steal, and molest statistically as often as men and commit crimes as often as men<sup>56</sup> does not fit our stereotype and thus we change the truth and believe a lie – citing research bias or newspaper slant etc. Current research indicates that not only do women have the capacity to break the law, but they are keeping pace with men in criminal activity other than violent crimes (murder and rape).

When compared to men, women seem to be committing the crimes of embezzlement, fraud, forgery, and larceny at a rate comparable to men.<sup>57</sup> Though women generally commit less violent crimes than men, they certainly do commit them, and at a rate of one out of every five.<sup>58 59</sup> In 2006 alone, that twenty percent would account for seventy-one

thousand violent crimes – a violent crime was committed by a woman every ten minutes in America.<sup>60</sup>

“Counter-attitudinal advocacy”<sup>61</sup> – that is what dissonance researchers call the ancient practice of self deception, and its name implies we have to work to change our attitudes before we can accept a lie. Our society does not want to believe that Hillary Clinton or women in general are liars, thieves and cold-blooded criminals. So we believe her lies and her handlers’ lies, rather than accept the truth about her reported and documented criminality.

External and internal misinformation is precisely why people find lies believable, contends Dr. Bette J. Dickerson:

"When people are bombarded with false information by the gate keepers and power brokers of information, such as the media, people will start believing it," argues Dickerson, chair of the Department of Sociology at American University in Washington, D.C. "If we get enough false information, myths and untruths long enough, which we do, we will come to believe it because that's all we know. What we believe, though false, will become true in its consequences."<sup>62</sup>

She says that many people stray from challenging lies just to keep the peace:

"In our learning how to live, we're not educated to question, challenge or even `revolt' against pieces of false information that disrupt the status quo. This is because that allows us to avoid controversial issues. Few human beings want lives filled with drama. People will resist change in long-held established beliefs that are based on falsehood because it maintains a `proper order, proper functioning.'<sup>63</sup> So the beat goes on, and ‘Hillary for President’ with it.”

After interviewing many of Clinton’s associates for a *New Yorker* article, Connie Bruck concluded, “In the end, the sureness about her own judgment—at its extreme, a sense that she alone is wise—is probably Hillary’s cardinal trait.”<sup>64</sup>

Childhood nicknames sometimes provide a useful index of an individual’s ingrained, central personality traits. Among their mock predictions for seniors, Hillary Rodham’s high school newspaper proclaimed that Hillary’s destiny was to become a nun named “Sister Frigidaire.” As Gail Sheehy has commented, “Empathy was not characteristic of Hillary.”<sup>65</sup>

In 1957, during a message entitled *God Keeps His Word* William Branham reiterates the prophecy he made in 1933; He says “And I seen a woman lying, vulgar as she was, and dominated the country. And I predict that a woman will either be President, or do, or come into great power of some sort in the United States before the total annihilation of the world. Keep that in mind, and I have said it. Notice, now, what takes place? Jezebel, she ruled Ahab.”<sup>66</sup>

*If Hillary Clinton is the one, the object in and of the prophecy, she will knowingly or unwittingly fulfill events that lead our country and the world to the brink of destruction.*

### **The Slippery Slope Argument**

A slippery slope argument is a kind of argument that warns you if you take a first step, you will find yourself involved in a sticky sequence of consequences from which you will be unable to extricate yourself, and eventually you will wind up speeding faster and faster towards some disastrous outcome. Given a favorable climate of social acceptance, one first step, if taken, may trigger a contagious sequence of steps, ultimately leading to a parade of horrors such as gay marriage, abortion on demand or a police state.

The slippery slope arguments depend on a strong presumption in favor of the status quo, and thus are invoked only when someone advocates departing from the status quo (extending marriage rather than preserving it).

Some believe if we reduce diligence, that reduction in civil liberties in order to combat terrorism will result in dictatorship, or relaxation in our sexual conventions will lead to abandon and lasciviousness. The slippery slope argument is therefore a warning not to abandon the legal and moral conventions on which our Country was founded, or we will find ourselves sliding in the direction of an immoral police state within a modern Babylon.

