

Brits target Clinton with 'well-aimed shot'

by Edward Spannaus

"Mr. Starr is, in effect, eliminating Mr. Clinton with a single rifle shot," wrote British intelligence asset Ambrose Evans-Pritchard in the Sept. 10 *Daily Telegraph* of London. "But it is well-aimed."

Evans-Pritchard was ostensibly illustrating his expectation that independent counsel Kenneth Starr would choose to focus his impeachment report to the Congress around allegations of perjury and obstruction of justice in the Paula Jones case, and that Starr would likely be leaving Whitewater, Filegate, and Travelgate for his final report to the court, sometime in the future. Evans-Pritchard takes some pride in this, since it was he who orchestrated the Paula Jones suit in the first place, in the spring of 1994.

Pritchard's lengthy diatribe-cum-confession was entitled "Nothing Can Save Him Now," and it opened with a quote from Sen. Daniel Moynihan (D-N.Y.), that "the regime is in crisis." Pritchard misidentifies Moynihan as "the elder statesman of the Democratic Party, who has been fulminating against Bill Clinton with the look of a willing regicide."

Are Ambrose Evans-Pritchard's allusions to rifle shots and regicide simply metaphorical whimsy? Or should we look deeper, to determine what is actually at stake here? Is this a case of "assassination by other means"?

'In the crosshairs'

EIR readers have some familiarity with the background to Evans-Pritchard's comments. For example, in the Nov. 11, 1994 issue of *EIR* we wrote: "Not since the assassination of John F. Kennedy has an American President been so targeted by the British Crown and its vast covert intelligence apparatus as President Clinton is today." Citing recent assassination attempts, the article reported that "evidence continues to mount from across the Atlantic that the British Crown is becoming more and more convinced by the day that one way or another, Clinton must go."

The article was entitled, "Do British Royals Have Clinton in the Crosshairs?"

A few weeks later, the *Feature* of our Dec. 2, 1994 issue was "British Monarchy Takes Aim at Another President"; the lead article described the extremely high level of threats against President Bill Clinton, and the historical record of British-sponsored assassinations of U.S. Presidents—Abraham Lincoln, James Garfield, William McKinley, and John Kennedy.

These articles, and virtually every article that *EIR* has published since early 1994 on the assault against the U.S. Presidency, has highlighted the central role of Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, the self-admitted British intelligence asset who was posted to Washington in late 1992 as the correspondent for the Hollinger Corp.'s *Sunday Telegraph*.

Evans-Pritchard returned to Britain in early 1997. (His subversive sojourn in the United States was described in "The Hyphenated Hoaxster" article in the June 19, 1998 *EIR*.) He is now back in the United States, and his Sept. 10 article was his summary of his Arkansas investigations.

'Ticking time-bomb'

What Evans-Pritchard uncharacteristically plays down, is his crucial role in instigating the Paula Jones case.

The name "Paula" was cited in the *American Spectator's* "Troopergate" article, published just before Christmas 1993. A few weeks after this, Evans-Pritchard was in Arkansas, and, according to his own account, he obtained Paula Jones's telephone number in California, and he then went to Long Beach to meet with her and her husband, and met with her mother and lawyers in Arkansas.

Around the time the Paula Jones civil suit was filed on May 6, 1994, Evans-Pritchard wrote a number of articles describing his role. In the *Sunday Telegraph* of May 8, Evans-Pritchard acknowledged that he had had "a dozen conversations with Mrs. Jones over the past two months." He furthermore 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."

A week later, Evans-Pritchard laid out the strategy of the case. It doesn't "matter all that much whether Mrs. Jones ultimately wins or loses her case," he wrote on May 15, 1994. "The ticking time-bomb in the lawsuit lies elsewhere, in the testimony of other witnesses."

Almost four and one-half years later, Evans-Pritchard now boasts that Paula Jones has "succeeded beyond her expectations, for she never imagined that her case would draw Mr. Clinton into a series of actions that would lead to forfeiture of office." (She may not have, but Evans-Pritchard certainly did.) Once Paula Jones got the go-ahead from the U.S. Supreme Court, with "the power of subpoena, with the broad 'discovery' permitted under U.S. civil law, Mr. Clinton was in trouble. Her lawyers could start to twist open the sexual can of worms."

Pritchard evasively describes that Jones's lawyers found out about Kathleen Willey, then about Monica Lewinsky, and how Linda Tripp was taping her discussions with Lewinsky, and that the President and the White House "did not know that the information had been passed on in great detail to the plaintiff's [Paula Jones's] lawyers." And then, on Jan. 17, 1998, the date of the President's deposition, "Mr. Clinton walked straight into the trap"—the trap set by his enemies almost four years earlier.