

Sex-maniac Starr takes over fraudulent Paula Jones case

by Edward Spannaus

It doesn't "matter all that much whether Mrs. Jones ultimately wins or loses her case," a newspaper reporter wrote on May 15, 1994, shortly after Paula Jones's lawsuit against President Clinton was filed. "The ticking time bomb in the lawsuit lies elsewhere, in the testimony of other witnesses."

That prescient passage is crucial to understanding how Whitewater prosecutor Kenneth Starr went from investigating a petty, failed real estate deal in Arkansas, to using his hordes of FBI agents and his grand juries to investigate every salacious detail of every rumor ever circulated about the sex life of the President of the United States.

For that was no ordinary reporter writing about the "ticking time bomb." It was the Washington correspondent of the *Sunday Telegraph* of London, Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, who doubles as a stringer for the British intelligence agency MI6. A week earlier, Evans-Pritchard acknowledged that he had had "a dozen conversations with Mrs. Jones over the past two months." He also admitted that "I happened to be present at a strategy meeting last month on a boat on the Arkansas River" at which Jones's attorney "was weighing the pros and cons of legal action."

In his 1997 book, *The Secret Life of Bill Clinton*, Evans-Pritchard admits, trying to make light of it, that for a few minutes, "I had become a consultant to the embryonic legal team of Paula Jones." In fact, he was much more than that, for it is clear that he spent many weeks trying to convince Jones, plus her husband and her mother, to file the lawsuit against the President.

Now, let's jump ahead to the beginning of October 1997. By this time, Jones's second set of lawyers has resigned, apparently after Jones refused a settlement offer. The bankrolling of the Jones suit has just been taken over by the pro-slavery Rutherford Institute, and, according to various accounts, a few days later, the Institute receives the first of a series of

anonymous calls, reporting that a woman named "Monica" has sex with the President in the White House. Around this same time, Jones's Dallas lawyers called Linda Tripp—the Bush mole who was in the Clinton White House during the first part of 1993—after Tripp had been cited in a *Newsweek* article, and Tripp gave them Monica Lewinsky's name. Shortly after this, Tripp began taping her conversations with Lewinsky.

In November, Jones's lawyers issued a subpoena to Lewinsky, and her deposition was scheduled for Dec. 18. The deposition was postponed, and on Jan. 7, Lewinsky signed an affidavit denying that she'd had an affair with Clinton, which was submitted by her attorney in an attempt to prevent her from having to testify.

With a few days, no later than Jan. 12, according to published accounts, Tripp went to the Office of Independent Counsel (OIC), Starr's office, and gave them 20 hours of tapes of her conversations with Lewinsky, claiming that President Clinton, and Clinton's friend Vernon Jordan, had encouraged her to lie under oath in the Paula Jones case.

This was not Tripp's first contact with Starr's office. She had been interviewed by the OIC in 1995, during Starr's investigation of the death of White House aide Vincent Foster, and it is almost certain that she stayed in contact with the OIC, either directly or through an intermediary.

But, let's follow the version of events being put out by various sources, for this version is in itself completely damning of Starr's conduct.

At Starr's direction, Tripp set up a meeting with Lewinsky for Jan. 13. Tripp was then wired up by the FBI, and recorded her conversation with Monica Lewinsky, which took place at a hotel near the Pentagon. Starr was gathering evidence to attempt to prove that his target—President Clinton—was encouraging others to commit perjury in an unrelated civil pro-

ceeding, and that perhaps the President himself was going to commit perjury a few days later.

But at this point, Starr had no legal right to get involved in the Jones case or the Tripp-Lewinsky matter. Every expansion of his jurisdiction is supposed to be approved by the special court which appoints independent counsels; the Justice Department is supposed to investigate any new matter first, and make a recommendation to the court. This was even more sensitive, because of Starr's personal conflict of interest around the Jones case. So Starr jumped first, and asked for authorization later. He had Tripp set up another lunch meeting with Lewinsky for Jan. 16.

Meanwhile, after having had Tripp tape the Jan. 13 conversation with Lewinsky — without any legal authorization to do so — Starr then took that information to the Justice Department to request expansion of his investigative authority from Attorney General Janet Reno. Representatives of Starr and Reno then went to the three-judge panel at the federal Court of Appeals on Jan. 16 to seek jurisdiction over possible perjury and obstruction of justice in the Jones case.