Some “steps” or events may not even be obvious or easily recognizable as “bad” or “evil” or “treasonous” to the average citizen. Hitler’s torture and extermination of Jews, Gypsies, the aged and the mentally ill was evidently cruel and evil, yet many events and indoctrination seemed logical and justified to many individuals. More importantly, the policy that was discussed and eventually put into force was innocuous and innocent and on its face. Few could have foretold the dire consequences of such a doctrine or policy.

Consider the Balfour Doctrine, the American policy of non-intervention; Recall Britain’s decision to sack Churchill and install the weak, pandering Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain who would eventually collude with Hitler and bargain away Hungary and Poland - or even the subservient mentality that developed in the American citizenry through the Great Depression and Roosevelt’s socialization by and of the government. Each of these had far-reaching consequences and collectively factored into the horrible events perpetrated by Germany during World War Two.

Most do not realize that it was American and Canadian doctrine that provided the inspiration and justification of Germany’s policies of sterilization and genocide. From its inception eugenics was supported by prominent people, including Alexander Graham Bell, George Bernard Shaw, Winston Churchill and Adolf Hitler. Eugenics was an academic discipline at many colleges and universities. Funding was provided by prestigious sources such as the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Institute of Washington, and the Harriman family.<sup>67</sup>

One of the first acts by Adolf Hitler after achieving total control over the German state was to pass the Law for the Prevention of Hereditarily Diseased Offspring (*Gesetz zur Verhütung erbkranken Nachwuchses*) in July 1933. [The law was signed in by Hitler himself, and over 200 eugenic courts were created specifically as a result of the law.]

Under the German law, any doctor in the Reich was required to report patients of theirs who were mentally retarded, mentally ill (including schizophrenia and manic depression), epileptic, blind, deaf, or physically deformed, and a steep monetary penalty was imposed for any patients who were not properly reported. Individuals suffering from alcoholism or Huntington's Chorea could also be sterilized. The individual's case was then presented in front of a court of Nazi officials and public health officers who would review their medical records, take testimony from friends and colleagues, and eventually decide whether or not to order a sterilization operation performed on the individual, using force if necessary. Though not explicitly covered by the law, 400 mixed-race "Rhineland Bastards" were also sterilized beginning in 1937.<sup>68</sup>

By the end of World War II, over 400,000 individuals were sterilized under the German law and its revisions, most within its first four years of being enacted. When the issue of compulsory sterilization was brought up at the Nuremberg trials after the war, many Nazis defended their actions on the matter by indicating that it was the United States itself from whom they had taken inspiration.

The first country to concertedly undertake compulsory sterilization programs for the purpose of eugenics was the United States. The principal targets of the American program were the mentally retarded and the mentally ill, but also targeted under many state laws were the deaf, the blind, the epileptic, and the physically deformed. Native Americans were sterilized against their will in many states, often without their knowledge, while they were in a hospital for some other reason (e.g. after giving birth). Some sterilization also took place in prisons and other penal institutions, targeting criminality, but they were in the relative minority. In the end, over 65,000 individuals were sterilized in 33 states under state compulsory sterilization programs in the United States.<sup>69</sup>

California sterilized more people than any other state by a wide margin, and was responsible for over a third of all sterilization operations. Information about the California sterilization program was produced into book form and widely disseminated by eugenicists E.S. Gosney and Paul B. Popenoe, which was said by the government of Adolf Hitler to be of key importance in proving that large-scale compulsory sterilization programs were feasible.<sup>70</sup>

California later apologized and eventually paid restitution to those forced to undergo compulsory sterilization. But could California or eugenicists Gosney & Popenoe ever have imagined that it was their ideas and policy that set in motion the annihilation of one third of the world's Jews and up to 42 million total people killed? No.

But when the history books were written by the victors, it was expeditious to place the full blame on Hitler and the Nazi regime. Little, if anything is ever taught in schools about America's part in the Nazi's genocide campaigns. Santayana said, "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."<sup>71</sup>

The problem we have today is that not only do most people not remember history; they probably never accurately learned it to begin with. Additionally, a new generation has arisen in the midst of an informational boom, a deluge of irrelevant knowledge that vies with truth. History has been "dumbed-down" and sanitized; it must pass the test of the "PC" (politically correct) enforcers before it reaches the desks of the schools and universities today. By the time "history" is taught, it has been spun, diluted and politicized so as the hard lessons are never learned.

