

Clinton Scandals

Compiled by Jerry Winkel

The following is a compilation, which is by no means exhaustive, of news excerpts from the last few years. Regardless of if you think the various charges against the Clinton's are false or if you think they are politically motivated, you will certainly see a pattern. You will see patterns of denial, alleged behavior, misinformation and poor judgment. Absurd comments are marked in bold and the comments of the compiler are in italics.

This is still a draft since it needs more editing. I also didn't capture all the references (major oops). But if you dislike the Clinton's it is a good resource.

One article I would love to include but could not find was about Al Gore admitting that he broke the law in campaign financing but was proud of it because he had to do whatever it took to prevent the Republican Congress from hurting America. Great! If you think your cause is the most important, it is ok to break the law.

To Bill - Thanks for the Memories

As I was making my daily journey to the Post Office the other day, I patiently waited for a car to vacate a parking space near the door. As the rear of the vehicle came toward me, I noticed a bumper sticker which read, in big, bold letters, "THANK ME. I VOTED CLINTON-GORE."

Of course, the bumper sticker was printed in response to an earlier sticker which adorned some automobiles some six years ago. Back then, as Presidents Bill and Hillary were attempting to nationalize health care and play havoc with the discipline and fiber of the military, "Don't Blame Me. I Voted For Bush," was the message on many bumpers. Hence, the "Thank Me..." message came in response.

Pondering the message of the brave, stubborn soul in the car ahead of me, I considered all the things I could be thankful for as a result of the Clinton-Gore regime.

Indeed, I discovered the list was long and varied. So, to my friend who has not yet discovered a razor blade and Goo-Be-Gone, I offer a hearty "Thank you!"

Thank you for reminding us that the government that gave us the Internal Revenue Service and welfare also lusts for control of the greatest healthcare system in the world. Thank you for reminding that the FBI, who has a file on millions of Americans, including myself, can give those files to people powerful enough to demand them.

Thank you for giving us a President who supports partial-birth abortions.

Thank you for introducing us to Jennifer Flowers, Paula Jones, Monica Lewinski and about two dozen other names that we might not have met and known otherwise.

Thank you for allowing a WAR HERO and the author of one of the most successful military campaigns in history to leave the presidency because, no matter how successful he was, we, in all our moral outrage, just wouldn't tolerate someone who would lie to the American people by promising "no new taxes" and then going back on his word. We certainly can't have a liar in the White House, now can we?

Thank you for giving us a President who discusses his choice of underwear with teenagers. We always wondered if presidents wore boxers or briefs.

Thank you for installing a man who reminds us of those good old days of pot smoking (without inhaling, of course) and war PROTESTING.

Thank you for showing us that the ridiculous plot of the movie, "Wag the Dog," could really be plausible after all.

Thank you for showing us the truly horrifying dangers of cloning someone's DNA. (After this is all over, BURN the blue cocktail dress...Please-e-e-e-e!).

Thank you for showing all the men and women in America that sexual harassment in the workplace, and on the job, is okay as long as it involves powerful middle-age executives and the young women half their age under their power. It is, after all, a "private matter."

Thank you for revealing that the agenda of the National Organization of Women only includes some women. Women like Anita Hill and not women like Paula Jones, Monica Lewinski, et. al.

Thank you for allowing us to come to the realization that "sexual relations" is not clearly defined after all. And all these years, I thought that "oral sex" really had something to do with sex. Imagine! Or is it Oral Sex when you talk about it. . . .?

Thank you for re-introducing the concept of "impeachment" to a new generation that missed the discussion surrounding it the last time it was brought up.

Thank you for curing me of my addiction to the evening news. Thank you for reminding us that, when all is said and done, "CHARACTER" really, really DOES matter.

And, in comparison to recent days:

Thank you for making Dan Quayle look like the Rhodes Scholar.

Thank you for making Jimmy Carter look competent.

Thank you for making Gerald Ford look graceful.

Thank you for making Richard Nixon look honest.

Thank you for making Lyndon Johnson look truthful.

Thank you for making John Kennedy look moral.

Thank you for making Al Gore look positively presidential.

Thank you for reminding us of the importance of term limits.

And really, thank you not once, but twice! Why, if not for YOU, instead of the current, interesting discussion all over the television networks and newspapers, we would be focused on a whole slew of trivial matters such as global defense, the economy, nukes in North Korea, genocide in Africa, the containment of terrorism, and all those other boring topics.

So, thank you, thank you, thank you! Oh, and if you voted for Ross Perot, thank you, too. You deserve just as much of the credit as my friend with the bumper sticker.

Since Bill Clinton took office, here are some of the "GOOD" things that have happened:

72 House and Senate witnesses have plead the fifth.

17 witnesses have fled the country to avoid testifying.

19 foreign witnesses have refused to be interviewed by US investigative bodies.

19 charges from Whitewater investigations.

14 convictions from Whitewater investigations.

8 imprisonments from Whitewater investigations.

55 total charges in all Clinton scandals.

32 total convictions (so far) in all Clinton scandals.

14 total imprisonments (so far) in all Clinton scandals.

938 overnight stays at Whitehouse for Clinton supporters.

\$40 million - cost of Clinton's trip to China.

62 House of Representative seats that have changed from Democrat to Republican.

12 Senate seats that have changed from Democrat to Republican.

13 Governorships that have changed from Democrat to Republican.

1,200 state legislative seats that have changed from Democrat to Republican

353 elected Democrats who have switched parties since Clinton took office.

Yes, it's been an interesting six years for "the most ethical administration in the history of the Republic".

But then ... everybody knows it's ALL the fault of the "Vast right-wing conspiracy". Go figure...!

(Written by an Episcopalian Minister in Georgia)

A Recent Father-Son Talk...

Dad: "Son, come in here, we need to talk!"

Son: "What's up, Dad?"

Dad: "There's a scratch down the side of the car. Did you do it?"

Son: "I don't believe, if I understand the definition of 'scratch the car' correctly, that I can say, truthfully, that I scratched the car."

Dad: "Well, it wasn't there yesterday. You drove the car last night. No one else has driven the car since then. Can you explain the scratch?"

Son: "Well, Dad, as I've said before, I have no recollection of scratching the car. While it is true that I did take the car out last night, I did not scratch it."

Dad: "Your sister told me she saw you back the car into the mailbox at the end of the driveway,

heard a loud scraping sound, saw you get out to examine the car, and then drive away. So again I'll ask you, yes or no, did you scratch the car?"

Son: "Oh, you mean you think you have evidence to prove I scratched it. Well, you see, I understood you to mean did 'I' scratch the car. I stand by my earlier statement, that I did not scratch the car."

Dad: "Are you trying to tell me you didn't drive the car into the mailbox?"

Son: "Well, you see sir, I was trying to drive the car into the street. I mishandled the steering of the car, and it resulted in direct contact with the mailbox, though that was clearly not my intent."

Dad: "So you are then saying that you did hit the mailbox?"

Son: "No sir, that's not my statement. I'll refer you back to my original statement that I did not scratch the car."

Dad: "But the car did hit the mailbox, and the car did get scratched as a result of this contact?"

Son: "Well, yes, I suppose you could look at it that way."

Dad: "So you lied to me when you said you did not scratch the car?"

Son: "No! No, that is not correct. Your question was 'Did I scratch the car?' From a strict legal definition, as I understood the meaning of that sentence, I did not scratch the car... the mailbox did... I was merely present when the scratching occurred. So my answer of 'No' when you asked 'Did I scratch the car' was legally correct, although I did not volunteer information."

Dad: "Where in the world did you ever learn to talk like a complete babbling idiot?"

Son: "I'm not really sure, but I recently picked it up from somewhere."

DNC Chairman Praises Clinton Moral Leadership

The Washington Times 9/16/98

Democratic National Committee Chairman Steve Grossman, told the party faithful at a New York fund-raiser Monday night that Mr. Clinton had provided "the kind of moral leadership to this country that has enriched the life of virtually every citizen."

"You have demonstrated at least in my adult lifetime a higher commitment to the kind of moral leadership that I value in public service and public policy than any person that I have ever met," Mr. Grossman told Mr. Clinton at the fund-raising event.

Clinton Disentangles Himself From Sex Scandal

January 19, 2001 3:03 pm EST

USAToday

By Steve Holland

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - President Clinton cut a deal on his last full day in office on Friday to disentangle himself from the fallout over his sex scandal, overshadowing inaugural celebrations for his successor, George W. Bush.

In a statement, Clinton admitted that he "knowingly violated" the law in giving testimony about his affair with former White House intern Monica Lewinsky in sworn testimony in the Paula Jones

sexual harassment case three years ago.

In return, independent counsel Robert Ray has concluded the Lewinsky case and dropped any plans to indict Clinton on criminal perjury charges after Clinton leaves office, White House spokesman Jake Siewert said.

As part of the deal, Clinton accepted a five-year suspension of his license to practice law in Arkansas and paid a \$25,000 fine.

The move removes a major legal cloud hanging over Clinton as he leaves office after eight years, but served to remind Americans why they held him in low personal regard even while giving him high job approval ratings of about 65 percent.

"Hopefully this will give America the chance to put this particular episode behind them and then move on," Siewert said.

It was Clinton's testimony in the Jones case, in which he denied sexual relations with Lewinsky, that triggered the scandal which led to his impeachment by the House of Representatives in December 1998.

The Senate acquitted him in February 1999 but Ray has been leading an investigation into whether Clinton committed perjury and was said to have been considering an indictment of him after he leaves office.

CLINTON ACKNOWLEDGES RESPONSIBILITY

"President Clinton has acknowledged responsibility for his actions," Ray said in a statement. "The nation's interests have been served and therefore I decline prosecution."

In his statement, read by Siewert to reporters in the White House briefing room, Clinton tried to explain how he came to make misleading statements in the Jones case.

"I tried to walk a fine line between acting lawfully and testifying falsely, but I now recognize that I did not fully accomplish this goal and that certain of my responses to questions about Ms. Lewinsky were false," he said.

"I have apologized for my conduct and I have done my best to atone for it with my family, my administration and the American people. I have paid a high price for it, which I accept because it caused so much pain to so many people. I hope my actions today will help bring closure and finality to the matters,"

Siewert said Clinton's lawyers had been involved over the past several weeks in a discussion about a deal with Ray and the Arkansas Committee on Professional Conduct, which had been considering disbarring Clinton because of the statements he made in the Jones case.

The decision came as rain-soaked Washington was awash in celebrations for Bush's inauguration at noon Saturday, and live television reports immediately dropped reports on the inauguration to pick

up again on the Clinton drama.

CNN, for example, broke into a taped interview with Bush to provide a live report on Clinton. Indeed Clinton, for all his comments about wishing Bush well, is showing a clear reluctance to leave the national stage.

On inauguration day, Clinton has two opportunities to make remarks, at a departure ceremony at Andrews Air Force Base and on his arrival in New York. Traditionally ex-presidents leave Washington quietly to let their successor take the limelight.

Bush spokesman Ari Fleischer said a Clinton administration official had informed Bush's Chief of Staff Andrew Card about the impending deal on Thursday night. The deal meant Bush would not have to spend time fretting over whether to issue Clinton a pardon if he was indicted.

"I can assure you that President-elect Bush is going to look forward ...to the beginning of a new chapter in our nation's history," said Fleischer. "He will look forward not backward. It is the beginning of a new chapter in our nation's history."

Disillusioned

"One young [White House] aide was in tears last week as she described the hellishness of the past seven months for those who believed in Mr. Clinton," reports John M. Broder of the New York Times.

"She worked night after night, going home in exhaustion and uncertainty. Her faith was shattered by Mr. Clinton's Aug. 17 confession of a relationship with Monica S. Lewinsky and by his repeated lies about it," the reporter said. "She is leaving the White House in the next few weeks and does not expect to work in government again."

Report: Prosecutors had ample evidence on Clinton

USAToday 3-6-2002

WASHINGTON (AP) — A final report by Independent Counsel Robert Ray concluded Wednesday that prosecutors had ample evidence for criminal charges against President Clinton in the scandal involving former White House intern Monica Lewinsky.

"The independent counsel's judgment that sufficient evidence existed to prosecute President Clinton was confirmed by President Clinton's admissions," the report stated. "President Clinton admitted he 'knowingly gave evasive and misleading answers'" about his sexual relationship with Ms. Lewinsky.

It wasn't until Clinton's next-to-last day in office that he finally put the investigation of allegations of perjury and obstruction in the Lewinsky matter behind him.

The president's lawyers cut a deal with Ray that spared Clinton from criminal charges in the Lewinsky controversy. The president admitted that he had made false statements under oath

about his relationship with the former White House intern and surrendered his law license for five years.

The report stated that "President Clinton engaged in conduct that impeded the due administration of justice by testifying falsely under oath ... that he could not recall ever being alone with Monica Lewinsky; and he had not had a sexual affair or engaged in sexual relations with Monica Lewinsky."

In response to the report, Clinton attorney David Kendall issued a brief statement: "The investigation of President Clinton from 1994 to 2001 was intense, expensive, partisan and long. There's still no Whitewater report, and there's nothing new in this report. It's time to move on."

Ray's report was released by a three-member panel of federal appeals court judges who appointed Ray and his predecessor, Kenneth Starr, to investigate the president and the first lady in 1994.

The independent counsel's report on the perjury and obstruction probe involving Clinton and Lewinsky is to be followed soon by Ray's last report, on Whitewater. It involves the business partnership of Clinton and now-Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton with the owners of a failing Arkansas savings and loan in the 1980s.

Starr's investigation of possible perjury and obstruction by the president regarding his sexual relationship with Lewinsky led to the impeachment crisis that threatened Clinton's presidency and resulted in serious political damage to his second term in office.

Clinton was impeached by the House, but the Senate acquitted him. Senators split 50-50 on an obstruction of justice charge and voted 55-45 to acquit the president of perjury. The congressional battle followed up the detailed findings of Starr that there was "substantial and credible information ... that may constitute grounds for impeachment."

The Lewinsky controversy grew out of a sexual harassment lawsuit by former Arkansas state employee Paula Jones. Testifying in the lawsuit, Clinton denied having sex with Lewinsky and said he didn't recall being alone with her.

The criminal investigation of Clinton in the Lewinsky matter began in January 1998. Former White House employee Linda Tripp, a friend of Lewinsky, turned over to Starr secretly taped phone calls in which the ex-intern confided her relationship with Clinton. The tapes contradicted Clinton's sworn testimony in the Jones case, which the president gave just days after Tripp had turned the tapes over to Starr.

The sequence — first turning over the tapes, then Clinton testifying in the Jones case — led Clinton and his defenders to accuse Starr's office of setting a perjury trap for the president.

