

# BIGGEST LIAR EVER: Hillary Breaks The “Pinocchios” At Washington Post Fact Checker

Robert Gehl

March 9, 2016

*The Washington Post* has given Hillary **TWENTY** “Pinocchios” for all the lies she’s told about her homebrew email server.

Compiling all eight fact-checks they’ve done on the issue ... mostly regarding the lies she’s told to defend her illegal use of an unsecure server in her basement to send and receive classified data ... The Post destroyed any credibility Clinton may have left on the issue.

The Fact Checker has run 10 fact checks on the issue, mostly regarding dubious statements that Clinton had made to defend her actions. (We also had one fact check each on the Democratic spin and the Republican spin on the issue.) Reviewing our conclusions again, it appears Clinton often used highly technical language to obscure the salient fact that her private email setup was highly unusual and flouted existing regulations.

Here are the ten “Fact Checks” and the number of “Pinocchio” they gave for each one:

## 1) The misleading Democratic spin on Hillary Clinton’s emails

March 10, 2015: Senior Democratic lawmakers argued that Clinton was the only secretary of state to produce so many records and that her production of emails was a transparent act that is unprecedented compared with her predecessors. These were technically correct but fundamentally misleading statements, intended to deflect from the central issue: Clinton exclusively used a personal account, and did not provide records until she was requested to — after she left office. The Democrats earned **Three Pinocchios**.

## 2) Hillary Clinton’s claim that ‘everything I did [on emails] was permitted’

July 9, 2015: We examined Clinton’s claim that “everything I did was permitted” because “there was no law ... there was no regulation.” We concluded that with her very careful language, Clinton skirts some of the important issues concerning her private email account. She appears to be arguing her case on narrow, technical grounds, but that’s not the same as actually complying with existing rules as virtually everyone else understood them. She earned **Three Pinocchios**.

## 3) Clinton’s claims about receiving or sending ‘classified material’ on her private email system

Aug. 27, 2015: The issue of classified material in Clinton’s emails grew in importance after the Inspector General for the Intelligence Committee wrote Congress to say that some of the emails “contained classified State Department information when originated.” Again, we found that Clinton’s very careful and legalistic phrasing raised suspicions. The classification rules are complex, but, legal technicalities aside, the question is whether classified information was exchanged over her private email system. The answer is yes, and so

Clinton earned **Two Pinocchios** for excessively technical wordsmithing.

#### 4) Hillary Clinton's claim that 'everyone' knew 'I was using a personal email'

Sept. 10, 2015: Clinton's careful language that her email operation was "fully above board" once again obscures some basic truths about her decision to only use a private email system for government business: It was unusual, and it skirted the edge of the rules. Clinton obviously received emails from hundreds of people who realized she was using a private email address. But whether they understood it was her only means of electronic government communication is another question. Clinton again earned **Two Pinocchios**.

#### 5) Hillary Clinton's incomplete timeline on her personal email account

Sept. 28, 2015: A number of readers asked the Fact Checker to explore Clinton's stated timeline about her dealings with the State Department concerning her private email system, after new questions arose in light of The Washington Post's report that the State Department confirmed that the triggering event to seek her emails was the congressional investigation into the 2012 Benghazi attacks that left four Americans dead. We concluded Clinton appears to be sticking to her timeline because it obscures the fact that she exclusively used a private email for company business. She earned **Three Pinocchios**.

#### 6) Hillary Clinton's claim that 90 percent of her emails were 'in the system'

Nov. 9, 2015: During congressional hearings, Clinton claimed that 90 to 95 percent of her emails were in the State Department system. She even wrongly suggested this calculation had been made by the State Department, when actually it was calculated by her staff. While not all of the emails she submitted to the State Department had been released at that point, what had been made available so far suggests that a substantial majority are to and from at least one "state.gov" email address. It is not an unreasonable assumption that these emails are contained somewhere within the bowels of the State Department. But we gave Clinton **Three Pinocchios** because she cannot make a definitive statement and certainly cannot attribute that to the State Department.

#### 7) How did 'top secret' emails end up on Hillary Clinton's server?

Feb. 4, 2016: We dug deep into the question of how "top secret" emails could have been located on Clinton's unsecure email arrangement. The emails in question were sent on an unclassified system — as they would have been if she had followed standard protocol and used a state.gov account. Under State Department practice, a request for public release of her emails would have been subject to the same classification discussion currently underway. Any "top secret" communications would have been withheld.

However, if she did not have a private server, intelligence officials now would not be scrutinizing every single Clinton email for possible public release. The Clinton campaign has argued that some intelligence officials are now engaged in a game of overclassification. But this debate would not even be taking place without the decision to set up the private server in the first place. She earned **Two Pinocchios**.

## 8) Why the Clinton email scandal and the Petraeus leak are not really alike

Feb. 24, 2016: Many Republicans have argued that the Hillary Clinton case is worse than that of Gen. David Petraeus, the former CIA director who pleaded guilty last year to mishandling classified information he gave to Paula Broadwell, his mistress and biographer. But there clearly are fundamental differences between the two cases that make it an illogical comparison, based on what we know of the Clinton case so far. At the most basic level, there is dispute over whether Clinton's emails contained "classified" information. An array of experts we consulted all told us that as long as the dispute exists, it will be difficult to bring the same charge of mishandling classified information to which Petraeus pleaded guilty. The broad-brushed comparison lacks context and thus earned **Two Pinocchios**.