### **Better Suited to Lead**

After the ratification of the Constitution, a philosophical feud developed between two of the leading architects of the American Revolution and the new nation: Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson believed that the "common man" [meaning farmers and tradesmen] were best suited to lead. On the other hand, Hamilton favored a nation led by "elitist," whom he considered better educated and better suited to rule.

Two hundred years ago Hamilton was widely known to have favored a highly centralized government, and a near-dictatorial executive branch. Fast-forward to Washington, DC 2008 -- the imperial presidency, judicial activism, the Federal Reserve System's institutionalized counterfeiting and fraud, the ever-metastasizing government debt, the expanding ranks of tax-subsidized corporate welfare parasites, the reduction of the states to docile administrative units of a national regime -- were inspired by, and are the fulfillment of, Hamilton's designs.

Though Hillary may dress-up like a Jeffersonian, she acts like a Hamiltonian. It is this author's opinion that Hillary Clinton truly believes that the government (read: Hillary Clinton) is more qualified to govern your life and your family's life than you are. In 1977 Hillary was part of the Carnegie Council for Children, which made this statement, "What would matter in the future of children was not the family structure, but the larger village of teachers, pediatricians, and social workers who would socialize the task of raising, supporting, and nurturing children."<sup>72</sup> In Hillary's world, parents would be subordinates to lawyers, judges, social workers and bureaucrats, which she believes are the true experts in child-rearing.

Hillary truly believes that children are in a "dependency relationship"<sup>73</sup> similar to that of earlier slaves and akin to the Indian reservation system. Children therefore are in need of governmental protection and emancipation as necessary to ensure their rights. Despite strong opposition to her ideas, years later she continued to defend her position. She said that it was not her interest for the government to interfere in mundane squabbles like taking out the trash or washing dishes, rather governmental intervention would involve important matters about "motherhood and abortion, schooling, cosmetic surgery,

treatment of venereal disease, or employment.” The *important* decisions should be made by the child with the government’s help, and not left for parents to make “unilaterally.”<sup>74</sup>

Why does this ideology matter? Set aside her belief that children should have the right to make their own decisions apart from their parents (which would translate to mean the right to abort their babies at will, or go to work in a saloon or brothel) – what is truly frightening is not the ideology but the reality of children’s right run amok. Her ideas are tangible today, lived out in courtrooms across America where the rights of parents and individual adults are overridden and even trampled on to advance legal advocates perceptions of the health and safety of the child. Given the overabundance of attorneys, a law-suit crazed society and the natural tendency of children to chafe at parental limits and discipline – children will and have already sued their parents over trivial issues. Taking out the trash as “involuntary servitude” is not too far away.

The Parent-Child bond will become defendant and plaintiff. The financial cost alone of one lawsuit will bankrupt the average family. In our country, and under the current conditions of a law-suit crazy society, if children are given the full rights of adults to sue, families as we know them will be destroyed in and by the adversarial legal system. Just as it had been prophesied 2000 years ago in Luke 12:53,

*The father shall be divided against the son, and the son against the father; the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother; the mother in law against her daughter in law, and the daughter in law against her mother in law.*

### **A Cautionary Tale**

June 14 of 2006, in Oaxaca, Mexico, that state's despot governor Ulises Ruiz attacked a peaceful encampment of thousands of striking schoolteachers and their supporters. He sent 3,000 police in at dawn, as the protesters slept, with bullets, nightsticks and teargas canisters shot from the ground and dropped from a helicopter. It was only the latest incident in a violent and repressive chain. Only this time, the public, armed with nothing but sticks and stones and strength in numbers, regrouped and chased the police out of the city. They established their own government by popular assembly, set up locally-organized and volunteer-staffed barricades in each neighborhood, and the governor's security forces were unable to enter - although they had tried on multiple occasions - for five months after that.

A 37-year-old reporter by the name of Brad Will, went to Oaxaca in early October 2006 to videotape the story. On October 27, 2006, he filmed gunmen loyal to the despot governor attacking one of the blockades and shooting their guns directly at him. It was believed that some of the attackers were plainclothes police. Will died during that attack, with his camera in his hand.

