

# It didn't start with Monica: the five-year campaign to bring down President Clinton

by Edward Spannaus

In an impeachment proceeding riddled with lies, fraud, illegally, and unconstitutionality, perhaps the biggest lie of all is that if President Clinton had only “told the truth” about Monica Lewinsky, none of this would have happened.

A review of how we got to his point, will demonstrate, once again, that the pending impeachment of President Clinton has nothing to do with Monica Lewinsky or any of the specific accusations against him. And it will show that nothing Clinton could have said or done last January, by way of a concession to his adversaries, or any time since, would have been likely to have stopped, or even slowed down, the British-American cabal that has been out to topple him for the past five or six years.

Since 1994, *EIR* has emphasized that the impulse for what we termed the “assault on the Presidency” came principally from outside the United States—from a London-centered cabal which we have identified as being personified in the Hollinger Corporation. We have, over the past few years, painstakingly identified the key players involved, in London, Canada, Israel, and the treasonous networks inside the United States.

Our purpose here will be somewhat different, and supplementary. Here, we shall show another facet of this process which has remained unexamined until now: how the demands for Clinton's impeachment began long, long ago—well before anyone had heard of Monica Lewinsky, and how a very small circle of people, centered around Washington lawyer Theodore Olson and his patron Richard Mellon Scaife, have been conspiring to bring President Clinton down since at least 1993.

## The 1996 elections

Before the November 1996 elections, this news service was told by knowledgeable sources that Clinton's enemies realized they could not prevent his re-election, but that the plan was to escalate the attacks on him so that he would be, in essence, a “lame duck” President throughout his second term.

In its Nov. 4, 1996 issue, the *Washington Times* “Insight” magazine ran a feature entitled, “Will Clinton Be Impeached?” The article said that Congressional Republicans were reviewing the 1974 Nixon impeachment proceedings, with an eye toward how the Watergate precedents could be used against Bill Clinton. The alleged “crimes” specified were

perjury and obstruction of justice—around Whitewater. No mention of Monica Lewinsky.

Around the same time, the December 1996 issue of the *American Spectator* was issued, with an article entitled “Impeach or Indict?”—which told its readers that it was probable that Clinton, as a sitting President, could not be indicted by Kenneth Starr, and therefore should be impeached. The article urged Congress to start thinking about impeachment, since Starr would be sending evidence of possible Clinton crimes to Congress at some point soon. The areas cited were Whitewater, Filegate, Travelgate. Again, no mention of Monica Lewinsky.

In spring 1997, the first actions around impeachment were initiated in the House of Representatives. At the beginning of March, the *Washington Times* prominently ran an op-ed by columnist Bruce Fein calling upon House Judiciary Chairman Henry Hyde (R-Ill.) to initiate impeachment proceedings. Now, the issue was campaign finance, and allegations that Clinton had sold his office to contributors, and to China, for political gain.

In mid-March, Rep. Bob Barr (R-Ga.), a member of the House Judiciary Committee, asked committee chairman Hyde to begin an impeachment inquiry against both President Clinton and Vice President Al Gore for fundraising abuses. Barr also began preparation of articles of impeachment. Hyde himself publicly was a bit more cautious, saying, “I want at least one smoking gun before we proceed with impeachment.”

However, Hyde acknowledged that the Judiciary Committee was already involved. “We are studying the law of impeachment, the procedures of impeachment,” Hyde said on March 16, 1997. “We have some staff who remember and participated in the Nixon hearings, and we'll be ready when the time comes and when we have the credible evidence to go ahead on. . . . We want to know what the law and the procedure is, in case something happens.”

That same day, the *Sunday Times* of London reported that “the possibility of impeaching the President is increasingly a topic of private discussion among politicians.”

The impeachment drumbeat picked up again in the fall, with a *Wall Street Journal* op-ed by one of its contributing editors simply entitled “Impeach.” The author, Mark Helprin, argued:



*Former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich (Ga.) and Majority Leader Rep. Dick Armey (Tex.) The plot to oust Bill Clinton from office began long, long before anyone had ever heard of Monica Lewinsky.*

“The Republican Party and its intellectuals have been searching hard for theme and direction. Futurism, the Contract with America, national greatness, capital gains: These have fallen flat. . . . Politically, there can be only one visceral theme, one battle, one task. If the party embraces it, the party will solidify. If it rejects it, it will drift.