Starr's prosecutors and the FBI looked into whether Clinton had tried to silence Lewinsky by getting presidential friend Vernon Jordan to find a job for her. Besides opening doors for her job-hunting efforts, Jordan arranged to hire a Washington lawyer for Lewinsky so that she could file an affidavit in the Jones case. In the affidavit, she denied having had a sexual relationship with Clinton.

When Lewinsky eventually agreed to cooperate with investigators in the summer of 1998, she turned over a stained blue dress from an encounter with Clinton, making it impossible for the president to deny a sexual relationship. Lab tests showed Clinton's DNA on the garment.

Depth of sorrow

President Clinton's stonewalling makes it imperative that Congress release "anything that bears on Clinton's use of presidential power" detailed in independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr's report, USA Today said Thursday in an editorial.

"Clinton's own assertions clearly can no longer be believed. The president lied to everyone about the affair. He repeatedly invoked claims of executive and attorney-client privilege, arranged joint-defense agreements, attacked his accusers for exposing the facts, and on and on. All with one goal in mind: to keep himself from ever having to confess the affair, let alone apologize to the nation for it," the newspaper said.

"Only when backed into a corner by mounting physical evidence collected over months of investigation – an investigation that cost taxpayers millions -- did Clinton confess to the truth. And only when backed into a corner again by falling poll numbers, crumbling Democratic support and the Starr report itself did the president manage to discover the depth of his sorrow."

A>I hope that the foundation of our national policy will be laid in the pure and immutable principles of private morality. The preeminence of free government exemplifies by all the attributes which can win the affections of its citizens and command the respect of the world.= That is a great statement.

It isn't asking too much of our public servants to make this greatest nation on earth not only make this nation the greatest nation on earth not only politically and militarily but also give moral leadership to the world....You cannot divorce private behavior from public leadership.@

President Gordon B. Hinckley
Larry King Live 9/8/98

As we start out, lets start with a quote from a Democrat in Massachusetts:.....

Meehan's Judgment

The Washington Times 8/16/98

Rep. Martin T. Meehan, who as co-author of a prominent campaign-finance reform bill is **considered by some** to be an expert on ethics in government, yesterday praised the Clinton administration for its ethical purity.

Tony Snow, host of "Fox News Sunday," asked the Massachusetts Democrat if President Clinton had made good on his promise to have the most ethical administration in the history of the republic.

"I think he has," Mr. Meehan replied.

Good Advice

The Washington Times 8/25/98

On Aug. 6, 1974, three days before Richard Nixon resigned the presidency, the Arkansas Democrat reported: "Bill Clinton, Democratic candidate for the 3rd Congressional District, said, 'There's nothing left to say. There's not any point now in his putting the country through an impeachment since he isn't making any pretense of innocence now.'

"Clinton said he believed the president should have stayed in office and resisted resignation if Nixon thought himself innocent. **But now that the president has admitted wrongdoing, he should resign, Clinton said.**"

A Dress to the Nation

The Washington Times 8/16/98

The sex-and-lies scandal has brought such ridicule upon the presidency that advertisers are using it to sell their products, writes New York Times columnist Maureen Dowd. In one Tommy Hilfiger ad, a young beauty "is squatting on the blue Oval Office rug, her knees over the presidential seal, her eager face looking up," Miss Dowd said.

And a Los Angeles computer retailer ran an ad in the Los Angeles Times "boasting that its prices were 'dropping faster than the president's pants.'"

The columnist added: "Mr. Clinton has condemned himself to provide lurid entertainment for a society addicted to lurid entertainment. He has a double-entendre presidency, where the nightly news is now the nightly gross-out, where talk of an address to the nation collapses into snickering about a dress to the nation."

Presidential address delivered on the evening of his Grand Jury appearance.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

August 17, 1998

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

The Map Room

10:02 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Good evening. This afternoon in this room, from this chair, I testified before the Office of Independent Counsel and the grand jury. I answered their questions truthfully, including questions about my private life -- questions no American citizen would ever want to answer.

Still I must take complete responsibility for all my actions, both public and private. And that is why I am speaking to you tonight.

As you know, in a deposition in January I was asked questions about my relationship with Monica Lewinsky. While my answers were legally accurate, I did not volunteer information. Indeed, I did have a relationship with Ms. Lewinsky that was not appropriate. In fact, it was wrong. It constituted a critical lapse in judgment and a personal failure on my part for which I am solely and completely responsible.

But I told the grand jury today, and I say to you now, that at no time did I ask anyone to lie, to hide or destroy evidence, or to take any other unlawful action.

I know that my public comments and my silence about this matter gave a false impression. I misled people, including even my wife. I deeply regret that. I can only tell you I was motivated by many factors: first, by a desire to protect myself from the embarrassment of my own conduct. I was also very concerned about protecting my family. The fact that these questions were being asked in a politically inspired lawsuit which has since been dismissed was a consideration, too.

In addition, I had real and serious concerns about an independent counsel investigation that began with private business dealings 20 years ago -- dealings, I might add, about which an independent federal agency found no evidence of any wrongdoing by me or my wife over two years ago.

The independent counsel investigation moved on to my staff and friends, then into my private life, and now the investigation itself is under investigation. This has gone on too long, cost too much, and hurt too many innocent people.

Now this matter is between me, the two people I love most -- my wife and our daughter -- and our God. I must put it right, and I am prepared to do whatever it takes to do so. Nothing is more important to me personally. But it is private. And I intend to reclaim my family life for my family. It's nobody's business but ours. Even Presidents have private lives.

It is time to stop the pursuit of personal destruction and the prying into private lives, and get on with our national life. Our country has been distracted by this matter for too long. And I take my responsibility for my part in all of this; that is all I can do. Now it is time -- in fact, it is past time -- to move on. We have important work to do -- real opportunities to seize, real problems to solve, real security matters to face.

And so, tonight, I ask you to turn away from the spectacle of the past seven months, to repair the fabric of our national discourse and to return our attention to all the challenges and all the promise of the next American century.

Thank you for watching, and good night.

END

10:07 P.M. EDT

The Legal Gamble: To Say Just Enough

The Washington Post August 18, 1998

President Clinton's legal strategy of denying any perjury and offering minimum details about his sexual relationship with Monica S. Lewinsky appears to be a gamble that independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr will be left without enough evidence to bring a criminal case or convince Congress to launch impeachment proceedings.

The centerpiece of Clinton's defense, as he told the country last night, is that, while admittedly misleading, his denial under oath last January that he had a sexual relationship with Lewinsky was "legally accurate" and therefore did not constitute perjury. He asserted he did not encourage Lewinsky to lie or obstruct justice in any way.

In acknowledging an improper relationship with Lewinsky but denying that he lied under oath in his deposition in the Paula Jones sexual harassment case, Clinton appears to be adopting a narrowly legalistic view of the definition of "sexual relationship" used by the Jones lawyers and arguing that, whatever the nature of the contact between him and the former intern, it did not fit within that definition.

Answers that are technically true cannot constitute perjury even if they are misleading. **But Clinton's apparent argument -- even if it is accepted B does not address a number of other statements he made during the deposition, such as his assertion that he did not recall being alone with Lewinsky and did not discuss with her the subpoena from Jones's lawyers.**

Nor does it take into account other evidence that Starr has amassed -- for example, Lewinsky's reported testimony that Clinton discussed with her "cover stories" to hide their relationship from the Jones lawyers or how to avoid turning over to them gifts that had been subpoenaed.

More immediately, Clinton's angry public denunciation of the independent counsel and his refusal to answer questions that prosecutors put to him yesterday behind closed doors is a high-stakes strategy that raises the possibility of additional legal confrontations between the president and the independent counsel.

Starr withdrew his initial subpoena to the president in return for Clinton's promise to answer prosecutors' questions voluntarily. Yesterday, Clinton balked at answering what he considered unduly intrusive questions and cut off prosecutors' questioning at the agreed-upon hour, even though they had not yet finished.

Given that stance, Starr could reissue the subpoena -- and seek to have him held in contempt if he refuses to comply, a possibility that prosecutors raised during their questioning of Clinton yesterday. For their part, the president's lawyers could take the approach they backed off from during the first round and challenge Starr's constitutional authority to summon a sitting president.

Clinton's refusal to answer prosecutors' questions on the grounds that they were too intimate is highly unusual. "Unless a witness has a legitimate privilege to refuse to answer a question or

series of questions, they have to answer them," said former prosecutor Lawrence Barcella. "A witness can't just refuse to answer a question because he or she doesn't feel like it,"

But Clinton's lawyer, David E. Kendall, said Clinton was justified in refusing to answer because the questions were improperly and unnecessarily graphic. "As to a very few highly intrusive questions, with respect to the specifics of this [sexual] contact, in order to preserve personal privacy and institutional dignity, he gave candid, but not detailed, answers," Kendall told the Associated Press. As he weighs the evidence against Clinton, Starr could still decide to seek an indictment of the president, although that is the least likely of the possible scenarios and one that is fraught with constitutional questions.

The more probable outcome is a scathing report to Congress that will outline evidence of possible grounds for impeachment and that, legal sources said, could cite Clinton's refusal to answer all the questions posed to him as evidence of efforts to impede the grand jury investigation.

Starr's office last night was silent on its plans, but some criminal defense lawyers said they thought Clinton's approach risked an angry retort from the independent counsel. "It makes Starr put up," one lawyer said. "If I were Starr I would be livid and prone to want to issue my report tomorrow."

Starr's face-off with Clinton yesterday was the climax of seven difficult and bitter months of investigation and the last major step before Starr sends the matter to Congress for possible impeachment proceedings.

Now that he has secured the president's account of his relationship with Lewinsky, Starr may recall a few final witnesses before the grand jury to test Clinton's story, the most likely being Lewinsky and Clinton's personal secretary Betty Currie. Starr may also have more Secret Service officers he wants to question, and he has not yet obtained the full testimony of deputy White House counsel Bruce R. Lindsey, one of the president's closest friends.

But yesterday's session with Clinton -- however acrimonious -- marks the beginning of the end for Starr's role in the scandal, a turning point that within weeks will likely move the investigation of Clinton to Congress, which has shown little enthusiasm for taking it on.

Starr is virtually certain to produce a report detailing possibly impeachable acts on the part of Clinton, sources close to the probe said. "If he provides testimony that they think is both truthful and indicates that prior testimony was truthful and takes care of obstruction of justice, then they won't send a report -- but I can't imagine how that scenario would be true," said a lawyer familiar with Starr's operation.

What is important, said a Democratic congressional source yesterday, is "whether Starr has anything other than the affair. If there is nothing else the House will find a means to truncate this, but if there is something else, the House will have to do something more."

Over the weekend anonymous Clinton allies tried to hold out an olive branch in hopes Starr would not embarrass Clinton at yesterday's session, one describing the special counsel as a "righteous man" -- not a partisan. **But soon after the session ended, Kendall signaled the day had been**

confrontational.

"We're hopeful that the president's testimony will finally bring closure to the independent counsel's more than four-year and over \$40 million investigation, which has culminated in an investigation of the president's private life," said Kendall, using the language Clinton supporters have time and again used against Starr.

Clinton's lawyers were opposed to the president testifying, sources said, fearing he would place himself in legal jeopardy. Kendall urged Clinton to challenge Starr's authority to compel his testimony, sources said, and Robert S. Bennett, the lawyer who represents Clinton in the Paula Jones matter, urged that he either refuse to testify or else respond fully to all Starr's questions.

For all its notoriety, in the end the investigation of the president has followed the course of a more normal criminal case, legal experts said. "To some degree this thing has proceeded -- albeit on a rather grand scale -- in the way that you'd expect," said Columbia University law professor Gerard Lynch. "Clinton has to be the last big witness. You build all of your case and then you confront the person with it."

General Impeachment

Starr report to go well beyond sex Lewinsky not mentioned in first 400 pages
World Net Daily 8/18/98

Statements by President Clinton's supporters suggesting the pending report by Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr on the various Clinton scandals will focus only on the Monica Lewinsky affair are totally without merit, according to a well-placed attorney close to the investigation.

The report is said to be well over 500 pages in length and growing daily, with nothing mentioned about Lewinsky until page 400. The attorney confirmed that the report is "massive and will deal with everything." He added that Starr intends to make a "very thorough report."

Another source also verified that the report "does not focus on Lewinsky alone. It covers it all. In fact, there is much the press and public don't know." He was certain that after a review of Clinton's testimony before the grand jury, and a review of evidence from other sources, it is very likely that Clinton will be asked to come back and answer more questions.

The number one damage control tactic used by Bill Clinton for many years has been what political consultants call "the three Ds" -- deny, discredit and destroy, according to former Clinton political consultant Dick Morris. The art and science of damage control is to manipulate public opinion.

Morris confirmed that Clinton has successfully used the tactic of "deny, discredit and destroy," for many years with one scandal after another. When Clinton appeared before the American people to explain his relationship with Monica Lewinsky, he once again used "the three Ds" in an effort to manipulate public opinion, said Morris.

Though Morris praised Clinton's remarks last night on national television, the very methods of manipulation he described were evident as Clinton attempted to minimize his affair with Lewinsky, transfer blame to Starr, and thereby extend even longer the continuing investigation.

Current Clinton damage control master-mind, James Carville, has admitted publicly that his No. 1 goal is to discredit and destroy Starr. He formed the Education and Information Project for that very purpose, and he has personally referred to EIP as "smear central."

According to Morris, reports in the press, generated by interviews with Carville, often portray the Starr investigation as being too long, too costly and fruitless. Carville, he says, knows that the more often the press hears such claims, true or not, the more likely the press will repeat the same claim.

"This has gone on too long, cost too much, and hurt too many innocent people," said Clinton of the Starr investigation in his speech to the American people. Yet, the facts, according to the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress, contradict the claims made by Carville and other Clinton supporters.

There have been 19 independent counsel investigations initiated under the provisions of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, according to Jack Maskell, the legislative attorney who prepared the report. His report lists the independent counsels, the dates of their work, the results of each, and the cost associated with each investigation according to General Accounting Office records.

Four of the 19 investigations are currently under way, and 12 of the investigations resulted in no indictments against those investigated, including two which were sealed. The following is a description of the seven investigations which resulted in convictions or guilty pleas in order from the fewest to the most. Also shown is the length of time of each investigation, the total cost, and the cost per conviction as of the date of the report:

1. James C. McKay appointed 2/2/87 until 7/18/88 (17 months) to investigate White House aide Lyn Nofziger and Attorney General Edwin Meese expending \$2,796,000. The investigation

resulted in a conviction of Nofziger, which was overturned on appeal due to a technical failure on pleading. There was no indictment of Meese. One conviction, cost per conviction: \$2,796,000.

2. Whitney North Seymour, Jr. appointed 5/29/86 until 8/16/89 (39 months) to investigate presidential aide Michael Deaver expending \$1,552,000. The investigation resulted in a conviction of Deaver on three counts of perjury. One conviction, cost per conviction: \$1,552,000.