Brad, a constituent of New York's Junior United States Senator Hillary Clinton (D-New York) from 2001 until his death, continues to provide a lurid example of the

consequences of violent regimes and US policy that protects certain foreign government at all costs as long as they toe the line on trade, drug policy, and other matters.

Brad's family and friends have sought justice now for several years; even some members of the New York Congressional delegation - like US Rep. Jose Serrano (D-Bronx) - have taken up the cause of seeking justice in that case.

But multiple and sustained efforts by Friends of Brad Will in New York to convince Senator Clinton to use her international “experience” and influence to help bring justice and closure to the case have gone unanswered.

Recently, some of them sat in front of Senator Clinton's New York office, at 780 Third Avenue in midtown Manhattan, and fasted to appeal for her assistance to her late constituent, his family and friends.

According to one report, Senator Clinton was physically present in the office on at least one of those days, but avoided responding to or speaking with those fasting out in front, much less writing the letters and making the public statements to bring justice to the case that any authentic advocate of human rights would do, especially if it involved a constituent.

There are those who claim that Senator Clinton is a "champion" of human rights, based on a solitary speech she gave in September of 1995 to the UN Conference on Women in Beijing, China, because her most quoted sound-bite from that speech was "women's rights are human rights."

Nobody, takes issue with her statement, *Women's rights are human rights*, as are men's rights, children's rights, minority rights, and everybody else's. But if a politician doesn't have a basic understanding of *what human rights are* to begin with, and has shrunk from the duty to defend them time and time again even when they have hit close to home, that politician is not going to be able and ready to extend them to any gender or demographic.

So much happens, day in, day out, in so many lands... so many daily attacks on dissidents, community organizers, and others who dare speak and act to improve lives... that no US president could possibly micro-manage the situation and take preemptive action on each pending atrocity from the Oval Office. That's what the Secretary of State and a State Department is for, to handle the constant communications that are necessary with other governments.

And if US President-elect Barack Obama is about to install someone as the next Secretary of State who has shown zero understanding of, much less passion and action for, human rights in Mexico, Colombia and elsewhere (except in isolated cases where the same mass media has turned a particular case into an international cause célèbre), we're going to see more of the same terrible stories happen over and over again.

If you can't get somebody to act to defend human rights when she's your own local elected representative, do you really believe that such a person would begin to do so if she suddenly represented the entire country before the world?

So will we as Americans learn the kind of lessons that will help us escape destruction? Not according to the seventh prophecy given by Wm. Branham in 1933. Will Hillary Clinton or another “great powerful woman raise up, either be President, or dictator, or some great powerful woman in this United States” and contribute to the events that lead to that destruction? This leader/dictator being Hillary Clinton really is not the point, the point is, if it is not her, it will be another like her – that is “THUS SAITH THE LORD.”



---

## Chapter 1

<sup>1</sup> Dowd, Maureen. *Team of Frenemies*. New York Times, November 15, 2008. Electronic Source. <[http://www.nytimes.com/2008/11/16/opinion/16dowd.html?\\_r=1&ref=opinion](http://www.nytimes.com/2008/11/16/opinion/16dowd.html?_r=1&ref=opinion)>

<sup>2</sup> Jacobs, Joseph. *English Fairy Tales*. London: David Nutt, 1890.

<sup>3</sup> Jan Thornhill (2002). *A Jataka Tale from India*. Maple Tree Press, Toronto. The story actually originates from the *Jataka Tales* of Buddhist Indian folklore. The basic motif and many of the elements of the tale can be found in the *Daddabha Jataka* (J 322). The *Jatakas* comprise a large body of folklore dating from around Gautama Buddha's time (6th century BCE) to the third century CE. However, this ancient version features a hare as the central character rather than a chicken, and the wise protagonist is a lion (the Bodhisattva or future Buddha).

<sup>4</sup> Aesop, *The Complete Fables*. New York : Penguin Books, 1998.

<sup>5</sup> Andersen, Hans Christian. *Anderson's Fairy Tales*. 1993. Wordsworth Editions.