“The task is to address the question of President William Jefferson Clinton’s fitness for office. . . .

“When that moment arrives. . . . It will come, if it does, in one word. One word that will lift the fog to show a field of battle clearly laid down. . . . One word that will break the spell. . . . One word. Impeach.”

One word *not* mentioned in the *Wall Street Journal* is “Monica.”

Also in early November, Representative Barr and 17 Republican Congressmen called upon the House Judiciary Committee to initiate an inquiry of impeachment against President Clinton, citing Whitewater, Travelgate, alleged misuse of FBI files, suppression of an RTC investigation, etc.

Shortly after that, the editor of the *American Spectator*, R. Emmett Tyrrell, and a co-author dubbed “Anonymous,” published a book called *The Impeachment of William Jefferson Clinton*. A review of Tyrrell’s book by former Federal judge Robert Bork was featured as the cover story in the December 1997 issue of the *American Spectator*. Tyrrell’s book was based on a narrative of the projected 1998 impeachment proceedings against President Clinton, with hearings set to begin in Henry Hyde’s Judiciary Committee in June 1998—even before Starr has submitted his final report. Hyde’s problem, Tyrrell projects, is that “of an embarrass-

ment of riches.” It includes Whitewater, Travelgate, Filegate, Hillary’s missing billing records, the Riady-China connection, the suppression of the RTC investigation.

But no Monica. This is still 1997.

Bork writes in his review: “Henry Hyde knows that impeachment ultimately depends upon persuading the public of its necessity,” the problem being that respect for the institution of the President can sustain the man who holds the office for a long time. But, Bork writes, the premise of the book is that “a similar anti-Clinton fervor can be created by nationally-televised impeachment hearings in the House of Representatives that make plain to the public the many abuses of power of this administration.”

But that was before Monica, and before the Starr Report.

Bork concludes that, at that point, it is a “close call” whether Clinton should be removed from office by impeachment—Bork professing concern about the precedent that this might set for future Presidents. Bork himself concludes that, as of late 1997, an actual impeachment of Clinton is unlikely, but he notes that “Tyrrell-Anonymous rely for their expectations of a successful impeachment not on a single dramatic event, but that is not to be ruled out, but on the steady, unremitting succession of scandals that will gradually erode public support to the point where the removal of the President seemed inevitable. . . . Perhaps it is realistic.”

### **The Olson Salon**

What do these writers and publications have in common, besides a hatred for Bill Clinton? During this period, a group of longtime friends and associates regularly got together on

Friday evenings in the Washington suburb of Great Falls, Virginia, in an expensive, secluded residence accessible only by a private road. Attendees at these gatherings were reported to include Bork, *American Spectator* editor Tyrrell, *Wall Street Journal* editorial page editor Robert Bartley, Supreme Court Associate Justice Clarence Thomas, and D.C. Circuit appeals judge Laurence Silberman — and Kenneth Starr. The weekly “salon” is held at the home of Theodore and Barbara Olson.

Starr’s presence at these gatherings would not surprise anyone. Ken Starr and Ted Olson were partners in the Los Angeles-based Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher law firm in the late 1970s. They joined the Justice Department together in 1981 when another partner, William French Smith, became Ronald Reagan’s first Attorney General. Olson became the head of the Office of Legal Counsel, an office previously headed by both William Rehnquist and Antonin Scalia. Starr, whose position was Counselor to the Attorney General, worked closely with Olson in the Justice Department, until he was appointed to the U.S. Appeals Court for the District of Columbia Circuit in 1983. In 1989, at the request of George Bush, Starr resigned from the court to become the U.S. Solicitor General, a position which he held until 1993.

Olson has been described as the person who runs Starr. He is the one with the “overview,” according to informed sources; it is Olson who serves as Starr’s link to the Justice Department permanent bureaucracy and who recommends whom Starr should hire for his staff.

Both Starr and the Olsons are activists in the mis-named Federalist Society, an organization of self-identified “conservative” lawyers founded in 1982 under Scalia’s direction. One of the most active speakers on the Federalist Society’s circuit is Appeals Court judge David Sentelle, who heads the judicial panel which appointed Starr as independent counsel in August 1994 — after it abruptly fired the first independent counsel, Robert Fiske.

Starr and Olson are also associated together in various of the so-called “public interest” law firms funded by Scaife and related intelligence-linked foundations, such as the John M. Olin Foundation (which is also the primary funder of the Federalist Society).

