

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.”