<sup>6</sup> BBC – Entertainment, Gay Tinky-Winky Bad for Children, 15 February, 1999. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/entertainment/276677.stm>

<sup>7</sup> Falwell, Jerry. Tinky-Winky Comes Out of the Closet. "Parents Alert" section in the *National Liberty Journal* February 1999.

<sup>8</sup> Olbermann, Keith. MSNBC TV – Countdown, Will Sponge Bob Make you Gay? January 21, 2005. <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/6852828/>

<sup>9</sup> The Moral Majority Coalition, *What We Are All About: The Four-Pronged TMMC Platform*. 2007. “The thought of a Hillary Clinton ... presidency is simply unacceptable (and quite frightening).” [http://www.moralmajority.us/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=12&Itemid=27](http://www.moralmajority.us/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=12&Itemid=27)

<sup>10</sup> Reed, David. Blue Helmets to Jerusalem, Ch.10. 2007. Online Book <http://www.bluehelmetstojerusalem.com/chapter10.htm>

<sup>11</sup> Kelly, Reggie. Latest Developments in the Middle East. Ben Israel – The Burning Bush. Online Periodical. 2007.

[http://www.benisrael.org/writings/currentevents/Latest\\_Developments\\_in\\_the\\_Middle\\_East\\_Crisis.html](http://www.benisrael.org/writings/currentevents/Latest_Developments_in_the_Middle_East_Crisis.html)

<sup>12</sup> Branham, William. *Why We Are Not a Denomination* Jeffersonville, IN 1958-0927

<sup>13</sup> Every, David K. *Microsoft, Apple and Xerox – The History of the Graphical User Interface*. 1999.  
[http://www.mackido.com/Interface/ui\\_history.html](http://www.mackido.com/Interface/ui_history.html)

<sup>14</sup> Horn, Bruce. *Xerox, Apple and Progress*. 2002. [http://www.mackido.com/Interface/ui\\_history.html](http://www.mackido.com/Interface/ui_history.html)

<sup>15</sup> Twain, Mark. Letter to San Francisco *Alta California*, dated May 17, 1867; published June 16, 1867.

<sup>16</sup> Demosthenes 348 BC

<sup>17</sup> Warner, Edward III. Nuclear Deterrence Force Still Essential. (Assistant Secretary of Defense for Strategy and Threat Reduction). <http://www.cnn.com/SPECIALS/2000/democracy/nuclear/views/>

*Excerpts from a prepared statement before the Strategic Forces Subcommittee, Senate Armed Services Committee, March 31, 1998.*

<sup>18</sup> Presidential Initiative on Nuclear Arms. The White House. September 27, 1991.  
<http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/acda/factshee/wmd/nuclear/unilat/sandy.htm>

<sup>19</sup> Gerth, Jeff, Van Natta, Don. *Her Way: The Hopes and Ambitions of Hillary Rodham Clinton*. 2007. Little, Brown.

<sup>20</sup> Carpenter, Amanda. *The Vast Right-Wing Conspiracy's Dossier on Hillary Clinton*. Regnery. 2006

<sup>21</sup> Baker, Peter and Solomon, John. *Books Paint Critical Portraits of Clinton*. Washington Post. May 25, 2007. A01

<sup>22</sup> <http://www.ocf.berkeley.edu/~roseying/ids110/MTEST.HTM>

<sup>23</sup> <http://niwde.blogspot.com/2007/03/history-of-mens-swimwear.html>

<sup>24</sup> Montgomery, L.M., *Rilla of Ingleside* (1921).

<sup>25</sup> *Pants for Women*. *St. James Encyclopedia of Popular Culture*. Thomson Gale. 2006  
<http://www.bookrags.com/history/pants-for-women-sjpc-04/>

<sup>26</sup> Cain, James M. *Mildred Pierce*. 1941. Alfred A. Knopf

<sup>27</sup> Kinnear, Mary. *Daughters of Time – Women in the Western Tradition*. 1983. University of Michigan Press.

<sup>28</sup> The Motion Picture Code of 1930 a.k.a The Hays Code;  
[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hays\\_code](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hays_code)

<sup>29</sup> IBID

<sup>30</sup> Gallup Poll. (1937). *Would you vote for a woman for president if she were qualified in every other respect?* Roper Poll on Lexis Nexis, Accession #0279248.