Another aspect of this “Get Clinton” salon has been presented by David Brock, the author of the famed “Troopergate” article published in the *American Spectator* at the end of 1993. Brock has written about how he was a guest at the wedding of Ted and Barbara Olson in the summer of 1996, where, he wrote, “the entire anti-Clinton establishment” was on hand, including Starr, Bork, former Bush White House Counsel C. Boyden Gray, and the *Wall Street Journal*’s Bartley. In an article called “Confessions of a Right-Wing Hit Man” in *Esquire* magazine, Brock wrote that Barbara Olson then disinvited him from another party at her home a few weeks later — after word had leaked out that Brock’s new book, *The*

*Seduction of Hillary Clinton*, was too sympathetic to its subject.

## The beginnings

Back in 1993, the impeachment of Bill Clinton was only a gleam in Ted Olson’s eye. But the groundwork was being laid already at that time, with the help of the Olson Salon’s stable of right-wing journalists, and a few million dollars from the “Daddy Warbucks” of the “Get Clinton” operation, Pittsburgh billionaire Richard Mellon Scaife.

It ostensibly began, you may recall, with “Whitewater.” During the 1992 Presidential campaign, a politically motivated investigator in the Resolution Trust Corp. (RTC) saw her opportunity to “alter history” by trying to instigate a criminal investigation of Bill and Hillary Clinton in connection with the RTC’s review of the failure of Madison Guaranty Savings & Loan in Arkansas.

Bush administration officials, including Attorney General William Barr and White House counsel C. Boyden Gray, personally intervened to attempt to get a criminal investigation of the Clintons opened before the November elections, despite the fact that the responsible officials in the Justice Department, both in Washington and in the Little Rock United States Attorney’s office, found no merit whatsoever in the Madison referral.

The operation backfired, however, and eventually the RTC opened an internal investigation of Jean Lewis and her supervisor for improper disclosure of confidential documents and other violations of RTC rules. The RTC internal investigation was stopped cold by Kenneth Starr; Starr’s first act as independent counsel, on Aug. 22, 1994, was to subpoena the RTC’s records on Lewis. A month later, Starr ordered the RTC to suspend its investigation — an investigation which would have shown that the Madison referral was, in fact, a Bush election-campaign “dirty trick.”

Meanwhile, Jean Lewis or her protectors thought she needed a lawyer, and she got one, courtesy of the Landmark Legal Foundation — one of a number of legal foundations financed by Mellon Scaife. A little earlier in the summer of 1994, another project of Landmark was the preparation of a legal brief on behalf of Paula Jones. The brief was to be written by the former Solicitor General of the United States, now in private practice, Kenneth Starr. This project was interrupted by Starr’s appointment as independent counsel in August — but, as the world now knows, Starr never gave up his interest in the Paula Jones case.

Jean Lewis was, in the fall of 1992, assigned to the Kansas City field office of the RTC. Around that same time, the Bush administration shut down the Chicago RTC office and apparently transferred its functions to Kansas City. Another former RTC investigator, Fred Cedarholm, has said that the Bush administration shut down the Chicago office “for strictly political reason,” undercutting the RTC investigation of a subur-

ban Chicago bank, Clyde Federal Savings and Loan—of which now-House Judiciary Committee chairman Henry Hyde was a former director. Despite the attempts of the Bush administration to sabotage the Clyde probe, Hyde and his fellow directors were eventually sued the next year by the RTC for \$17 million; but Hyde has, to this day, evaded paying his portion of the settlement (see accompanying article).

## **Brits vs. Clinton**

Now, how did a clumsy, failed effort to instigate a politically motivated criminal investigation of Madison Guaranty in 1992, end up with the appointment of the Whitewater independent counsel in January 1994? And how did that lead to the eventual abandonment of the whole Whitewater investigation, in favor of having the new independent counsel virtually take over the Paula Jones case in January of 1998?

The first major event which gave Clinton's enemies an opportunity to contrive new accusations against him, was the death of White House aide Vincent Foster in July 1993. Speculation around the death of Foster, whose body was found by Park Police in Ft. Marcy Park, was an especially hot topic in the British press, and in particular for the admitted British intelligence stringer Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, who had come to Washington in 1992 in the guise of the Washington correspondent of the London *Sunday Telegraph*. Evans-Pritchard became a close collaborator of Emmett Tyrrell and others of the "Olson Salon."