3. David M. Barrett appointed 5/24/95 and is ongoing (36 months) to investigate Secretary of HUD Henry Cisneros expending thus far \$5,467,514. There have been three guilty pleas with four indictments pending, including one of Cisneros. Three guilty pleas, cost per guilty plea or conviction: \$1,822,504.

4. Lawrence E. Walsh appointed 12/19/86 until 8/4/93 (80 months) to investigate Lt. Col. Oliver North and others expending \$47,865,000. The investigation resulted in seven guilty pleas, four convictions with two overturned on appeal, three indictments, and six Presidential pardons. 11 guilty pleas or convictions, cost per guilty plea or conviction: \$4,351,363.

5. Donald Smaltz appointed 9/9/94 and is ongoing (44 months to date) to investigate Secretary of Agriculture Mike Espy expending \$14,839,986. The investigation resulted in six guilty pleas, one no contest plea, six jury convictions with two verdicts set aside, four acquittals, one civil suit settlement, and three indictments pending, including that of Espy. 13 guilty pleas or convictions, cost per guilty plea or conviction: \$1,236,665.

6. Kenneth W. Starr appointed 8/5/94 and is ongoing (45 months to date) to investigate President Bill Clinton and First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton and others expending \$29,600,976. Additionally, Robert Fiske

expended \$6,073,000 on his portion of the investigation. The investigation resulted thus far in 12 guilty pleas, three convictions with two acquittals, and there are five indictments pending. 15 guilty pleas or convictions, cost per guilty plea or conviction: \$2,378,265.

7. Arlin M. Adams and Larry D. Thompson were appointed 3/1/90 and 7/3/95 respectively with no report filed to date (98 months to date) to investigate Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Secretary Samuel R. Pierce and others expending \$27,597,009. The investigation brought about 11 guilty pleas, six criminal convictions, one reversal on appeal, on acquittal, and no indictment of Pierce. 17 guilty pleas or convictions, cost per guilty plea or conviction: \$1,623,353.

Based on the CRS report, the longest independent counsel investigation is that of Arlin M. Adams and Larry D. Thompson with 98 months and still going. In fact, there have been 12 investigations with absolutely no convictions, making the Kenneth Starr investigation far from being the longest. Starr is second only to Adams and Thompson for the most guilty pleas and convictions. Considering that Starr has five pending indictments (and more possible indictments) it is likely that Starr will end up with more than Adams and Thompson when all is said and done. Starr's investigation is an expensive one, but on a cost per conviction basis the Walsh investigation was nearly twice as expensive.

Despite the claims by Clinton, the Starr investigation has not gone on as long as others that were less successful, it has cost less than others per conviction, it has obtained many convictions, additional convictions are likely, and at least 15 of the people investigated were not "innocent."

The A To Z Of Clinton Scandals

New York Post October 16, 1996

...It's The Alphabet Of Ethics -- Stupid!

Whitewatergate, travelgate, cattlegate and now Indonesiagate...there seem to be more gates in the Clinton White House than on the barns of America.

So just in case you've lost track of the scandals that have hit this current White House the Post's DEBORAH ORIN and THOMAS GALVIN have pieced together your cut-out-and-keep guide A to Z of Clinton scandals.....

A is for Arkansas, where Bill Clinton got his political start, where Hillary Rodham Clinton worked at the Rose Law Firm, and where whitewater began as a land deal between the Clintons and Jim and Susan McDougal.

B is for Billing-gate, Hillary Clinton's missing law-billing records. Those records -- which raise questions about Mrs. Clinton's role in the Castle Grande deal -- were subpoenaed in 1994. They were missing until early 1996, when they turned up in a White House room next to her office. She says she doesn't know how they got there.

B is also for Ron Brown whose scandals we can't mention in reverence for the dead.

C is for Cattlegate, Hillary Clinton's mysterious ability to turn a \$1,000 investment into a \$100,000 profit on cattle futures, a feat experts say was virtually impossible in normal trading. C is also for Castle Grande, a real-estate scheme that federal regulators say was a sham. A federal inspector general's report found Hillary Clinton drew up the legal papers that were used to improperly funnel hundreds of thousands of dollars to Seth Ward, father-in-law of her ex-law partner Webster Hubbell.

C is also for the Creative, Corrupt Campaign financing performed by the Clintons and the DNC.

D is for Billy Dale, the career head of the White House Travel Office, who was fired, along with six other career staffers, to make way for Clinton cronies in Travelgate. The White House then brought in the FBI to justify the firing, and Dale was hit with criminal charges that wrecked his life for two years. A jury cleared him in just two hours.

E is for Mike Espy, the former agriculture secretary who was forced out over charges that he got gifts and favors from Arkansas-based Tyson foods, whose owners were longtime Clinton backers. A special counsel has brought several indictments, though not against Espy.

F is for Filegate, the improper White House rummaging through 900 FBI files on Republican officials in the Bush and Reagan administrations. The White House says it was an innocent snafu. Republicans suspect an enemies list. Whitewater independent counsel Ken Starr and several congressional committees are probing.

F is also for the Fifth Amendment claimed by so many people involved with various Clinton scandals.

G is for Golfgate, ex-White House aide David Watkins' improper use of presidential helicopters for a personal golf outing. He was forced to resign. In the 1992 presidential campaign, Clinton aides tried to use taxpayer funds to help settle a sexual harassment case filed by a fellow campaign worker against Watkins.

H is for Hillary Clinton, whose role has been questioned in Filegate, Travelgate, Billing-gate,

Whitewater and Castle Grande. She denies any wrongdoing. H is also for Hubbell, in jail after pleading guilty to bilking law clients on charges brought by Whitewater independent counsel Starr. Hubbell was previously the associate attorney general, the No. 3 Justice Department office.

H is also for the Hush money funneled to Webster "Big Lips" Hubbell. Over \$400,000 in casual money paid to Hubbell to stay quiet on Clinton involvement in scandals.

I is for Indonesiagate, featuring the Lippo group, a firm with long-standing ties to Bill Clinton, Clinton cronies and Arkansas. Republicans want to know why an Indonesian couple -- of apparently modest means -- with ties to Lippo gave \$452,000 to the Democratic National Committee and what the firm may have gotten in return. Lippo also hired Hubbell, at a reported fee of \$250,000, for the five months between when he left the White House and went to jail

I is also for impropriety by allowing DNC non-government workers access to secret government information and the use of government office space and computers.

J is for Paula Jones, who accuses President Clinton of sexual harassment, saying he dropped his pants and asked for oral sex in an Arkansas hotel room while he was governor and she was a state employee. The U.S. Supreme Court will rule this fall on whether her case must wait until after Clinton leaves office, as he demands.

J is for Joke. As in what a joke it is that the Clinton White House has the audacity to say it was ok to break federal laws because "We had to fight off the baby starving, river polluting Republicans". And what a joke that the Clintons wanted to have the Amost ethical administration in history@. J also stands for Jennifer Flowers. A Clinton bimbo from his days in Arkansas.

K is William Kennedy, another ex-Hillary Clinton law partner who became a White House lawyer and was forced to resign after concealing his failure to pay nanny taxes. He was reprimanded for his role in Travelgate.

L is for Craig Livingstone, the ex-bar bouncer with a history of drug use who was head of White House security. Two FBI agents say it was Hillary Clinton who demanded his hiring, which she denies. Disgraced Clinton political guru Dick Morris' hooker pal, Sherry Rowlands, claims Morris told her a "paranoid" Hillary Clinton was behind Filegate. He says he only told her that's what polls show.

L is also for Abraham Lincoln, whose bedroom was sold off to the highest democratic contributor.

M is for Jim and Susan McDougal, the Clintons' Whitewater partners, both of whom have been convicted of fraud. Jim McDougal is said to be helping Whitewater independent counsel Starr. Susan McDougal is in jail for refusing to say whether President Clinton lied when he denied knowing about an illegal \$300,000 loan to bail out Whitewater. The loan wasn't repaid, and taxpayers were left holding the bag. M also is for disgraced Clinton political guru Dick Morris.

N is for Bernard Nussbaum, the former White House lawyer who barred federal investigators from searching Vince Foster's office after Foster's death. Nussbaum also withheld Foster's diary on

Travelgate problems from federal probes for more than a year. Nussbaum was forced to resign for botching damage-control efforts.

O is for Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary, the frequent flier who drew up an enemies' list of reporters, hired an image consultant at taxpayer expense, and has run up huge tabs on overseas trips.

P is for pardons, which President Clinton has refused to rule out for individuals like Susan McDougal who potentially could provide evidence against him. P is also for White House Chief of Staff Leon Panetta, expected to leave in a second Clinton term -- with the prospect that his deputy, Harold Ickes, could replace him. Senate Republicans want perjury charges brought against Ickes for his answers on Whitewater damage control.

Q is for all the questions -- unanswered -- on Whitewater, Filegate, Travelgate, Cattelgate and Billing-gate.

R is for Sherry Rowlands, the \$200-an hour hooker who revealed her ongoing affair with Clinton political guru Dick Morris, the author of Clinton's family-values strategy, forcing Morris to resign. R also is for Rose Law Firm, where Hillary Clinton, Vince Foster, Webster Hubbell and William Kennedy were partners, as was Joseph Giroir, a key figure in the Lippo group.

S is for Kenneth Starr, the Whitewater independent counsel probing Filegate, Travelgate and Vince Foster's death. He has won 15 convictions or guilty pleas, including both McDougals and former Arkansas Gov. Jim Guy Tucker, who was forced to resign. Starr says his probes are active and ongoing, and there is widespread speculation he will have more indictments after the election, possibly including one of Hillary Clinton.

T is for Travelgate, the Clintons' firing of career travel staffers like Billy Dale to make way for Clinton cronies. White House memos say Hillary Clinton was behind the firings -- she denies it -- and that she was spurred on by Clinton Hollywood pal Harry Thomason, who was seeking a piece of the lucrative White House charter business.

U is for undue influence and the question of whether that is what Lippo was seeking through megabucks contributions to Democrats. Lippo has close ties to Indonesia's brutal dictatorship, responsible for near-genocide in East Timor, which it occupied two decades ago.

V is for Vince Foster, the former Hillary Clinton law partner who became a White House lawyer and was found dead, an apparent suicide with a gunshot wound to the head. He apparently was a central figure in Travelgate and Filegate and handled Whitewater matters for the Clintons. Starr is examining his death and has yet to confirm former prober Bob Fiske's conclusion that it was a suicide in the park where Foster was found.

W is for Whitewater, the Arkansas land deal that started it all, with questions about whether the Clintons improperly benefitted from funds from Jim McDougal's Madison Guarantee savings-and-loan, which went belly up, costing taxpayers an estimated \$60 million.

X is for the Xeroxed copy of Hillary Clinton's law billing records that were found in the White House book room, two years after they were first sought. The pages had Mrs. Clinton's fingerprints

around the section on Castle Grande -- there were red ink notations in the late Vince Foster's handwriting.

Y is for the young White House aides who were hired by the Clinton administration despite FBI background checks that found "recent" use of hard drugs like cocaine, crack and hallucinogens.

Z is for zero -- the amount of money the Clintons had at risk in Whitewater, even though they were equal partners with the McDougals. -- By Deborah Orin and Thomas Galvin

Copyright 81996, N.Y.P. Holdings Inc.

(Italics where added by Jerry Winkel)

Cover Your Eyes

Washington Times 5/7/98

"Let us say out loud," dares say one congressman, "what Republicans and Democrats on Capitol Hill are saying privately about what they are reluctant to say in public -- the emperor has no clothes!"

"It is obvious," says Rep. John E. Peterson, Pennsylvania Republican, "that the people who came to Washington promising 'the most ethical administration in history' [gave] nothing of the sort."

A grocery store owner serving his first term in Congress, Mr. Peterson bases his opinion on the nearly \$3 million the Democratic National Committee forked over after the 1996 election when the money was found stained with "foreign" fingerprints.

Assertions that the administration doesn't know how 900 FBI files on Republicans surfaced in the White House "are not true," he adds, and that nobody knows who hired Craig Livingstone "is not only a lie, it is a laughable one."

White House denials that the Lincoln Bedroom was not sold, or White House coffees had nothing to do with fund raising, "are all lies," he says, all examples of the administration's "almost pathological inability" to be honest with the American people.

Pretty tough words, sir. AWhy sugarcoat what everyone knows to be true?@ he says. AThe emperor has no clothes!@

The Gates

Clinton invokes executive privilege on FALN clemency
The Washington Times 9/17/99

President Clinton on Thursday claimed executive privilege and refused a congressional subpoena seeking details of his clemency offer to 16 Puerto Rican terrorists.

"Pursuant to the Constitution and the separation-of-powers doctrine, the president's authority to grant clemency is not subject to legislative oversight," White House Deputy Counsel Cheryl Mills wrote to Rep. Dan Burton, Indiana Republican and chairman of the House Committee on Government Reform.

It was the sixth investigation in which Mr. Clinton invoked executive privilege. The last was in the Monica Lewinsky scandal.

His decision angered Republicans on Capitol Hill, who want to know why Mr. Clinton offered clemency despite the objections of law enforcement agencies.

Many suspect Mr. Clinton timed the offer to aid first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton's likely Senate run in New York, which is home to 1.3 million people of Puerto Rican descent.

"The president has a moral obligation to the American people to explain why he let terrorists out of prison," Mr. Burton said.

"By claiming executive privilege he is, in essence, telling the American people that it's none of their business. But it is their business, and it is the business of law enforcement agencies across the country."

Auditgate

The Washington Times
August 21, 2002
Inside Politics
Greg Pierce

Clinton and the IRS

Judicial Watch yesterday filed a civil rights lawsuit accusing Bill Clinton and five top congressional Democrats of instigating a politically motivated audit of Judicial Watch by the Internal Revenue Service.

The conservative public-interest law firm said it even had proof that Mr. Clinton was personally involved in getting the IRS to start the investigation.

Documents turned over to Judicial Watch by the IRS under the Freedom of Information Act included a copy of an e-mail to President Clinton at the White House that stated: "I have received solicitation for funds and a questionnaire from Larry Klayman, of Judicial Watch. They have targeted you and the Vice President. My question is how can this obviously partisan organization be classified as tax-exempt under 501(C)(3). I think you and your wife have done a great job in spite of the partisan attacks against both of you."

Judicial Watch, in a prepared statement, said: "The IRS documents show the e-mail, which was sent to the IRS Commissioner Charles Rossotti's office by President Clinton, was received by the IRS on or about September 22, 1998. Judicial Watch's first audit notice was dated two weeks later, on October 6, 1998. It is illegal and criminal for the President to directly or indirectly request an IRS

audit of any taxpayer. Separately, Judicial Watch had been told by an IRS official that an audit was to be expected for suing President Clinton."