<sup>31</sup> Winick, Lyric Wallwork. *Is It Time for a Woman President?*. Parade. April, 2006.

<sup>32</sup> May-June 2003 Gallup Poll; December 2006 Newsweek Poll; July 2007 Newsweek Poll; March 2007 Gallup Poll as cited in *Center For American Women and Politics*. Eagleton Institute of Politics – Rutgers University. 2008.

<sup>33</sup> Branham, William. *God Keeps His Word*. Jeffersonville, IN. April 07, 1957.

<sup>34</sup> Leviticus 25. The King James Version of the Bible.

<sup>35</sup> Exodus 21:6; Romans 6; 2 Chronicles 36:21. The King James Version of the Bible.

<sup>36</sup> Slate, Chuck. *Caution! Hillary: America's First Dictator*. Trafford. 2005

<sup>37</sup> Cox, Ana Marie. *Noted*. The Atlanta Journal-Constitution, 8/27/06 (A Time Magazine writer).

<sup>38</sup> O'Beirne, Kate, Op-Ed, "Hillary Prepares – With Her Eye On The Oval, The Senator Pretends She's Out Of Center Field," National Review, 9/23/05

<sup>39</sup> Williams, Ron, Op-Ed, "Hillary Ran Through Cash In Easy Race," The [Wilmington, DE] News Journal, 11/22/06.

<sup>40</sup> Fox News' *Hannity & Colmes*, October 13, 2006. In a YouTube video clip: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AJanKEVDsxs>

<sup>41</sup> Fox News' *The Big Story with John Gibson*, October 16, 2006. In a video clip at *Media Matters For America*. <http://mediamatters.org/items/200610190002>

<sup>42</sup> Noonan, Peggy. *The Case Against Hillary Clinton*. 2000. HarperCollins.

<sup>43</sup> At the Republican National Convention in Chicago in June 1920, the Republicans went through four votes without deciding upon a candidate and adjourned until the next morning. A series of predawn meetings took place in suite number 404 in the Blackstone Hotel. The phrase "smoke-filled room," used to describe the suite is still used to refer to a meeting where political deals are made. The meeting in the original smoke-filled room was controlled by Republican senators, including Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts, Charles Curtis of Kansas, and James E. Watson of Indiana. After consulting with state leaders, the group agreed that Harding should be nominated. The next day the convention proceeded as planned, and on the tenth ballot, Harding received 692.5 votes and was nominated for president.

<http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/f/franklind164126.html>

<sup>44</sup> <http://www.theempressproject.com/>

<sup>45</sup> Jefferson, Thomas. In a letter to William S. Smith in 1787.

<sup>46</sup> Hatley, Christopher N., *The Empress Project Review*. January 27, 2007. <http://www.amazon.com/review/product/1597811238?filterBy=addFiveStar>

<sup>47</sup> Hatley, Christopher N., *A True Work of Literary Art*, Amazon.com, January 25, 2007 Electronic source: [http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/customer-reviews/1597811238/ref=cm\\_cr\\_dp\\_all\\_top/103-6551248-4894227?ie=UTF8&n=283155&s=books#customerReviews](http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/customer-reviews/1597811238/ref=cm_cr_dp_all_top/103-6551248-4894227?ie=UTF8&n=283155&s=books#customerReviews)

<sup>47</sup> Gibbon, Edward. *The History of the Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Macmillan, 1914. Digitized October 21, 2005.