On July 25, 1993, in an article entitled "Death in Clinton Clique: In Italy and America, Scandal and Peer Pressure Surround Suicides at the Top," Evans-Pritchard wrote that Foster's death "has set off a flurry of conspiracy theories," that some people think it was murder. Evans-Pritchard commented on Foster's role in the White House Travel Office affair, and he raised the question of whether Foster "had been drawn ineluctably into something that had got out of hand."

Throughout 1993, Evans-Pritchard's more-or-less weekly columns attacked the new Clinton administration, particularly on foreign policy matters. As early as June 1993, Evans-Pritchard was showing signs of concern that Clinton might break with the British in a way no U.S. President had done for decades. Evans-Pritchard worried out loud that a "special relationship" was emerging between Washington and Bonn, and that this "pro-German tilt" in Washington would end up "relegating Britain to the status of a secondary ally."

Adding to the fears of the British and the financial oligarchy by the end of 1993 were the signs of a potential U.S. break with International Monetary Fund policies, with Clinton administration officials openly criticizing the brutal IMF shock therapy being applied to Russia, and calling for "less shock, more therapy."

From the British standpoint, things went from bad to worse during early 1994. When Clinton invited Sinn Fein leader Gerry Adams to the White House in March, the Brits

went ballistic. On March 19, the *Sunday Telegraph* screamed, "The United States is no friend of Britain." It charged that Clinton was seeking the breakup of the United Kingdom. When Clinton stood at the Brandenburg Gate in Berlin in July, and called for a new German-American partnership, the British accused Clinton of betraying the mother country and killing off the "special relationship" between the United States and Great Britain.

But, we get ahead of the story.

## **Hale and Whitewater**

On July 20, 1993—the same day that Vincent Foster died—FBI agents raided the office of Little Rock businessman and former municipal judge David Hale. Hale had come under scrutiny by Federal authorities already in the 1980s for questionable transactions involving the Small Business Administration; he later testified about almost a dozen illegal loans to himself or companies he secretly controlled during 1985-86. These were a few of the many fraud schemes he was running.

Immediately after the raid, Hale had his lawyer contact the U.S. Attorney in Little Rock, and offer that Hale could provide damaging information about the "political elite" in Arkansas. The prosecutor was not interested in bargaining, so Hale then went to one of Clinton's long-standing adversaries in Arkansas, "Justice Jim" Johnson, an ardent segregationist who appears on the "Clinton Chronicles" videotape promoted by televangelist Jerry Falwell (and filmed, by the way, in the offices of the now-Speaker-elect of the House, Rep. Bob Livingston). Johnson, in turn, put Hale in touch with Floyd Brown of Citizens United—the producer of the "Slick Willie" tract during the 1992 election campaign, who maintains a massive database utilized by private and Congressional anti-Clinton writers and investigators. David Bossie, Brown's investigator, who later (along with Barbara Olson) worked for Rep. Dan Burton's (R-Ind.) House Governmental Affairs and Oversight Committee, had a long telephone conversation with Hale; and then put Hale in touch with NBC. The tale Hale was peddling, was that Bill Clinton and Jim Guy Tucker had pressured him to obtain a \$300,000 loan to the McDougals through the Small Business Administration (SBA).

Meanwhile, "Justice" Johnson also put Hale in touch with Cliff Jackson, another Clinton enemy, who by this time was already involved in something else: coordinating the publicity and money-making schemes of a number of state troopers who had been part of Clinton's personal security detail when Clinton was Governor. Jackson was in contact with Peter W. Smith, a wealthy Chicago investment banker and a key funder of Newt Gingrich's GOPAC; Smith put about \$80,000 into efforts to dig up dirt against Clinton, including cash payments of \$6,700 each to two of the troopers. Some of these troopers were also recipients of monies originating from Richard Mellon Scaife.

Despite Hale's efforts to arrive at a plea-bargain, he was indicted in September 1993 on charges of conspiracy and three counts of making false statements to the SBA. But Hale was more successful peddling his story to the "Get Clinton" journalist gang than to Federal prosecutors. His story, which eventually made its way into the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*, was instrumental in the appointment of the first Whitewater independent counsel, in January 1994. Hale struck a deal with the first independent counsel, Robert Fiske, agreeing to cooperate, and to plead guilty to two felonies—but not to be sentenced until later. (Later, Hale admitted that he had lied under oath to the judge in that case during his guilty plea.)