Reps. Charles B. Rangel of New York, Martin Frost of Texas, James P. Moran of Virginia and John Lewis of Georgia, as well as Sen. Tom Harkin of Iowa, also were accused of starting "a widespread campaign to illegally pressure the IRS to audit Judicial Watch." All are Democrats.

The lawsuit will be heard by Judge Emmet G. Sullivan of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. The lawsuit charges the lawmakers of conspiring to violate Judicial Watch's First, Fourth, and Fifth Amendment rights.

Documents tie Clinton to audit of journalists Treasury investigation report shows White House passed on tip to IRS

8 1999 WorldNetDaily.com

A 1996 Internal Revenue Service audit of WorldNetDaily.com's non-profit parent company began with an accusatory letter forwarded to the agency from the Clinton White House, show Treasury Department documents obtained by the Internet newspaper through the Freedom of Information Act.

The Western Journalism Center is one of dozens of tax-exempt organizations targeted for IRS audit after criticizing President Clinton. Joseph Farah, editor of WorldNetDaily.com and founder of the center, first exposed what appeared to be a pattern of political audits three years ago. **The revelations were followed quickly by the resignation of IRS Commissioner Margaret Milner Richardson, a close personal friend and political confidante of Bill and Hillary Clinton, and the launching of a congressional probe by Rep. Bill Archer, R-Texas, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee and co-chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation.**

"Back in 1996 I alleged, based on largely circumstantial evidence, that Clinton was waging a political war on his enemies and employing the IRS as his private army," said Farah. "The documents we now have in our possession, at long last, prove the White House did just that in our case and that his administration has engaged in a massive cover-up of the facts behind this abuse of power."

A heavily redacted 1997 Treasury Department report titled, "Questionable Exempt Organization Examination Activity," was released July 6 to Farah's news organization following three years of FOIA filings and appeals for such information. **Contradicting IRS officials and their Justice Department lawyers in two suits pending against the agency by the center and its legal counsel, the Treasury report states unequivocally and repeatedly that the audit began with a letter forwarded from the White House to the IRS.**

"The audit originated from a taxpayer who faxed a letter

to the White House expressing his concern over a one-page advertisement paid for by WCJ (Western Center for Journalism) that asked for contributions to investigate (White House deputy counsel Vincent) Foster's death," explained the official Treasury Department report. "The fax was forwarded to the EO (Exempt Organizations) National Office and then to the respective Key District Office for appropriate actions."

The taxpayer who wrote the Nov. 9, 1994 letter to Clinton, after spotting the ad in question in the Los Angeles Times, is Paul Venze of Beverly Hills. Venze was unavailable for comment to WorldNetDaily but told Treasury Department investigators the letter to the president was his own idea.

In a report by special investigator Timothy Herlihy and inspector Rod Ammari, Venze is recorded as saying he wondered how the Western Journalism Center "could have been tax exempt because the advertisement seemed politically motivated and mean." The advertisements summarized the key questions and inconsistencies raised through investigative reporting into the Foster case. Foster was found dead in Fort Marcy Park July 20, 1993. Despite the fact that no bullet was found in Foster's body or in the park or surrounding area and that Foster's fingerprints were not found on the gun next to his body, several official government investigations ruled suicide.

Some of the material released among the 59 pages from the Treasury Department is less than enlightening. Several pages are so heavily redacted that they include only three words -- "Western Journalism Center."

For three years, the center has been attempting to obtain its own case file from the IRS without success. FOIA requests have been denied. The Treasury Department report may shed some light on the reasons for stonewalling. High-level IRS officials took a special interest in the center's case after receiving the letters from the White House.

In a section titled, "Case Origination," the report explains that senior auditor Ed Gorman visited the Exempt Organization Technical Branch II Office of the IRS and obtained documents in "a pink envelope"

relating to the source of the case examination. The documents included a memo dated Feb. 28, 1995, from the director of the exempt organizations division to the district director in Los Angeles. The memo explained that the fax from Venze to the president was being forwarded "for your information and any action that you deem appropriate." The memo advises, according to the Treasury report, that the advertisement in question might not be in full compliance with IRS regulations and that the organization may not have filed tax returns. (The center was not required to file a return until May of that year.) Included with those advisories and the Venze letter was the cover sheet showing that it was addressed to President Clinton and received by the White House Congressional Affairs Unit Legislative Affairs Division.

While the Treasury Department report concludes there is "no indication as to how the taxpayer's fax and letter was routed from the White House to the IRS," Farah believes that statement is disingenuous and "a last-ditch, ever-changing cover story typical of this administration."

"That letter was forwarded just the way it was to convey a message to officials and underlings at the IRS," he said. "The message was the White House has a special interest in this case. See what you can do to help him out. You don't have to be a genius to figure that out."

From Los Angeles, the case file subsequently found its way into the hands of agent Thomas Cederquist in Sacramento, who first raised suspicions about the fairness of the center's audit when, according to the sworn testimony of the center's accountant, John Roux, he announced during their first meeting, "Look, this is a political case and the decision is going to be made at the national level." At every stage of the process, the case file included the fax letter to President Clinton, along with the stamped cover page showing that the letter had been received and passed on by the White House.

Cederquist and other IRS officials are named in a \$10 million lawsuit filed on behalf of the center by Judicial Watch's Larry Klayman. Klayman believes criminal contempt citations may be in order after reviewing the Treasury Department document. Cederquist and his superiors in the Sacramento office of the IRS have

consistently denied -- even under oath -- that there were any suggestions from above to investigate the Western Journalism Center. Furthermore, Justice Department lawyers defending the government officials have buried potentially explosive evidence from the case file, says Klayman.

"The Treasury report shows there was a direct chain of events beginning with that fax in the White House -- just as I suspected all along but could never conclusively prove until now," said Farah. "This is why the IRS has steadfastly refused to provide us with our own case file, as it is required to do under the law. Had officials coughed up the file, they would have hanged themselves and provided us with a winning case."

The IRS has recently maintained that there are no more documents associated with the case. Yet the Treasury report discusses many in the actual case file being sought.

"At the time the FOIA report was being prepared, those documents obviously existed," said Farah. "If they do not exist now, it seems appropriate to ask what, precisely, has happened to them?"

Cederquist's early biases against the center are evident in the Treasury report. It was his assessment that "investigative journalism is not educational" and, therefore, not a suitable mission for a 501c(3) corporation. Before ever contacting Farah or any other representative of the center, Cederquist had already formally recommended that the group's tax-exempt status be revoked. Only a review process required Cederquist to continue the investigation. As of February 1997, the Treasury report shows, he was still adamantly holding out for revocation.

He also leveled charges against Farah of using the center for personal gain, though, during the 1994 and 1995 audit years, Farah took no salary from the non-profit. IRS officials spoke openly with Treasury Department investigators about the possibility of auditing Farah's personal taxes in an effort to make the case for inurement. One agent, whose name was redacted from the report, commented on "the nice neighborhood" in which Farah lived while devoting many hours to the

charity without compensation.

Cederquist was eventually removed from the case by the IRS, a new agent assigned and the tax-exempt status of the center extended with no penalties. But the audit's toll on the center had been heavy. Faced with rising legal and accounting costs, diverted staff time and falling donations, the center was forced to fold one of its two publications and to lay off key personnel including investigative reporters.

Partly as a result of its experience with the nine-month audit ordeal in 1996, the center's leadership came face to face with the chilling reality that it was nearly silenced officially by a government agency for doing what it perceived to be its First Amendment-protected job. Rather than live under the shadow of facing the IRS again because of a run-in with corrupt officials in this administration or another, the center decided to take its latest project, the highly successful WorldNetDaily.com, from the non-profit realm to the taxpaying sector.

Just last month, the Charitable Trust Division of the California Attorney General's Office issued a ruling permitting the center to spin off the red-hot Internet newspaper into a private, for-profit company, which will be able to begin raising private investment capital later this month to expand WorldNetDaily.com into a full-service, one-stop shopping place for news. WorldNetDaily.com already has a readership significantly greater than that of Salon.com, the unabashedly pro-Clinton Internet magazine that went public in June.

"According to the IRS, WorldNetDaily.com has no First Amendment rights as a non-profit," said Wayne Johnson, a WorldNetDaily.com Inc. board member. "Fine, we'll pay taxes and be 100 times larger. The White House may be able to target one little foundation, or one lone investigative journalist, but it can't shut down the Internet. The bureaucratic state is an anachronism that simply no longer possesses the means to silence its critics, short of unplugging the Internet itself."

Long before the IRS audit of 1996, the White House had taken critical notice of the activities of the center. A White House counsel's memo, written by Jane Sherburne in December 1994, lists the center as a

major concern with regard to its coverage of the Foster story. In 1995, the White House counsel's office, in conjunction with the Democratic National Committee, produced and distributed at taxpayer expense a 331-page report called "Communication Stream of Conspiracy Commerce," in which it was alleged that the center was directing a vast, international media plot to discredit President Clinton.

This week, with Klayman's assistance, Farah filed a Privacy Act request for any and all files the White House maintains on him and his organization. To a previous FOIA request for such information, the White House claimed to have no pertinent files and claimed exemption from FOIA rules of disclosure. Currently, Farah's news organization is appealing a Superior Court ruling denying it a public trial on charges the audit was politically motivated.

"This new evidence, clearly suppressed by the administration until after a favorable ruling by a Superior Court judge, provides the smoking gun we were hoping to find in the discovery process," said Klayman. "I am confident this new revelation demonstrating the government systematically concealed the truth will persuade the courts to permit this case to proceed to trial and give us the opportunity to expose and punish these abuses of power."

Pardongate

Report: Meeting Between Clinton, Rich Backers Pardon Probe's Focus
Sunday, September 08, 2002

<http://foxnews.com/story/0,2933,62424,00.html>

NEW YORK — A secret airport meeting between a prominent Democratic fund-raiser and a backer of fugitive financier Marc Rich has gained the attention of prosecutors investigating President Clinton's pardons, according to a Newsweek report.

The magazine said that Beth Dozoretz met with Avner Azulay, the former Israeli Mossad agent who was spearheading Rich's pardon effort, but that she did not report the encounter to Rich's chief pardon lawyer, Jack Quinn.

Dozoretz, a close Clinton friend and former finance director of the Democratic National Committee, appeared twice before the New York grand jury investigating the pardon Clinton granted to Rich just before he left the White House. However, when prosecutors asked her recently to appear for a third

time she balked, sources told Newsweek. Her lawyer told the magazine she will invoke her Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination.

Dozoretz had pledged to raise \$1 million for Clinton's presidential library, suggesting to prosecutors that she may have discussed such donations with Azulay at their meeting.

But Dozoretz's lawyer, Tom Green, called that "pure nonsense" and accused prosecutors of harassing Dozoretz.

Rich's ex-wife, Denise Rich, contributed \$450,000 to the library foundation, \$1.1 million to the Democratic Party and at least \$109,000 to Hillary Rodham Clinton's Senate campaign.

Lawyers representing Dozoretz and Rich could not be reached by telephone for comment Sunday.

Bill Clinton drew a firestorm of criticism after he pardoned Rich, a billionaire who has lived in Switzerland since just before he was indicted in 1983 on charges of tax evasion, fraud and making illegal oil deals with Iran.

Denise Rich has strongly denied allegations that the pardon was tied to her contributions. The pardon was among 176 pardons and clemencies Clinton issued on his last day in office.

Bloodgate

Clinton pal tied to blood scandal

Vince Foster suicide linked to Arkansas tainted plasma sales

Mark Kennedy
The Ottawa Citizen 10/4/98

The controversy over how a U.S. firm collected tainted blood from Arkansas prison inmates and shipped it to Canada has spread to Vince Foster -- U.S. President Bill Clinton's personal confidant who committed suicide in 1993.

Mr. Foster, a boyhood friend of Mr. Clinton's, was one of the president's most trusted advisers. As a corporate lawyer in Arkansas, he worked in the same law office as Hillary Rodham Clinton and became a close colleague of hers. When Mr. Clinton left Arkansas for the White House in early 1993, he called on Mr. Foster -- known as an earnest individual with high ethical standards -- to join him as deputy White House counsel. Mr. Foster obliged, also remaining the Clintons' personal lawyer. Now, five years after his mysterious death, two developments have prompted questions about Mr. Foster's knowledge of the U.S. company's prison-blood collection scheme:

- There are signs that Mr. Foster tried to protect the company called Health Management Associates (HMA) more than a decade ago in a lawsuit.

- And a major U.S. daily newspaper recently reported that Mr. Foster may have been worried about the tainted-blood scandal, which was just emerging as a contentious issue in Canada, when he killed himself in July 1993.

Mr. Clinton was governor of Arkansas when the Canadian blood supply was contaminated in the early and mid-1980s. He was familiar with the operations of the now-defunct HMA, the Arkansas firm given a contract by Mr. Clinton's state administration to provide medical care to prisoners. In the process, HMA was also permitted by the state to collect prisoners' blood and sell it elsewhere.

HMA's president in the mid-1980s, Leonard Dunn, was a friend of Mr. Clinton's and a political ally. Later, Mr. Dunn was a Clinton appointee to the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission and he was among the senior members of Mr. Clinton's 1990 gubernatorial re-election team.

The contaminated prisoners' plasma -- used to create special blood products for hemophiliacs -- is believed to have been infected with HIV, the virus that causes AIDS. As well, it's likely the plasma was contaminated with hepatitis C.

Any information linking Mr. Foster to HMA and its blood program is bound to raise more questions about how much Mr. Clinton knew.

Michael Galster, a medical practitioner who did contract work for the prison system, has revealed to the Citizen that Mr. Foster once approached him in the mid 1980s to ask for a favour.

At the time, Mr. Clinton's administration and HMA were facing a \$12-million lawsuit from a prisoner whose infected leg had been amputated at the hip in 1982.

The inmate was claiming that poor medical care by an HMA doctor -- who had been working in the prison despite being denied a permanent licence to practice by the state medical board -- had resulted in the needless amputation.

Mr. Galster, an expert in prosthetics, says HMA's medical director had asked him to build a special artificial leg for the prisoner in the hope that it would lead to an out-of-court settlement. Mr. Galster refused to get involved, and was visited several weeks later at his office by Mr. Foster, who appealed again for his assistance.

"The purpose of his being there was to convince me to take this, smooth it over and everybody would be happy," says Mr. Galster, who has written a fictionalized account of the prison-blood collection saga, called Blood Trail.

"I refused him. He said, 'I understand your predicament, but this could make it difficult for you to get a future state contract.'