- 
- <sup>49</sup> Maranis, David, *First Lady Launches Counterattack*, Washington Post, Wednesday, January 28, 1998; Page A01
- <sup>50</sup> *The Political Personality of New York Senate Candidate Hillary Rodham Clinton* by Aubrey Immelman & Avi A. T. Bahadoor. Research paper, Unit for the Study of Personality in Politics, Saint John's University and the College of Saint Benedict, April 2000.
- <sup>51</sup> *Hillary as Dictator*, YouTube video spoof, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6h3G-IMZxjo&mode=related&search=>, 2007.
- <sup>52</sup> Weisberg, Jacob. *But Why Can't Hillary Win? Clinton's electability problem*. Slate.msn.com. July 29, 2005.
- <sup>53</sup> <http://www.aseenontv.com/prod-pages/playpainodvd.html>
- <sup>54</sup> *Goebbels, Joseph. Aus Churchills Lügenfabrik, January 12, 1941. Die Zeit ohne Beispiel*
- <sup>55</sup> Are Lies More Believable Than The Truth? - Psychological Effects of Lying. Jet Magazine. Jan 22, 2001. [http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m1355/is\\_6\\_99/ai\\_69698454](http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1355/is_6_99/ai_69698454)
- <sup>56</sup> Sullivan, Bob. *Study: ID Thieves Are Strangers, Often Women*. 10/22/2007. <http://redtape.msnbc.com/2007/10/study-id-thieve.html>
- <sup>57</sup> Small, Kevonne. *Female Crime in the United States, 1963-1998: An Update*. June 22, 2000. Gender Issues. Transaction Publishers. [http://www.accessmylibrary.com/coms2/summary\\_0286-1901759\\_ITM](http://www.accessmylibrary.com/coms2/summary_0286-1901759_ITM)
- <sup>58</sup> *Crime & Violence - Perpetrators and types of crime. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, Gender Issues. 2007.* <http://unece.org/gender/genpols/keyinds/crime/perps.htm>
- <sup>59</sup> Giddons, Anthony. *Sociology*, 5<sup>th</sup> Rev. Crime and Gender – Crime Rates. P. 815. 2006. Polity Press.
- <sup>60</sup> *Crime in the United States - 2006*. U.S. Department of Justice — Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). September 2007 [http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2006/data/table\\_01.html](http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2006/data/table_01.html)
- <sup>61</sup> Griffin, Em. *A First Look at Communication Theory*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Rev. Ch. 16. 1997 McGraw-Hill. <http://www.csudh.edu/dearhabermas/cognitivediss01bbk.htm>
- <sup>62</sup> Are Lies More Believable Than The Truth? - Psychological Effects of Lying. Jet Magazine. Jan 22, 2001. [http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m1355/is\\_6\\_99/ai\\_69698454](http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1355/is_6_99/ai_69698454)
- <sup>63</sup> IBID
- <sup>64</sup> Bruck, Connie. *Hillary the Pol*, New Yorker Magazine. May 30, 1994
- <sup>65</sup> Immelman, Audrey. *The Character of Hillary Rodham Clinton*. Journal of the Psychohistory Forum, vol. 7, no. 2 (September 2000), pp. 65-66
- <sup>66</sup> Branham, William, in an electronic message *God Keep His Word* preached in Jeffersonville, IN. 1957.
- <sup>67</sup> Allen, Garland E., Was Nazi eugenics created in the US?, Embo Reports, 2004

<sup>68</sup> Robert Proctor, *Racial hygiene: Medicine under the Nazis* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988), and Gisela Bock, "Nazi sterilization and reproductive policies" in Dieter Kuntz, ed., *Deadly medicine: creating the master race* (Washington, D.C.: United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2004).

<sup>69</sup> An overview of U.S. eugenics and sterilization is in Daniel Kevles, *In the name of eugenics: Genetics and the uses of human heredity* (New York: Knopf, 1985).

<sup>70</sup> On California sterilizations and their connection to the Nazi program, see: Stefan Kühl, *The Nazi connection: Eugenics, American racism, and German National Socialism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994); Alexandra Stern, *Eugenic nation : faults and frontiers of better breeding in modern America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005); and Wendy Kline, *Building a better race: gender, sexuality, and eugenics from the turn of the century to the baby boom* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001).

<sup>71</sup> George Santayana (1905) *Life of Reason* vol. I, ch. XII Charles Scribner's Sons

<sup>72</sup> Olson, Barbara. *Hell to Pay: The Unfolding Story of Hillary Rodham Clinton*. Page 103. 1999. Regnery.

<sup>73</sup> Rodham, Hillary. *Harvard Educational Review*, 43, 4, 487-514, 1973.

<sup>74</sup> Rodham, Hillary, "Children's Rights: A Legal Perspective." *In Children's Rights: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. Patricia A. Vardin and Ilene n. Brody (New York: Teachers College Press, 1979), p.19.