It was during 1994 that Hale became a federally protected witness, and he was then hidden away for two years by Starr, while Starr and his deputies built their case against the McDougals, Tucker, and Clinton. This was all based upon Hale's story that Clinton and Tucker had pressured him to make the loan to the McDougals for Whitewater—even though, in a 1989 FBI interview concerning the loan, Hale had never mentioned Clinton or Tucker!

### Enter the 'Arkansas Project'

By late 1993, Hale had come under the protection of another group of benefactors: Theodore Olson and the "Arkansas Project." The Arkansas Project was organized by Olson in the late fall of 1993, as a covert operation to develop derogatory and potentially incriminating information on Clinton; this included buying sources and manufacturing witnesses. The project was financed by over \$2 million from Scaife, and operated under the auspices of the American Spectator Educational Foundation, the tax-exempt umbrella under which the *American Spectator* magazine was published. Olson was the attorney for the American Spectator Education Foundation, and also a member of its Board of Directors.

The British intelligence-trained Scaife (he ran a joint CIA/British Intelligence proprietary called Forum World Features in London in the early 1970s) was no stranger to media propaganda operations or other covert intelligence operations, and he quickly became the "Daddy Warbucks" of the anti-Clinton secret conspirators. Why was Olson involved? As one source familiar with the Arkansas Project told *Salon* magazine, "Olson is somebody who Scaife would trust to see that nothing went wrong and that his money would not be wasted."

Olson didn't just operate out of his Washington law firm—where he enjoyed a reputation as a top appellate lawyer and one of a small circle of experts on the independent counsel law. Olson also picked up David Hale by no later than November 1993, and became his lawyer.

During the March-April 1996 trial of Gov. Jim Guy Tucker and James and Susan McDougal, the issue of Starr's ties to Olson came up, and Starr's deputies went to extraordinary lengths to block any testimony concerning the relationship. During the cross-examination of Hale by George Col-

lins, the attorney for Governor Tucker, Collins had gotten Hale to acknowledge that he had retained Olson as an attorney in December 1993—over strenuous objections from Starr's prosecutor Ray Jahn:

**Mr. Collins:** Did you know that Theodore Olson was a former partner of Kenneth Starr?

**Mr. Jahn:** Your Honor, Your Honor, that is outrageous. Counsel is engaging in unscrupulous conduct at this point.

**Mr. Collins:** That is not unscrupulous, Your Honor.

**Mr. Jahn:** It is, Your Honor. The Court has already sustained an objection to this line of questioning.

**Mr. Collins:** I think I'm entitled to know that he's personally represented by—

**Mr. Jahn:** They live in the same city. So what? We object to it, Your Honor. We object to it.

As a Federal Witness Protection Program protectee, Hale never went anywhere without an FBI escort. During 1994-96, Hale would regularly go from meeting with Starr's prosecutors in Little Rock, to the Hot Springs, Arkansas bait shop run by Clinton-hater Parker Dozhier, and to meetings with other operatives of Scaife's Arkansas Project. Hale was regularly debriefed, and the information passed along to investigators and journalists, particularly ones working for the *Wall Street Journal* and the *American Spectator*.

David Hale was one product of the Arkansas Project. Paula Jones was another.

### 'Troopergate'

The big bombshell at the end of 1993 was David Brock's "Troopergate" story, which broke on Dec. 19, 1993, triggering a media uproar which soon resulted in President Clinton's Jan. 12, 1994 request for the appointment of an independent counsel.

While the "Troopergate" frenzy was erupting in the last part of December, the *New York Times* and *Washington Post* both reported that Whitewater files had been removed from Vincent Foster's office on the night of his death. The *New York Times* solemnly called for a Congressional investigation, and, by Jan. 4, it was calling for the appointment of a special prosecutor. The *Washington Post* followed suit the next day. On Jan. 12, the embattled White House announced that the President would ask Attorney General Janet Reno to appoint an independent counsel. (She made the appointment, rather than the court, because the independent counsel statute had been allowed to expire.) On Jan. 20, Reno announced the appointment of Robert Fiske.

Clinton's concession only fed the media's appetite, which tried to come up with something new every day. Over the next few months, a succession of new "scandals" was cooked up almost weekly—many of them by the British press, which then laundered them into the U.S. media through what has been dubbed the "media food chain." Already, on Jan. 2,

1994, Ambrose Evans-Pritchard was complaining that most of the U.S. news media had “diluted” the Troopergate story, and he suggested that the American public “probably knows less detail than the British public at this point.”