"If it's like the past state contracts I've had, I don't need any," Mr. Galster says he replied. "He (Foster) kind of laughed and said 'OK, I appreciate your time.' "

It was the only time the two met, but Mr. Galster now says he believes Mr. Foster was trying to protect both Mr. Clinton and HMA from public embarrassment.

The questions surrounding Mr. Foster became even more intriguing when, several days ago, the New York Post published an article entitled "The tainted blood mystery" by one of its columnists, Maggie Gallagher. She reported on how the Citizen had broken a lengthy story in mid-September about the Arkansas prison-blood scheme.

Most significantly, Ms. Gallagher wrote that the story suddenly cast new meaning upon "a strange little memory fragment" that had been "meaningless in itself."

Citing a source who asked not to be identified, Ms. Gallagher reported that a day or two after Mr. Foster died on July 20, 1993, someone called a little-known phone number at the White House counsel's office where Mr. Foster had worked.

"The man said he had some information that might be important," wrote Ms. Gallagher. "Something had upset Vince Foster greatly just days before he died. Something about 'tainted blood' that both Vince Foster and President Clinton knew about, this man said."

Mr. Foster's mysterious death spawned a political controversy from the moment that police, responding to an anonymous 911 caller, found his body in a national park in Washington, D.C.

Police concluded that Mr. Foster had stood there coatless in the late-afternoon heat, inserted the muzzle of an antique Colt 38. revolver into his mouth and pulled the trigger. Immediately, conspiracy theorists began spreading rumours that Mr. Foster had been murdered. But independent counsel Robert Fiske (a special prosecutor who examined the Whitewater scandal before being replaced by Kenneth Starr) conducted his own review and agreed with police that it was suicide.

It was believed that Mr. Foster had been suffering from depression and was especially perturbed by a brewing scandal in which he was embroiled. In the so-called Travelgate fiasco, Clinton aides had fired several veteran White House travel-office employees as part of an alleged attempt to give the

lucrative travel business to Arkansas cronies.

However, Ms. Gallagher's column has raised questions over whether Mr. Foster was distressed about something he knew regarding tainted blood, and whether this anxiety contributed to his suicide.

In Canada, the summer of 1993 was a critical period. A Commons committee, which had conducted a brief review of the tainted blood scandal, had just released its report in May. Its first recommendation called for a major "public inquiry" to conduct a "full examination of the events of the 1980s" when the Canadian blood supply became contaminated with AIDS.

Indeed, on Sept. 16 -- eight weeks after Foster's death -- the federal government announced the public inquiry, to be headed by Justice Horace Krever. During the course of his work, Justice Krever unearthed the Arkansas prison-blood collection scheme and wrote about it in his final report last year.

However, no mention was made of Mr. Clinton until last month's story in the Citizen, which drew on documents obtained from Arkansas State Police files.

Clinton's Arkansas blood scandal
WorldNetDaily.com 9/29/98

Just when you're certain you've heard about and explored every conceivable crime to which President Clinton has been a party, another bombshell drops.

Like so many other Clinton administration scandals, this one still hasn't been broken in the establishment U.S. press, but it has been covered extensively in Canadian papers -- from the Calgary Sun to the Ottawa Citizen. Those reports have also appeared in WorldNetDaily, bringing this story to the attention of radio talk-show hosts throughout America.

Here's the story: In the early 1980s, while Bill Clinton was serving as governor of Arkansas, his administration awarded a contract to Health Management Associates to provide medical care to the state's prisoners. The president of the company was, naturally, a long-time friend and political ally of Clinton and was later appointed by him to the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission. Later, he was among the senior members of Clinton's 1990

gubernatorial re-election team.

As part of the deal HMA struck with Arkansas, in addition to treating the prisoners, the company collected their blood and sold it. Because of the exploding AIDS crisis, U.S. regulations didn't permit the sale of prisoners' blood within the country. But HMA found a willing buyer in Montreal, which brokered a deal with Connaught, a Toronto blood-fractionator, which didn't know the source of the supplies. The blood was distributed throughout Canada by the Red Cross. Sales continued until 1983, when HMA revealed that some of the plasma might be contaminated with the AIDS virus and hepatitis. The blood was also peddled overseas.

Now the lid has been blown off this scandal by Michael Galster, who conducted orthopedic clinics in the Arkansas prison system during the period the blood was collected. Afraid to tell the story any other way, Galster authored a thinly veiled fictional book called "Blood Trail," which tells the story of an Arkansas governor's role in the mega-scandal -- an Arkansas governor, by the way, who later becomes president.

Galster charges HMA officials knew the blood was tainted as they sold it to Canada and a half-dozen other foreign countries. He also alleges that Clinton knew of the scheme and likely benefited from it financially.

"We now have solid evidence he not only knew about it, but he signed off on it," Galster told the Calgary Sun.

Galster says Clinton organized a payoff plan to various officials, including a judge, to make sure the blood sales continued. He claims millions were made from the conspiracy because between 5,000 and 8,000 units of blood were shipped every week from one prison alone. He has eyewitness reports that inmates were even drawing blood from each other with dirty needles.

So fearful of the dreaded Clinton attack machine was Galster, that he wrote the book under a pen name,

Michael Sullivan. But now, as of last week, he has gone public with his story.

"Knowing the nature of politics in Arkansas, I felt unsafely exposed," said Galster.

Galster is understandably frustrated with the unwillingness of the U.S. media to seize on this latest Clinton scandal -- even as the impeachment process begins to move forward.

"If you would just listen to all of the dying people out there, you would understand that there are much greater atrocities than a sexual liaison in the Oval Office," he told the Ottawa Citizen.

The Royal Canadian Mounted Police are now investigating the blood trail, but Galster is frustrated that the FBI has not yet conducted a probe. I have some advice for Galster on that front: Don't hold your breath.

If even a small percentage of Galster's accusations are true -- and I have no doubt they are -- this is criminal behavior tantamount to mass murder. No one is certain how many people in Canada and other foreign countries died as a result of infections from the bad blood. It may have been hundreds. It may be thousands.

It's worth pointing out, however, that even if the catastrophe was all the result of innocent mistakes, Clinton is the president who wanted to take over the U.S. health-care system -- to nationalize it and, presumably, run it as efficiently and humanely as he and his friends in Arkansas did in the 1980s.

Can you imagine the kind of holocaust such a system would have wrought on America?

ChinaGate

January 12, 2001

The Washington Times

Riady to plead guilty to fraud in

fund raising

By Michael J. Sniffen
ASSOCIATED PRESS

Indonesian billionaire James Riady has agreed to pay a record \$8.6 million criminal fine and plead guilty to using foreign funds to reimburse contributors to Bill Clinton's 1992 campaign for the presidency, the Justice Department announced last night.

Mr. Riady, a key figure in the Clinton-Gore campaign finance scandal, pledged \$1 million to support the then-Arkansas governor's campaign, the government said.

Under terms of a plea bargain filed in U.S. District Court in Los Angeles, Mr. Riady agreed to surrender and come to this country at an unspecified future date even though there is no extradition treaty between Indonesia and the United States.

Mr. Riady also agreed to cooperate with the government's continuing investigation. It was not clear last night if that meant he would testify about the involvement of Mr. Clinton and Vice President Al Gore.

Mr. Clinton had no comment on the guilty plea, spokesman Jake Siewert said.

According to the plea bargain papers, Mr. Riady agreed to plead guilty to a felony charge of conspiring to defraud the United States. Foreign campaign contributions are illegal under U.S. law.

In addition, LippoBank California, a California state-chartered bank affiliated with Lippo Group, agreed to plead guilty to 86 misdemeanor accounts charging that its agents, Mr. Riady and Huang, made illegal foreign campaign contributions from 1988 through 1994.

The total of \$8,610,000 in fines is the largest ever imposed in a campaign finance case in U.S. history, the department said.

An FBI summary released last year said Democratic fund-raiser John Huang, a Riady employee, said that Mr. Riady had told the Arkansas governor during a limousine ride that he wanted to raise \$1 million for his campaign. Huang himself

pleaded guilty to a campaign financing felony and has been cooperating with the government since August 1999.

In April, Mr. Clinton told federal investigators that he did not have "a specific recollection of what the conversation was, or this fact of the car ride." He said he only remembered seeing Mr. Riady "sometime in '92 after I became the nominee," and that Mr. Riady pledged to help his campaign.

Mr. Riady is one of 26 persons and two corporations so far charged by Justice's campaign finance task force since it was established four years ago.

A Justice Department official, requesting anonymity, said federal sentencing guidelines would not call for a prison term for a first-time offender like Mr. Riady for this type of felony conviction.

This official added that independent counsel Robert Ray, who is investigating Mr. Clinton on other matters, was consulted and indicated that the plea agreement was consistent with the best interests of his investigation, which does not include campaign financing.

Mr. Ray's office has prosecuted former Justice official and Clinton friend Webster L. Hubbell and has investigated whether payments to him, including \$100,000 from Lippo Group, after he resigned were designed to keep him from testifying against Mr. Clinton or his wife, Hillary.

A videotape of a December 1995 White House "coffee" also shows Mr. Gore talking with Arief Wiriadinata, an Indonesian gardener who illegally donated \$455,000 to the Democratic Party in 1995, and records comments by the vice president to Mr. Wiriadinata concerning Mr. Riady.

Attorney General Janet Reno considered — but rejected — a special counsel to investigate Mr. Gore's 1996 campaign fund-raising activities.

The government's court filing said the goal of the contributions was to obtain access, meetings and time with politicians, elected officials and top government officials; to enhance the contacts and status of the Lippo Group and LippoBank with business and government leaders here and abroad, and to find business opportunities for Lippo Group and LippoBank.

The government said that federal policies that would benefit Lippo Group including granted most-favored-nation trade status to China, which the Clinton administration recently obtained from Congress; normalization of U.S. relations with Vietnam; open trade policies with Indonesia; Community Reinvestment Act exemptions for Lippo Bank and a repeal of the Glass-Steagall Act, which limited business opportunities for LippoBank.

Since August, Mr. Riady, an Indonesian citizen, has met about half a dozen times with U.S. prosecutors and FBI agents to outline the information he could provide as part of a plea bargain.

Mr. Riady will waive his legal right to apply for re-entry into the United States for a period of two years, except when his presence is requested to fulfill his agreement to cooperate with the continuing investigation.

He also agreed to perform 400 hours of community service and forfeit to the U.S. Treasury any refunds that might be issued to him by any political campaign committees because of yesterday's announcement. He will be barred from making or directing any future campaign contributions in U.S. elections.

The government's court filing said that between May 1990 and June 1994, Mr. Riady and Huang, who worked in the Commerce Department and for the Democratic National Committee during the Clinton administration, conspired to obstruct the Federal Election Commission by secretly reimbursing campaign contributions with funds from foreign people or companies, who are barred from U.S. contributions, and by exceeding U.S. limits on campaign contributions.

The government's filing said Mr. Riady reimbursed Huang and LippoBank employees for their contributions with wire transfers from a foreign Lippo Group entity, cash in Hong Kong and a fictitious bonus issued to Huang by a foreign Lippo Group entity.

Mr. Riady has been to the White House twice since Mr. Clinton was elected: once in 1993 and again in 1995 for brief "meet and greet" visits, according to White House records. Mr. Riady also participated in Mr. Clinton's 1992 economic conference in Little Rock and the president met with him briefly during his visit to Indonesia in 1994.

Who's who in the Commerce scandal
WorldNetDaily 10/6/98

In September 1998, the Commerce Department was forced by legal action to release documents from the late Secretary Ron Brown. The Clinton White House was illegally withholding the documents from public release. The newly released materials include the detailed biographies of the entire Chinese communist leadership. The detailed dossiers were given to DNC donors Loral CEO Bernard Schwartz and investment millionaire Sanford Robertson by the Clinton White House just prior to their August 1994 trade trip to China with Brown.

Curiously, the briefing package also included the detailed bio of a civilian who is not even a Chinese citizen -- Hong Kong billionaire Li Ka-Shing. According to Forbes, Li Ka-Shing is the sixth richest man in the world. Li is not a red Chinese government official nor is Li a member of any military service. Yet, a detailed dossier on Li Ka-Shing was included along with Chinese President Jiang Zemin, foreign minister Li Peng and other top communist officials.

Li Ka-Shing owns the huge shipping firm Hutchison Whampoa Ltd. and the giant far east investment firm Cheong Kong Holdings. According to the 1994 Clinton-supplied dossier -- Li has "significant economic and political ties to China" including investments in a "power station, a highway construction project and a large contribution to Shantou University." Li Ka-Shing also had legal troubles and a known criminal record. Li, according to the White House documents, was "found guilty of insider trading after a widely publicized trial in 1984; he was not punished by the courts."

According to the White House, Li was also a "member of the boards of directors of the China International Trust and Investment Corporation (CITIC)." CITIC is the bank of the People's Liberation Army, providing financing for Chinese Army weapons sales and western technology purchases. CITIC serves as the chief investment arm of China's central government and holds ministry status on the Chinese State Council.

Ron Brown helped CITIC more than once. Brown had the CITIC American representative, Bai Xingji, serve as a panelist/speaker at the 1995 Big Emerging Markets Conference (BEM). Brown arranged for the Chairman of CITIC, Wang Jun, to meet President Clinton. Wang Jun was not only chairman of CITIC but also President of Poly Technologies, a firm known to be an outlet for Chinese weapon exports. Wang Jun is an international arms dealer known in every major capital of the world. Wang Jun met with Ron Brown and DNC fundraiser Charlie "Ya-Lin" Trie prior to meeting Bill Clinton and making a large contribution at a White House coffee/fundraiser.

CITIC also owns a controlling interest in the Hong Kong based Asia Satellite Telecom Co. Ltd., or AsiaSat. AsiaSat, a company founded in 1988, operates several

communications satellites in the far east bought from U.S. manufacturers such as Hughes. Asiasat also signed an exclusive deal with billionaire Li Ka-Shing to carry his STAR television service -- 54 channels of premium cable/satellite television including MTV, re-runs of American sitcoms dubbed in various languages, and pay-per-view X rated movies.

Li also scored with Indonesian Dictator Suharto, arranging for the Palapa satellite purchased from U.S. space giant Hughes to also carry STAR TV. After helping kick off AsiaSat with big paying customers seeking far east satellite TV and cable service, Ka-Shing later sold all of his STAR TV holdings in two huge chunks to news magnate Rupert Murdoch for nearly a billion dollars.

AsiaSat and CITIC are also front companies for the People's Liberation Army (PLA). In addition to the direct TV broadcasts of STAR, AsiaSat satellites also regularly carry communications traffic for Chinese military units and Chinese military owned companies. Thus, with Ka-Shing's help the profits from X-rated films and American pay-TV channels help fund Chinese Army satellite communications.