But at this same time, Lewinsky was on her way to have "lunch" with Linda Tripp. The court, meanwhile, in secret session, granted Reno's and Starr's petition, and sealed the court documents. But the information, which was held under seal at the court, was about to make its way to Paula Jones's lawyer, despite the court order.

When Lewinsky arrived at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel in Pentagon City, she walked directly into the arms of waiting FBI agents and Starr's deputies. OIC lawyers and a team of FBI agents then took her to a room in the hotel and detained her for about eight hours, threatening her and her parents, and trying to convince her to wear a wire in order to entrap Clinton and Jordan into making incriminating statements. Meanwhile, Linda Tripp herself was in the next room at the hotel, where she spent the afternoon talking with FBI agents and lawyers from Starr's office.

Tripp then called Paula Jones's lawyers, and told them to meet her at her house in Maryland that evening, where she told them everything that had happened, and briefed them on her conversations with Lewinsky. Jones's lawyers were naturally quite eager to talk to Tripp — for they were getting ready to take a sworn deposition from President Clinton the next day, on Jan. 17! One or perhaps more of the members of the Jones legal team went to Tripp's house, and Tripp gave the lawyers a thorough briefing on her conversations with Lewinsky — including on the Jan. 13 discussion which Tripp had secretly recorded at the direction of Starr, using microphones supplied by the FBI!

Tripp, who was operating as an agent of Starr, thus provided secret information from Starr's investigation to Paula Jones's lawyers, including the fruits of her FBI-monitored conversations with Lewinsky. Jones's lawyers were then able to use this information in their deposition of President Clinton the next day, to assist Starr in trying to set up a "perjury trap" against him.

The information provided by Tripp allowed Jones's lawyers to ask very precise and detailed questions of Clinton the next day: questions about Lewinsky, about whether Clinton ever gave her any gifts, whether Clinton's personal secretary Betty Currie had cleared Lewinsky into the White House, and so forth. According to an account published in the *Washington Post*: "The President was so stunned by the specificity of the questions, one person close to him has said, that when he returned to the White House that night, he called Currie and asked her to come into the office the next day so they could compare notes." Subsequently, Currie was hauled in front of Starr's grand jury to be interrogated about that Sunday conversation.

Over that weekend, *Newsweek* magazine was about to go to print with the Lewinsky story, but was persuaded by Starr's office to hold off, so as not to jeopardize his investigation. The story began to leak out anyway, and burst into public view on Jan. 21, with a front-page story on Lewinsky in the *Washington Post*, quickly picked up by all major news media.

Evans-Pritchard's "ticking time bomb" had finally gone off.

'Misconduct of the highest order'

As we reported in last week's *EIR*, the issue of Starr's collusion with the Jones legal team "in an effort to unfairly and illegally trap the President" has already been raised by Sen. Robert Torricelli (D-N.J.), in his Feb. 11 letter to Attorney General Reno, demanding that the Justice Department investigate Starr for violations of the Ethics in Government Act. Torricelli said that if Starr's office had played any role in the preparation of questions for Clinton's deposition, that such collusion "would constitute misconduct of the highest order and provide grounds for Mr. Starr's removal."

Torricelli's letter also cited the legal impropriety of using a civil proceeding for the purpose of setting a perjury trap for a witness.

Starr's involvement in the Jones case, and Starr's tactics around this, were also attacked by former Watergate prosecutor Richard Ben-Veniste, during an appearance on ABC's "This Week" on Feb. 15. Noting that Starr has subpoenaed all the depositions and affidavits in the Jones case, and that he is about to start questioning all of the witnesses in the Jones case, Ben-Veniste charged that Starr has "criminalized" the entire process around the Jones case. He added that Starr has been allowed "to morph from the Whitewater investigator into the Federal sex police."

Ninety-nine percent dirt

Further confirmation that the Jones suit was simply being used to gather dirt on the President, came on Feb. 9, when the President's lawyers filed a motion seeking summary judgment in the Jones civil suit. They charged that "there has been a total failure of proof" on Jones's part, and that her lawyers have spent 99% of their discovery seeking "to substantiate rumors that President Clinton made sexual advances to other

women,” while failing to prove any of the elements of Jones’s own legal claims. They further declared that the sexual-harassment lawsuit against Clinton represents a “frivolous claim” and that it “has been pursued in other than good faith.”