On Jan. 23, Evans-Pritchard scored his first “exclusive” scandal story, with a front-page *Sunday Telegraph* spread about a former Arkansas beauty queen who claimed that Clinton had threatened to maim and kill her. This fairy-tale soon made its way across the Atlantic into the *Washington Times* and other U.S. media outlets. By Feb. 6, Evans-Pritchard was in Little Rock, predicting—slightly prematurely—that Bill Clinton would be forced out of office by the end of the year.

### The Ken and Paula show

The *American Spectator*’s “Troopergate” article had mentioned an incident involving a woman named “Paula”—with no further identification. Paula was persuaded to go public by Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, who, by his own account, convinced Jones and her family to file a lawsuit against Clinton. In a series of articles written in May 1994, Evans-Pritchard described the Paula Jones case as a “ticking time bomb” under the Presidency.

At the same time, in May 1994, according to his own account, Pritchard attended a dinner party during which he discussed the Jones case with Judge Laurence Silberman. Whether the discussion took place at one of the regular gatherings at Ted Olson’s house is not known, but Pritchard did describe how Silberman was analyzing the Jones case, and the question of whether the suit might be delayed until after the 1996 elections, on grounds of Presidential immunity.

Meanwhile, Starr, still a private lawyer, was also getting involved with the Paula Jones case. At the request of Rosalie Silberman, a founder of the Independent Women’s Forum and the wife of Judge Silberman, Starr was preparing to draft an *amicus curiae* legal brief to be filed on behalf of Jones by the Landmark Legal Foundation, arguing against Presidential immunity from a civil suit. Starr also consulted with Jones’s lawyers at least half a dozen times, before being appointed independent counsel in August.

The public was not aware of any further involvement by Starr with the Paula Jones case until Jan. 21, 1998, when the Monica Lewinsky story crashed onto the front pages. Five days earlier, attorneys from Starr’s office and from the Justice Department had gone to Judge Sentelle and the special three-judge court to obtain official authorization to expand Starr’s investigation into allegations of perjury and obstruction of justice in the *Jones v. Clinton* case.

Much information has since emerged, showing that the court approval authorizing Starr to get involved in the Jones case was simply rubber-stamping what had already been going on for some time.

It is an absolute lie by Starr’s defenders, to claim that he only began probing into the President’s sex life in January 1998 because of the Monica Lewinsky allegations. The truth

is that within weeks of the November 1996 elections (when public discussion of Clinton’s possible impeachment was already beginning among the Starr-Olson circle), Starr deployed his own agents to interview every trooper for Clinton’s former security detail, asking about women with whom Clinton was rumored to have had sexual affairs.

On June 25, 1997, the *Washington Post* ran a front-page story headlined “Starr Probes Clinton Personal Life,” reporting that FBI agents and prosecutors from Starr’s office were questioning Arkansas state troopers and others about any extramarital affairs Clinton may have had. This included asking about Paula Jones by name. “They asked me all about Paula Jones, all kinds of questions about Paula Jones, whether I saw Clinton and Paula together and how many times,” former state trooper Roger Perry was quoted as saying. “The asked me if I had ever seen Bill Clinton perform a sexual act.”

Sound familiar?

### Lucy Goldberg’s back channel

In October 1997, the Rutherford Institute, which had just taken over funding of the Jones case, received a number of anonymous calls, reporting that a woman named “Monica” had sex with the President in the White House. These calls apparently came from Linda Tripp’s “literary agent” Lucianne Goldberg. At about same time, Jones’s Dallas lawyers called Tripp, after Tripp had been cited in a *Newsweek* article,

**“Long before Paula Jones,  
long before Monica Lewinsky,  
there was a conscious decision, made in  
London, that there would be a full-scale  
campaign to destroy Bill Clinton,  
and to destroy, once and for all,  
the credibility of the office of the  
Presidency of the United States.”**

—Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.



A 56-minute video featuring LaRouche, *EIR* Editors Jeffrey Steinberg and Edward Spannaus. **\$25** postpaid  
Order number EIE 98-001

**EIR News Service** P.O. Box 17390 Washington, D.C. 20041-0390  
To order, call 888-EIR-3258 (toll-free). We accept Visa or MasterCard.

and Tripp gave them Monica Lewinsky's name. Shortly after this, Tripp began illegally taping her conversations with Lewinsky — at the direction of Goldberg.