Interestingly, one area the Chinese communists decided not to crack down on after the 1989 Tianamen square uprising was satellite TV dish ownership. Instead of going against the tide of global communications, China selected both a profitable and pro-Marxist approach. AsiaSat HK also has an exclusive deal to carry the official TV news, sports and propaganda outlets for the PRC. By allowing private dish ownership, Beijing can spread propaganda to the masses while concealing military satellite operations among the thousands of commercial dishes.

Furthermore, Beijing's military front companies also manufacture satellite dishes and receivers. Chinese Generals earn a sweet profit from commercial dish exports and sales that provide financial support to the hidden military operations in Chinese commercial satellites.

Red satellite TV is not the only deal that Li Ka-Shing managed to score with the assistance of the Chinese armed forces and Bill Clinton. One deal led by Li Ka-Shing nearly added four new ships to the Chinese Navy.

In 1982, the giant civilian container ship Atlantic Conveyor

joined the U.K. Royal Navy task force off the Falkland Islands. The civilian container ship was quickly modified for war and it brought Harrier jump jets and helicopters to reinforce the already badly under-powered Royal Navy. During the course of the south Atlantic combat, the Atlantic Conveyor was struck and sunk by an Argentine EXOCET cruise missile, killing the entire civilian crew.

In January 1997, Bill Clinton authorized four container ships similar to the Atlantic Conveyor for export directly to China. The four container ships were to be constructed for the China Ocean Shipping Company (COSCO) and Li Ka-Shing's Hutchison Whampoa Ltd. by the Alabama Shipyards, Mobile Ala.

The four ships were to be built using \$138 million in private loans backed by the U.S. government. The loans have very favorable terms including low interest rates and a 25-year re-payment plan, longer than the expected life of the ships. The loans were also U.S. backed, so even if the ship and owner disappeared, the Federal Government would still repay the lenders.

COSCO is better known for the recent unsuccessful attempt to purchase the former Long Beach Naval station. COSCO is also part of the Chinese Navy and wholly owned by the Chinese government. COSCO is the flag carrier for China, hauling official cargoes exported by the Chinese government including weapons. Recent U.S. Navy photos show COSCO cargo ships carrying missile armed patrol boats bound for Iran and tons of depleted uranium tank shells for Pakistan. COSCO ships have carried jet fighters, missile parts and tanks for export to Iran, Iraq, Syria and Libya.

The COSCO container ship deal fell apart in November 1997 due to "commercial" reasons blamed on the Asian financial crisis. Nevertheless, the Chinese Navy deal to acquire these ships actually started in 1993 when Bill Clinton and the Democrats were starved for donation cash.

The Maritime shipyard-funding program, managed by the Department of Transportation (DOT), was created to finance American built ships sold to U.S. flag companies. In 1993, the Democratic controlled Congress joined President Clinton and altered the program to allow U.S. financing on ships built for export. Li Ka-Shing, COSCO, Ron Brown

and Bill Clinton worked to provide the four container ships, including the low cost, 100% U.S. government backed loans, to Hutchison Whampoa and COSCO.

Li Ka-Shing is not the only one to take advantage of the Clinton sponsored changes in the Maritime finance program. For example, two power barges for export to Indonesia made by Enron Corp., a large contributor to Bill Clinton, were also built through the DOT Maritime-funding program, and backed by \$50 million in taxpayer financing. Another questionable ship deal included over \$60 million to build a paddlewheel steam boat/casino. Still another deal landed millions in taxpayer supported loans for two floating combination hotel/casino barges.

Li's role in Chinese maritime power is clearly outlined by the kind of special deals he has struck with the communist government. It is known that Li Ka-shing played a significant role in the attempted purchase of the Long Beach Naval station for COSCO. Li Ka-Shing also owns most of the dock space in Hong Kong. Li Ka-Shing and COSCO co-own the ports at both ends of the Panama Canal (Atlantic and Pacific). In fact, Li has over a billion dollars invested in China and an exclusive deal that includes first right of refusal over all PRC ports south of the Yangtze river.

According to documents obtained from the Commerce Department using the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) the 1994 August far east trade trip schedule included Mr. Li on the midnight cruise aboard the "Love Boat" (Pacific Princess) from Hong Kong with Brown and a host of other high level guests. In Hong Kong Li Ka-Shing met with Brown and the entire trade mission of American executives, including Loral CEO Schwartz and DNC donor Sanford Robertson.

The Clinton supplied documents clearly provide the answer to why civilian/billionaire Ka-Shing was included with communist leader President Jiang Zemin. Li Ka-Shing is really part of the Chinese government. Li Ka-Shing's partnership with the red Chinese military has been a very profitable story of symbiotic business deals with great financial benefit to both Li and the communists. Without Li Ka-Shing the Chinese army would have to find some other billionaire front man to run their western business dealings.

Li Ka-Shing willingly provided his services for a piece of the action. Li Ka-Shing cashed in on his co-existence with the Chinese military to the tune of billions in his pocket. Li Ka-Shing bought his way into the Commerce trade missions of 1994 through Ron Brown and the DNC. There is no question that Li Ka-Shing's contributions to Chinese Naval power projection should earn him the title "Commodore" in the People's Liberation Navy -- if not a more official rank of red Admiral.

House OKs Select Probe of Clinton-China Link

The Washington Times 6/19/98

The House voted overwhelmingly Thursday to create a special select committee to investigate charges that the Clinton administration, in return for campaign contributions, helped Chinese efforts to develop nuclear missiles.

"U.S. national security has been harmed, in fact it has been breached, by these policies," said Rep. Gerald B.H. Solomon, New York Republican.

Democrats overwhelmingly supported creating the committee. The vote was 409-10. All of the opponents were Democrats.

The vote took place amid a growing confrontation between Congress and the administration over China policy, examined in several hearings Thursday on Capitol Hill, days before President Clinton is due to travel to Beijing.

One waiver for launching a U.S. satellite in China that was opposed by the Justice Department was approved by the State Department "in a normal manner," one administration official said. Several testified that U.S. satellite policy did not aid Chinese strategic missile development.

Congress is investigating how two U.S. satellite makers, Hughes Electronics Corp. and Loral Space & Communications Ltd., provided sensitive missile technology during space cooperation that the Pentagon has determined damaged U.S. national security.

Administration officials faced questions about recent changes in export policies governing sensitive technology during a hearing of the Senate Governmental Affairs subcommittee on proliferation.

"Our export control system should prevent technology transfers to China that endanger American security," said Sen. Thad Cochran, Mississippi Republican, who chairs the subcommittee. "We have no defense against missile attack. Helping equip nations directly or indirectly with the means to put our nation's citizens at risk from ballistic missile attack must be stopped."

Three senior administration officials from the Commerce, State and Defense departments defended recent policies that loosened controls on satellite technology exports.

Undersecretary of Commerce William Reinsch, who is in charge of export administration, said the new policy "both protects our national security and facilitates our economic well-being."

Earlier Thursday, Republicans on the House International Relations and National Security committees challenged those claims.

"To argue that China's ballistic missile program has not benefited from launching U.S. satellites defies common sense and ignores reality," said Rep. Floyd Spence, South Carolina Republican and chairman of the National Security Committee.

In another Senate hearing, however, a leading Democrat dismissed the dangers of technology transfers to China as "malarkey."

"Don't let yourself be too concerned about this malarkey about the transfer of technology through satellites to China and whether the president sold American interests for a campaign contribution," Sen. Joseph R. Biden Jr., Delaware Democrat, told Assistant Secretary of State for East Asia Stanley Roth during a hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee on East Asia. "That is a diversion. You should act as if it doesn't even exist."

Mr. Biden added that "no one believes" Mr. Clinton "would sell out the national security of the United States of America."

But another Democrat, Sen. Max Cleland of Georgia, said he is concerned that recent changes in the process for licensing exports could be undermining national security in favor of commercial interests.

"I guess I have real concerns about Commerce more and more becoming the lead dog here," Mr. Cleland said during the Senate's proliferation subcommittee hearing. "We are talking about national security and companies making the same products and satellites and rockets and boosters that possibly could be targeted toward our country. This is serious business."

Early in the day, Democrats attacked the GOP, releasing a report that listed 50 congressional probes conducted since 1995, saying Republicans have "spent more than \$17 million in taxpayer dollars" on "politically motivated" investigations.

At a press conference, House Minority Leader Richard A. Gephardt, Missouri Democrat, likened GOP investigations to a bumbling detective from the "Pink Panther" movies. "It is the Congress of Inspector Clouseau," he said.

The new select committee on China is authorized to spend up to \$2.5 million before the end of the year and will have wide discretion on what and how to investigate.

The nine-member committee will be chaired by Rep. Christopher Cox, California Republican. It is modeled on a similar committee created by the Democrat-controlled House to look into the Iran-Contra Affair during the Reagan administration.

Despite the partisan sniping, there are signs that the China debate has crossed party lines. Sen. Craig Thomas, Wyoming Republican, Thursday made public a letter signed by several key Republican and Democratic senators opposed to sanctions recently approved by the House.

The letter favoring "engagement" rather than "isolation and containment" was signed by Mr. Thomas and Republican senators Frank Murkowski of Alaska, Chuck Hagel of Nebraska, Gordon Smith of Oregon and Rod Grams of Minnesota, along with Mr. Biden and fellow Democratic senators John Kerry of Massachusetts, Dianne Feinstein of California, Charles S. Robb of Virginia and Joseph I. Lieberman of Connecticut.

Criticism of satellite exports to China has prompted the White House to reconsider a \$650 million deal approved in 1996, the New York Times reported Thursday.

The deal between Hughes Space and Communications and Asia-Pacific Mobile Telecommunications (APMT), a consortium with close ties to the Chinese army, has come under closer scrutiny from Pentagon and State Department officials concerned about potential Chinese military uses of the satellites, the report said.

The newspaper also reported that one of the investors in APMT is China Resources Holdings, a trading company with ties to the Riady family of Indonesia.

The Commerce Department's export administration chief defended the satellite policy. The United States should continue to license Chinese launches, Mr. Reinsch said.

The U.S. satellite industry produced more than \$23 billion in revenues last year and employed more than 100,000 people, he said. Pending contracts to launch U.S. satellites on Chinese rockets are now worth \$1.7 billion and as many as 1,200 satellites will be launched in the next 10 years, Mr. Reinsch said.

"The system I think has worked smoothly," Mr. Reinsch said. "What you hear about here, of course, are places where there was some problem."

At the House hearing, John Holum, acting undersecretary of state for arms control, stated that strategic missile technology and space launch know-how are "dramatically different."

The testimony differed from recent information supplied to the Senate by the CIA, which provided a chart showing that the basic technologies for space launchers and nuclear missiles are very similar.

Jan M. Lodal, deputy undersecretary of defense for policy, said he does not believe allowing U.S. satellites to be launched on Chinese boosters has harmed U.S. national security.

Mr. Holum testified that the State Department knew about an ongoing criminal investigation of Hughes and Loral, and handled a waiver for Loral to export a satellite to China "in a normal manner."

"We do not believe that commercial space launch activities that have been authorized by licenses and monitored under these procedures have benefited China's missile or military satellite capabilities,"

Mr. Holum said.

Mr. Roth told senators that when Mr. Clinton visits China next week he will not sign any agreement to curb U.S. weapons sales to Taiwan.

"Let me state up front and emphatically that the administration remains firmly committed to filling the security and arms transfer provisions of the TRA, Taiwan Relations Act," he said.

Sen. Paul Wellstone, Minnesota Democrat, challenged Mr. Roth to harden the administration stance on China, calling on Mr. Clinton to "demand" that China release political and religious prisoners, defend human rights and meet dissidents and relatives of those killed at Tiananmen Square in 1989.

"Otherwise, I think it will be a trip which will just validate the abuse and violation of human rights of citizens in China," said Mr. Wellstone.

Satellite Export Concerns Date to '95

The Washington Times 6/3/98

A previously undisclosed improper export by Hughes Aircraft of satellites containing embargoed technology was a key reason for former Secretary of State Warren Christopher's rejection of a plan to give the Commerce Department full authority to control such overseas transfers.

A classified memorandum obtained by The Washington Times reveals the improper sale of two satellites by Hughes in 1995 -- the second major report of a questionable technology transfer by the Los Angeles-based aerospace firm that manufactures communications satellites.

Mr. Christopher was ultimately overruled by the White House, which transferred the power to regulate sensitive satellites to Commerce, under Secretary Ronald H. Brown. Before moving to Commerce, Mr. Brown headed the Democratic National Committee, now under fire for improper fund raising.

According to a Sept. 22, 1995, memorandum, Mr. Christopher rejected plans to give Commerce the sole power to approve satellite exports after an interagency study warned that "significant" military and intelligence capabilities could be lost in the licensing authority switch.

The memorandum said the Pentagon and U.S. intelligence agencies strongly opposed the policy change because Hughes "recently" had exported two satellites with sensitive cryptographic technology without first getting a State Department munitions license. Hughes Electronics Corp. and Loral Space & Communications Ltd. are under investigation by the Justice Department concerning unauthorized transfers of military-related missile technology to China. The probe began after scientists from the two companies provided data on space launchers that helped China improve its strategic nuclear missiles, according to U.S. officials.

Mr. Christopher, who was overruled by the president five months later, signed the memo on Oct. 9, 1995, recommending that some weapons controls on satellite exports be loosened. But he also tried to keep oversight of sensitive satellite technology exports under an interagency review group.

Right from the Start

The Washington Times 5/19/98

On CBS' "Face the Nation" Sunday, Sen. John McCain said the latest revelations in the 'Chinagate' scandal are a vindication of Sen. Fred Thompson's original claims that communist China sought to buy influence with 1996 campaign contributions.

"What has happened here is corroboration of what Fred Thompson alleged, which many people scoffed at and derided," the Arizona Republican said. "And perhaps, some people ought to owe Fred Thompson an apology."

Meanwhile over on ABC's "This Week," Sam Donaldson echoed that sentiment toward the Tennessee Republican who chaired the 1997 campaign finance investigations: "Well, may I just say a word in behalf of Senator Fred Thompson," said Mr. Donaldson. "In the sense that he started those hearings by saying there was this connection. And he was much derided. Well, senator, you're right."

A dupe?

The Washington Times 5/19/98

"Chinagate now looms as the most serious risk ever" to President Clinton, writes Deborah Orin, Washington bureau chief of the New York Post, "because no one can dismiss it as a silly flap over oral sex in the Oval Office or the long-ago Whitewater real-estate deal."

So far, Miss Orin writes, the president's defense against charges that his administration aided China's missile program consists of portraying himself "as an innocent dupe of Chinese espionage. ... In blunt terms, the question is whether Clinton made it easier for China to aim its nuclear missiles at American cities because he got blinded by wads of campaign cash.