There are three claims in the Jones suit: 1) As to the civil rights claim, Clinton’s lawyers say that Jones did not suffer any job detriment, and that in fact she stayed in her job two years after the alleged incident, and received pay raises during that time. 2) As to the civil rights conspiracy claim aimed at Clinton and state trooper Danny Ferguson, the motion says that “the record is barren of any evidence that Trooper Ferguson and Governor Clinton entered into any agreement to violate plaintiff’s civil rights.” 3) As to the claim of intentional infliction of emotional distress, or “outrage,” Jones has presented no evidence on this count. The motion says that, because this last claim “is part of any unprecedented lawsuit against a sitting President of the United States,” the court should not expand state law and “permit such a frivolous claim to go forward against the President, when it would be rejected against anyone else.”

Because Jones has failed to produce evidence to support her claims, the motion argues “that if the Court were to permit such a veneer-thin case of sexual harassment and outrage as this to go forward against a sitting President, it would place future Presidents at risk for frivolous and vexatious litigation.”

What LaRouche said

The fact that Jones’s lawyers spent all of their effort trying to find women who could claim that Bill Clinton made sexual advances to them, while failing to produce any evidence which would support Jones’s actual legal claims, proves what Lyndon LaRouche said almost four years ago: that the suit

was politically motivated to destabilize the Presidency, brought in collaboration with Ambrose Evans-Pritchard. (See *EIR*, May 27, 1994, p. 62.)

LaRouche said that it cannot automatically be assumed that a civil action should not be allowed to be pursued against a sitting President, because the litigant would have certain rights in an honest, good-faith case. Under the circumstances of the Paula Jones case, he said, there should be some special rules applied. The first thing to do, would be to require that Jones submit to a preliminary deposition, and that “she should be compelled to show that her collaboration with Ambrose Evans-Pritchard did not produce a lawsuit which is clearly politically motivated to destabilize the Presidency.”

If it turns out to be the case that she wouldn’t have filed the suit without the instigation of Evans-Pritchard, a British intelligence-controlled agent, LaRouche continued: “There are grounds for a summary dismissal or suspension of the suit, and I don’t think the woman has any claims coming to her. . . . If she’s got a claim, she can wait until the President is through with his business in office. Because she would not have made the suit at this time, but for foreign intelligence instigation.”

In remarks which anticipated precisely what has come to pass since that time, LaRouche said the following: “If the case is shown to be frivolous, I think very stiff sanctions should be applied against those, including Mr. Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, who would instigate such a civil action dishonestly for a political purpose, particularly if it destabilized the government of the United States.”

Only now, one must add Kenneth Starr to the list of those who have utilized the Jones case to destabilize the Presidency for a political purpose.

Kenneth Starr’s ‘amici’

Defenders of Kenneth Starr have been quick to jump to his defense against accusations that he was preparing an *amicus curiae* (“friend of the court”) legal brief for Paula Jones and the Landmark Legal Foundation — which is one of the national network of so-called “conservative,” “public interest” law firms funded by Richard Mellon Scaife. For example, Mark Levin, president of the Landmark foundation, recently published a column in the *Washington Times* attacking both Lyndon LaRouche and Hillary Clinton for making such a scandalous allegation against Starr.

The actual story, told here for the first time, is even more damaging. The brief on which Starr was working, in the summer of 1994, right before his appointment as

Whitewater independent counsel, was on behalf of the Independent Women’s Forum of Washington. The executive director of the Independent Women’s Forum is Barbara Ledeen, a key figure in the “Temple Mount” operation being conducted by Israeli fanatics and U.S. evangelicals, and the wife of “X Committee” prominent Michael Ledeen (see *Investigation*).

Last June, the Independent Women’s Forum put out a press release attacking President Clinton’s lawyer Robert Bennett, accusing him of attempting “to wage a war of intimidation against Paula Jones.”

“These are cheap threats designed to accomplish outside of the courtroom what Mr. Bennett and his client know they will be unable to accomplish inside the courtroom,” said Barbara Ledeen. She said that the evidence will show that an Arkansas state trooper was used as a procurer for Clinton, and that Bennett “is using sexist and misogynistic tactics.”