Goldberg was an old intelligence hand who had cut her teeth on political dirty tricks during the 1972 Nixon campaign. In a career path which tracked that of Starr's patron Scaife, Goldberg had got her start working for a joint CIA/British intelligence propaganda front, the North American Newspaper Alliance. Scaife got his training by heading another CIA/British propaganda front in the early 1970s, known as Forum World Features, headquartered in London.

It is now well known how Goldberg created a "back channel" to Starr's office through a circle of lawyers who are all members of the Starr-Olson-Bork "Federalist Society." It has also been publicly disclosed that by December 1997, Olson himself had been told about Tripp's involvement with Lewinsky, and was asked if he would represent Tripp. (It is utterly inconceivable that Olson could have been aware of the Lewinsky story without immediately passing that information on to Starr.)

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 had had an affair with Clinton; that affidavit — now a subject great controversy in the impeachment proceedings — was submitted by her attorney in an attempt to prevent her from having to testify.

Linda Tripp herself was no stranger to Starr's office. She had been interviewed by Starr's staff in 1995, during Starr's investigation of the death of Vincent Foster, and it is likely she remained in contact with them, directly or indirectly.

In any event, on Jan. 13, Tripp was wired up by the FBI, to record her discussion with Lewinsky at a hotel near the Pentagon. Starr then had Tripp set up another lunch meeting with Lewinsky for Jan. 16, on which day Lewinsky walked directly into the arms of waiting FBI agents and Starr's deputies. Tripp spent the afternoon at the same hotel talking with FBI agents and lawyers from Starr's office, and then went to meet with Paula Jones's lawyers that night, who were getting ready to take a deposition from President Clinton the next day, Jan. 17.

At that point, Starr abandoned everything he and his friends had been doing since 1994 and threw all of his resources into trying to construct a perjury and obstruction-of-justice case against the President around Lewinsky and the Jones case — which would provide the pretext for initiating the impeachment that the President's enemies had been planning for years.

Recall that Henry Hyde had said, in March of 1997, "I want at least one smoking gun before we proceed with impeachment. . . . We'll be ready when the time comes." Monica Lewinsky may not quite have been the smoking gun Henry expected, but he certainly was ready to use her to implement his anti-Constitutional plans.

## Hyde's secret life of corruption and coverup

by an EIR Investigative Team

Would you hire a home protection agency whose chief executive officer's background includes a history of adultery, coverup of adultery, investigation for bank fraud, lying about hiring investigators to track opponents, refusal to pay fines ordered by a Federal regulatory agency, and conflict of interest? If your answer is no, you'd better think again about the assault on the Presidency, and how House Judiciary Committee Chairman Henry Hyde (R-Ill.) hijacked the U.S. government.

For the last month, the fate of the U.S. Constitution has been held in the hands of Hyde, whose career includes all the above-mentioned elements, earning him title of the "most corrupt hypocrite" in the U.S. House of Representatives. As the impeachment railroad opened before the full House on Dec. 18, Hyde again proved he deserves that title, by declaring in the opening speech that there cannot be "one law for the rulers" and another law for everybody else.

Hyde's charmed life shows that it exactly under that double standard that he has survived.

### Hyde and Clyde

On Nov. 19, 1998, major media ignored a story that appeared in *If Magazine*, called "Henry Can't Hyde." The article, by Dennis Bernstein, began, "Rep. Henry Hyde, who argues 'no man is above the law' in President Clinton's impeachment inquiry, escaped legal responsibility as a former director of the failed Clyde Federal Savings and Loan because of his political clout, according to investigators and others in the S&L case."

One person close to the investigation of the Clyde failure, Resolution Trust Corp. (RTC) investigator Fred Cedarholm, claims that the Chicago RTC office in 1992 was even closed down by Bush administration "for strictly political reasons," to undercut the investigation of Clyde and other Illinois savings and loans.

The Clyde S&L, in suburban Chicago, finally failed in 1990 due to speculative operations, necessitating a \$68 million bailout, at taxpayers' expense. Representative Hyde was a Clyde director from 1981 to 1984. Another wrinkle in the Clyde case, was its dealings with Guaranty Savings and Loan of Harrison, Arkansas, which also collapsed. The combined cost to taxpayers for the two belly-up banks was more than \$150 million.

Tim Anderson, an independent bank investigator who has