"For it now appears that China's military did funnel cash to Clinton's party while Clinton was overruling his own secretary of state and easing satellite exports to China -- a totalitarian state with a brutal record of human-rights violations. ...

"Clinton insists it wasn't a quid-pro-quo -- the Chinese didn't buy a policy shift. But at a minimum, it certainly appears that the Chinese thought they were buying a policy shift."

The Faint First Cracks in the Body Armor

The Washington Times 5/19/98

We've found the smoking gun. (The steaming egg roll, if you like.)

President Clinton, whose blind partisans doggedly insist there's nothing any more suspicious about this than any of the other score or so Clinton scandals and none are scandalous, has to be feeling a little queasy in his hideout in London. When Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Joe Biden and Tom Daschle raise a collective eyebrow on a single day, the president has to feel a sudden chill in the wind

blowing in across the Atlantic.

Johnny Chung, the California businessman and Democratic bag man, expressed his fund-raising philosophy with Oriental directness. The hundreds of thousands of dollars he passed on from the government in Beijing, he said, were spent as "subway tokens" for himself and his Chinese friends to buy entry into the White House, where Bill Clinton cheerfully stood by while the visitors picked up everything that wasn't nailed down, and a few things that were. Only inscrutable Occidentals, all 270 million of us, have been unable to recognize what they were doing.

What we know so far is that Mr. Chung took \$300,000 from a Chinese aerospace official, Liu Chao-ying, a lieutenant colonel in the People's Liberation Army designated by the Beijing government to give at the office. Mr. Chung passed \$100,000 of that sum on to the Democratic National Committee, and kept the rest as a sort of service charge, or handling fee. There may have been lots more.

Janet Reno's G-men are believed to have on tape intercepts of conversations in which Mr. Chung and his clients in Beijing discuss the plan for buying Bill Clinton. This is what Fred Thompson and his Senate committee were after last fall, and never got.

The three Democratic senators are the first to break ranks with the administration, and they choose their words carefully. But it's clear that they've got cramps in their fingers from holding their noses, and the stink is getting worse by the hour. If it becomes impossible to keep Mr. Clinton propped up as a president just credible enough to survive -- this has been the Democratic strategy since mid-winter -- nobody wants to be the last one out of the pig sty.

Nobody knows where the Chinese money will lead, though it looks like the path will go through the Loral Corp., which two years ago obtained a presidential waiver to export advanced satellite technology to Beijing. At that time, Loral was under criminal investigation for an earlier export of such technology to China. Bernard Schwartz, chairman of Loral, is one of the most generous Democratic contributors. You could add it up.

The brazen seediness of this scheme, specifically forbidden by U.S. law, defies credulity. Only a country boy confident of taking the pants off the city slickers would even attempt it. There's no denying that the bag man was collecting hot money wherever he could; Mr. Chung pleaded guilty in March to making illegal donations. He told prosecutors that Liu Chao-ying, whose employer is a company owned by the Chinese government, told him that the money came from Chinese intelligence sources and was meant for political contributions.

Miss Liu's father is Gen. Liu Huaqing, once a member of the Communist Party leadership and once the top Chinese military commander.

Naturally, the Democrats know nothing -- they know nossing! -- about the source of the contributions. Why should they? Bag men are famously altruistic, and just because Johnny Chung slopped around nearly half a million dollars, like mayonnaise on an egg-salad sandwich, there was no reason to think he would have wanted his clients to get credit for it. It was only money.

"This money has not been at the DNC for almost a year," party spokesman Rick Hess insists. "We

returned every penny. We had no way of knowing this money came from overseas."

Richard Sullivan, who was the finance director for the party, seems to have been the only man over there who knows how babies are made. He told investigators for the Senate Government Affairs Committee that he was concerned about Mr. Chung's sources. "I had a sense that he might be taking money from them and then giving it to us." What a sensible fellow.

Only someone who has been asleep for the past decade would not have seen this coming. This is exactly how Bill Clinton turned Arkansas into a private satrapy, drying up the sources of political money by taking it all for himself. Raising money is what the president does best. It's all he ever wanted to do. He has never cared where the money comes from, or what he gives in return. It's a mad, mad, mad world out there, studded with peril, and 42 presidents before him worried themselves sick about it. But it's a world that just never occurred to Bill Clinton.

Hatch Sees Probe into Campaign Financing

The Washington Times 5/4/98

The Senate Judiciary Committee chairman says new evidence uncovered by Justice Department investigators will force Attorney General Janet Reno to seek an independent counsel probe of White House campaign finance practices.

"I think the case is overwhelming that there should have been an independent counsel long before now, and I believe that within the near future Janet Reno will have no choice but to appoint an independent counsel in the campaign finance thing," Sen. Orrin G. Hatch, Utah Republican, said on "Fox News Sunday."

Miss Reno, who also appeared on the show, said that she will listen to all her advisers, and that if sufficient evidence exists to support naming an independent counsel, "I'm going to do it." But she has no plans to act on requests by some Democrats to seek the removal of Kenneth W. Starr, the independent counsel investigating the Whitewater land deal and the White House sex-and-lies scandal. "At this point, I have seen no evidence that would justify that action," the attorney general said.

Pressed as to her professional relationship with Mr., Starr, Miss Reno said, "I don't know Judge Starr very well, but to date I've had, I think, very cordial relationships with him."

A report in yesterday's editions of the New York Times said Charles La Bella, Justice's top prosecutor for campaign finance, had urged the attorney general to seek an independent counsel to probe campaign practices by Mr. Clinton and Vice President Al Gore.

Asked about that report, Mr. Hatch said: "I'm satisfied that Mr. La Bella has made good recommendations to the attorney general, that he's doing a very good job -- he's got the backing of the deputy attorney general, as well --and that there are some things that are going to happen there that I think are going to be very revealing."

In a statement yesterday, Mr. La Bella acknowledged he had recommended that Miss Reno request

an independent counsel last year. But he said that he was "completely comfortable" with her decision not to do so, and that he has not renewed the recommendation since that time.

However, there's speculation he could make that recommendation again in a report he's preparing for Miss Reno.

Mr. Hatch and other Republican leaders sharply criticized Miss Reno when she announced in December she would not request an independent counsel to look into fund-raising calls Mr. Clinton and Mr. Gore made from the White House.

She said then that the two had broken no federal laws, but that the Justice Department was continuing its investigation into Democratic Party fund-raising activities and an independent counsel probe was still possible.

Miss Reno declined to discuss what Mr. La Bella told her in the past. But, she said, "if he at any time thinks that the independent counsel statute is triggered, I want to know about it."

The Independent Counsel Act is invoked when credible evidence has surfaced that a senior administration official has committed a crime. Miss Reno has requested four independent counsels. Mr. Starr is investigating the Whitewater land deal and, more recently, whether Mr. Clinton committed perjury or encouraged others to do so in testifying about his relationship with former White House intern Monica Lewinsky.

Regardless of what Mr. La Bella and other advisers recommend, Miss Reno said she will make the final decision on whether there should be another independent counsel.

Miss Reno said she has asked Mr. La Bella to "pursue every lead. ... What I try to do is to take all the evidence, all the law, hear from everybody concerned, including the investigators, and then I make the judgment."

Mr. Hatch said he and Sen. Fred Thompson, the Tennessee Republican who is chairman of the Government Affairs Committee that probed campaign fund raising, had a "hard-hitting" meeting last week with Mr. La Bella. "There are many people down at Justice who felt that there should have been an independent counsel before now," he said.

The Judiciary Committee chairman said he believes there is "no question" Miss Reno will seek an independent counsel if Justice Department investigators "continue to follow up on Johnny Chung, Charlie Trie" and others who purportedly funneled illegal foreign campaign contributions to the Democratic Party.

"There is an awful lot of information there. There's an awful lot of cooperation now. There's prosecutorial squeeze being put on people to tell the truth. And I believe that the attorney general is just going to have to do it," said Mr. Hatch.

Miss Reno said yesterday she would welcome a decision by Mr. La Bella to postpone his decision to return to San Diego, Calif., where his family remains and where he was formerly assistant U.S. attorney.

If he does leave as planned, Miss Reno said, "I will make sure that there is a firm, complete transition."

In his statement, Mr. La Bella said he will not leave until his replacement has been chosen.

Fund-Raiser Hsia Faces Federal Tax Charges Pressure in Campaign Probe Alleged Washington Post July 8, 1998

Democratic fund-raiser Maria Hsia was indicted on federal tax charges yesterday just weeks before she is due to go on trial for allegedly disguising illegal contributions to the 1996 Clinton-Gore reelection effort.

Hsia's attorney, Nancy Luque, said Hsia is innocent of any wrongdoing and portrayed the new indictment as part of a long-standing effort by federal prosecutors to pressure her into pleading guilty to campaign fund-raising misdeeds.

"She will not plead guilty to crimes she did not commit," Luque said.

Hsia, a naturalized U.S. citizen born in Taiwan, has pleaded not guilty to a six-count federal indictment that charges that from 1993 to 1996 she illegally routed funds from a Buddhist temple in California to support the Democratic Party and several Democratic campaigns. That trial is scheduled to start Aug. 31.

Hsia is best known for escorting Vice President Al Gore to a controversial 1996 campaign event at the temple, which was cited as an unindicted co-conspirator in the February indictment.

According to yesterday's indictment, Hsia illegally failed to file a 1994 income tax return, underreported income on her 1995 and 1996 tax returns and filed a false 1995 corporate tax return for her immigration consulting company, Hsia & Associates Inc., which is based in the Los Angeles suburb of Arcadia. If found guilty on the criminal tax charges, Hsia would face a maximum of 10 years in jail and a fine of \$850,000.

Burton to Air Hubbell's Taped Prison Calls

The Washington Times 5/4/98

Rep. Dan Burton said he will release today entire tapes of 54 jail house conversations of Webster Hubbell, following angry charges by Mr. Hubbell's attorney and top Democrats that the Indiana Republican selectively released misleading excerpts from the tapes.

Mr. Burton, chairman of the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee, announced the action yesterday afternoon after Mr. Hubbell's lawyer, John Nields, and Rep. Henry A. Waxman, ranking Democrat on Mr. Burton's committee, accused him of "editing" the tapes "to change their meaning."

By releasing the 54 tapes in "their entirety ... I believe this will once and for all put the lie to any accusation of 'editing,' 'doctoring,' or 'out of context' quotation," Mr. Burton said in a statement.

Mr. Hubbell, a former top Justice Department official and friend of President Clinton's, was indicted last week along with his wife, Suzanna, and two advisers on charges of tax evasion.

Newly disclosed tape excerpts --reportedly provided by Mr. Waxman and played on NBC's "Meet the Press" yesterday -- showed that some potentially important material was omitted from tapes of Mr. Hubbell's 1996 prison conversations that Mr. Burton released last week.

Some comments were removed in midsentence, according to "Meet the Press" host Tim Russert, who said he'd been reviewing some of the newly released tapes and transcripts.

The new excerpts appeared to clear first lady Hillary Clinton of wrongdoing in the billing scandal at the Rose Law Firm in Little Rock that sent Mr. Hubbell, a former associate attorney general, to federal prison for 18 months in 1994. Mrs. Clinton and Mr. Hubbell were both partners in that law firm before Mr. Clinton became president.

Mr. Nields, interviewed yesterday on ABC's "This Week," objected to any public airing of the tapes. "I want none of it talked about," he said. "This is very, very wrong."

Mr. Nields described Mr. Hubbell's prison conversations with his wife and others as "private" and said they do not belong in the public domain. "These tapes have all been edited to change their meaning," he charged on ABC.

In the part of the tape played yesterday, Mr. Hubbell said of Mrs. Clinton: "The only thing is people say: 'Why didn't she know what was going on?' And I wish she'd never paid any attention to what was going on in the firm. That's the gospel truth. She just had no idea what was going on."

Mr. Burton said yesterday that many of Mr. Hubbell's comments appeared designed to be overheard.

"You know, there's a sign above that [prison] phone that said, 'All these phone calls are being recorded.' And he was looking right at that, and he might have let his guard down and then said, 'Well, you know, I'd better say something positive about Hillary,'" Mr. Burton said.

In another example, Mr. Nields said Mr. Burton mischaracterized a conversation he had with his client. Mr. Burton maintained the two were discussing a possible presidential pardon after the 1996 election, but Mr. Nields said they were actually discussing a possible immunity deal from Whitewater independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr.

On "Fox News Sunday," Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Orrin G. Hatch, Utah Republican, said federal prosecutors are investigating far more serious crimes than possible overbilling by Mrs. Clinton.

"I think they're after whether or not perjury and obstruction of justice and subornation of perjury and conspiracy are involved, because those are very serious things, no matter who you are," said Mr. Hatch.

In appearances on two network news talk shows yesterday --"Meet the Press" and CNN's "Late Edition" -- Mr. Burton said he would release all 295 tapes of some 600 recorded conversations

involving Mr. Hubbell that his panel received from the Justice Department, provided Mr. Hubbell's attorney and the White House did not object.

After Mr. Nields nixed that idea, the congressman said he would make public the 54 tapes from which excerpts were taken. A spokesman said the congressman would make those tapes available today, whether Mr. Nields and the White House liked it or not.

In explaining why he had not released all tapes to begin with, Mr. Burton said he wanted to "protect the privacy" of the Hubbells.

But White House senior domestic policy adviser Rahm Emanuel countered on "Late Edition" that Mr. Burton "never worried about anyone's privacy when he released previous tape segments that were not exculpatory."

Said Mr. Burton in his press statement yesterday: "To assure that only information clearly relevant to our investigation of campaign fund raising be released, I instructed the responsible staff to exclude anything that might touch on personal or private affairs.

"Now, however, I have heard these baseless claims by White House operatives that call into question that careful process. I will not let these charges stand without challenge," he said.

Republican investigators obtained the tapes of the 1996 prison conversations as part of their probe into whether Mr. Hubbell received hush money from Clinton supporters to ensure his silence on any wrongdoing involving the failed Whitewater real estate deal.

In a letter to Mr. Burton, released yesterday, Mr. Waxman accused the committee chairman of "unilaterally altering the content of the tapes" for political purposes, an accusation the chairman rejected as "baloney."

Mr. Waxman said it's impossible for Mr. Burton to continue as the House's chief investigator of White House scandals and said the committee must meet as soon as possible to discuss the new developments.

Gingrich Rails at Democrats' 'Obstruction' of Clinton Probes

The Washington Times 4/29/98

House Speaker Newt Gingrich yesterday fired his angriest salvo yet in the escalating political controversy over

Democratic efforts to derail investigations of President Clinton and questionable White House campaign activities.

The speaker took to the House floor to say that Democrats who voted against immunity for four witnesses in the campaign-finance investigation are obstructing justice, and he demanded another vote.

"When the people breaking the law are foreign nationals trying to corrupt the United States by bringing in foreign money -- in some cases in a deliberate effort in collusion with billionaires in Asia -- we have every reason as a national security matter to protect our political system," Mr. Gingrich said.

"For some reason, Democrats voted 19-0 to cover up this testimony," he said. "That means they voted 19-0 to block it from getting to the American people and to prevent the Congress from being informed."

His comments followed a strongly worded speech Monday night to GOPAC, the Republican political action group he once led, denouncing White House efforts to discredit independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr.

The White House should call off the "paid hacks" attacking the Whitewater prosecutor, since the administration can fire him at any time, Mr. Gingrich said.

"If [President Clinton] doesn't want to fire Ken Starr, he should tell his staff to shut up," Mr. Gingrich said. "I am sickened by how unpatriotically they undermine the Constitution of the United States."

The speaker said there were two principles "which I am prepared to live and die on."

"The first is that the American people have the right to know about basic facts. And the second is that we are a nation under the rule of law and no person, including the president, is above the law."

Henceforth, he said, "I will never again, as long as I am speaker, make a speech without commenting on this topic." His declaration was a far cry from the GOP strategy early in the year to stay silent as the Monica Lewinsky sex-and-lies scandal unfolded.

Mr. Clinton was reluctant to respond yesterday. "[Mr. Gingrich] said a lot of things last night that I don't think it would serve any useful purpose for me to respond to," the president said. "There is enough negative political talk in Washington every single day without the president adding to it."

White House Press Secretary Michael McCurry called Mr. Gingrich's GOPAC speech "a rank partisan political attack" aimed at firing up his political base and raising money for his party.

But it was Mr. McCurry who acknowledged at a Feb. 24 briefing that White House aides, behind the scenes, were distributing material critical of Mr. Starr and his prosecutorial team to the media.

He insisted, however, that the effort did not include investigating the personal lives of Clinton critics.

Newspapers and TV networks have received information about the personal lives of Mr. Starr and his prosecutorial team.

But White House officials said they were not responsible, blaming unnamed Clinton associates instead.

Mr. Clinton, asked about the speaker's assertion that he could fire Mr. Starr, said yesterday, "That's not what the statute says."

Justice Department spokesman Bert Brandenburg said the independent counsel statute stipulates that the attorney general may terminate an independent counsel only for "good cause," or if a physical or mental problem impairs his performance.

The Justice spokesman declined to comment on Mr. Gingrich's defense of Mr. Starr as an "officer of the Department of Justice." "We've not traditionally been part of the back-and-forth," Mr. Brandenburg said.

The House Government Reform and Oversight Committee has been investigating the White House on several fronts, including campaign fund raising. The committee voted 21-19 last week not to grant immunity to four witnesses believed to have information about improper fund raising.

The committee will vote again on immunity. Two-thirds of members voting on the committee are necessary to grant immunity. Mr. Gingrich said that if Democrats again block immunity, he will transfer the immunity vote to the House Oversight Committee, chaired by Rep. Bill Thomas, California Republican.

Rep. Henry A. Waxman, California Democrat and the committee's ranking minority member, said he and other Democrats blocked immunity because they have no faith in the investigation, which he described as "partisan and reckless."

Rep. Dan Burton, Indiana Republican and the committee chairman, is not conducting an impartial hearing but an effort to bring down the president, Mr. Waxman said.

Mr. Gingrich said Mr. Waxman's approach to the investigation is a far cry from that of Howard Baker, the ranking Republican from Tennessee who served on the investigating committee during Watergate.

"Howard Baker understood that Richard Nixon could not be allowed to take the entire Republican Party and the Constitution down in flames," he said.

Mr. Waxman shot back, "The chairman [of the Watergate panel] didn't call the president of the United States a 'scumbag.' He did not say he was out to get him."

Mr. Burton, in an interview with the Indianapolis Star during the Easter recess, referred to Mr. Clinton as a "scumbag" and said he was "after" the president because he believes he is corrupt.

Mr. Gingrich noted yesterday that during the Watergate hearings a quarter-century ago, Republicans voted "consistently and unanimously" for immunity.

He said that even during the Iran-Contra probe, which most Republicans opposed, the congressional investigative committees voted unanimously to grant limited immunity to Oliver North, John Poindexter and Albert Hakim.

"There is no logical reason for the Democrats' stonewalling and sharply partisan actions," he said. "What are they afraid of?"

Only two weeks ago, House GOP leader Dick Armey of Texas called the president "shameless" and said that he, himself, would resign if he were guilty of the same charges being leveled at Mr. Clinton in the sex scandal.

Yesterday, however, Mr. Armey distanced himself from Mr. Gingrich's suggestion that the White House "shut up."

"I was amused by that," he said. "I would never deign to tell the White House when to shut up."

Hillary Silent on Two Starr Questions

USAToday 04/29/98

Hillary Clinton refused to answer two questions posed by independent counsel Kenneth Starr during a five-hour interview last Saturday, President Clinton's lawyer said Wednesday.

"She appropriately declined to answer two questions which inquired into conversations she may have had with her husband, conversations that plainly fell under the long-established common-law privilege for marital communications," said David Kendall, the president's personal lawyer.

Her videotaped comments to Starr were being played Wednesday for a Little Rock grand jury investigating the Clintons' role in the failed Arkansas land deal known as Whitewater. The session was scheduled last week by Starr in order to begin summarizing two years of evidence and theories.

The 23-person panel is set to expire on May 7.

Starr told USA TODAY that the investigation continues to move forward and that he expects to detail the progress Friday night in a speech to a bar association in San Antonio.

But Starr declined to comment on when - or if - he would bring Whitewater partner Susan McDougal back before the grand jury. She remains in an Arkansas jail after refusing to answer questions before the panel last Thursday.

Also in Little Rock Wednesday, Paula Jones formally told a federal judge she was appealing the decision tossing out her sexual-harassment lawsuit against the president.

Ex-Teamsters official indicted

The Washington Times 4/28/98

A federal grand jury indicted the Teamsters' former political director yesterday on charges of giving \$1.1 million in union funds to the Democratic Party, the AFL-CIO and liberal advocacy groups so they would launder portions into the re-election campaign of Teamsters President Ron Carey.

The indictment was handed up just hours after James P. Hoffa --who blames the money-laundering scheme for his 1996 loss to Mr. Carey -- was cleared by a federal election officer to seek the

presidency in a rerun election.

William W. Hamilton Jr., who controlled the union's powerful political action committee until his resignation in July, was charged with embezzlement, conspiracy, wire fraud, mail fraud, perjury and making false statements to a federal election officer. If convicted, he faces up to 30 years in prison and \$1.5 million in fines.

"Bill is innocent of all charges and we look forward to his day in court," said his attorney, Robert Gage.

Mr. Hamilton -- a former Planned Parenthood spokesman who once ridiculed Mother Teresa's opposition to abortion in a letter published by The Washington Post -- joined the Teamsters in early 1995, bringing with him a commitment to liberal activism that contrasted sharply with the union's previous support of Presidents Reagan and Bush.

"Mr. Hamilton had an expansive and pro-active view of the [Teamsters'] role in politics and in mobilizing its membership for political action, a view shared by Mr. Carey," Barbara Zack Quindel, a former federal election officer, wrote last year. Mr. Hamilton's own records show that he emptied the coffers of the Teamsters' political action committee, known as DRIVE, tapped the general treasury and even secured a \$500,000 bank loan so the union could keep giving money to Democrats in the 1996 elections.

"We have to recommend to our members, semantics aside, that they vote for Bill Clinton, not Bob Dole," Mr. Hamilton told Teamsters Communications Director Matt Witt in a March 1996 memo. "We ask for and get, on almost a daily basis, help from the Clinton administration for one thing or another. In the absence of a better candidate, it doesn't make sense to complicate our ability to continue doing so."

The Clinton administration even agreed to "lean on" railroad executives who might ask union workers for concessions, Mr. Hamilton wrote in another memo.

Later in the year, Mr. Hamilton schemed with Carey campaign manager Jere Nash and campaign aides Martin Davis and Michael Ansara to launder union funds into Mr. Carey's re-election bid, the indictment says.

He diverted unprecedented sums to the AFL-CIO and liberal advocacy groups -- including Citizen Action, Project Vote and the National Council of Senior Citizens -- all of which kicked back portions of the money into the Carey campaign, prosecutors said.

Mr. Hamilton also directed \$236,500 to various state Democratic parties in exchange for a \$100,000 contribution to the Carey campaign that was to be arranged by the Democratic National Committee and the Clinton-Gore re-election campaign. The Democrats lined up a donor who sent the check, but the Carey campaign sent it back because the donor was an employer and thus barred by election rules from contributing.

Last year, the money-laundering scandal was uncovered by Hoffa aides, including spokesman Richard Leebove, who fed evidence to FBI agents and federal prosecutors. A grand jury was

convened and, on April 14, 1997, questioned Mr. Hamilton. Mr. Hamilton made "29 false declarations when questioned concerning the [Teamsters'] contributions to Citizen Action and Project Vote, and Hamilton's and Nash's roles in those contributions," the office of U.S. Attorney Mary Jo White in New York said in a statement yesterday. Those declarations are the basis for the perjury charge.

On July 29, Mr. Hamilton resigned from the Teamsters, saying he would no longer cooperate with Mrs. White's investigation, which he called "a circus."

"I admit to doing everything I could do last year to try to re-elect the president and defeat Newt Gingrich's congressional majority," Mr. Hamilton wrote in his resignation letter to Mr. Carey. "I also did what I could to help you win re-election and continue to reform this union."

On Sept. 18, Nash, Davis and Ansara pleaded guilty in the money-laundering scheme and agreed to cooperate in Mrs. White's investigation. The results of the election were nullified and Mr. Carey, who also has been implicated in the scandal, was barred from participating in the rerun election.

Yesterday, federal election officer Michael Cherkasky cleared the way for Mr. Hoffa to seek the presidency but fined his campaign for minor fund-raising violations. Mr. Cherkasky also barred Mr. Leebove from working for Teamsters candidates until the rerun election is completed later this year.

Mr. Cherkasky said Mr. Leebove made an improper in-kind contribution to the Hoffa campaign by underbilling it by \$167,675. Mr. Leebove called the ruling retaliation by the election office, which he said was embarrassed by its failure to detect the money-laundering scandal.

Mr. Leebove also said Mr. Cherkasky was seeking personal revenge against him for telling reporters earlier this year that the election officer once accepted questionable campaign donations when he sought unsuccessfully to become district attorney of Westchester County, N.Y. After news reports on the contributions, the New York State Board of Elections began an inquiry.

Mr. Cherkasky yesterday denied accepting improper contributions. He also said his punishment of Mr. Leebove was based on evidence, not revenge.

Emailgate

Gore's Subpoenaed E-mail is Lost

By Jerry Seper
THE WASHINGTON TIMES 6/9/2000

Missing e-mail messages sent to Vice President Al Gore between March 1998 and April 1999 will never be found because a "technical error" resulted in the failure of a backup tape system, the White House has told a House committee.

The messages had been sought by the Justice Department's campaign-finance task force and the House Committee on Government Reform in ongoing investigations into the White House's failure to turn over thousands of e-mail messages to comply with subpoenas from a federal grand jury and congressional committees.

The e-mail involved Monica Lewinsky, the former White House intern with whom President Clinton admitted having a sexual relationship; the White

House's receipt of secret FBI files on Reagan and Bush administration officials; information on the selection of corporate executives for overseas trade trips; and e-mail concerning campaign-finance activities in the 1996 election, according to Sheryl L. Hall, chief of White House computer operations.

Senior Associate White House Counsel Steven F. Reich, in a letter Wednesday to the committee's chief counsel, James C. Wilson, said that in checking for the missing Gore documents, White House computer specialists discovered that the backup taping system had failed.

Mr. Reich described the problem as a configuration error involving the failure of a White House contractor to add a new e-drive to the vice president's backup taping system. He said the problem was not discovered until April 1999, when it was repaired. Committee Chairman Rep. Dan Burton Thursday described the new information as "the latest outrage in this whole unfortunate matter."

The Indiana Republican said the White House counsel's office initially had certified that the committee had all the e-mail documents responsive to its subpoena, and then "led us to believe" that the missing documents "had been saved on thousands of backup tapes."

"The White House failure to turn over records about problems in the vice president's office is yet another example of the ethical minimalism that governs White House document production," he said.

White House Counsel Beth Nolan told the committee in March that "much, if not all," of Mr. Gore's e-mail messages had not been retrieved by the White House archive system, but that backup tapes from the vice president's e-mail servers were being reviewed to determine whether any could be reconstructed.

Miss Nolan said the search was aimed at restoring 3,400 backup tapes for the Executive Office of the President (EOP) and 625 backups involving Mr. Gore.

The Washington Times reported in February that thousands of e-mail messages sent to the White House had not been retrieved in a search of records in response to subpoenas from a federal grand jury and three congressional committees.

A computer glitch that caused the e-mail not to be retrieved was first discovered in May 1998 when Northrop Grumman Corp. contract employees traced a programming error on one of four White House servers back to August 1996. The missing e-mail messages were discovered when Northrop Grumman found that one of the four White House Lotus Notes e-mail servers handling the mail was mislabeled and a search of e-mail messages under subpoena was incomplete.

House investigators have said that more than 246,000 e-mail messages are believed to be missing.

In March, Justice Department campaign-finance task force chief Robert J. Conrad Jr. told a federal court he had begun a probe into the missing e-mail, trying to determine whether subpoenas issued by his office were "fully complied with."

Mr. Conrad said the inquiry also focused on accusations that Northrop Grumman employees working on the White House computer system were "threatened with retaliation" to keep the messages from being turned over.

Five Northrop Grumman employees told the House Government Reform Committee in March they were warned not to discuss the problem after the firm had discovered it. Three of the employees said they were threatened with jail if they mentioned the missing e-mail messages to anyone.

One of the employees, Betty Lambuth, former manager of the Lotus Notes Group at the White House, testified she was told that if she or any of her team mentioned the error to anyone else, "we would lose our jobs, be arrested and put in jail." Another, Robert Haas, a systems administrator, said he was told there was a "jail cell with my name on it" if he told even his wife.

Mark Lindsay, head of the White House Office of Administration, and Laura Crabtree Callahan, former White House customer-support branch chief, have denied that anyone was threatened over the missing e-mail.

Mr. Conrad said the task force learned that the White House's e-mail management system had "for some period of time" failed to collect incoming electronic messages to several officials, some of which may have included "communications related to various criminal investigations."

3 Investigations Begin into White House E-mails

By Jerry Seper
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

The independent counsel's office and two congressional committees yesterday opened investigations into accusations by a former White House aide that the administration hid thousands of e-mail messages concerning "Filegate," Monica Lewinsky, and Chinese and other campaign finance abuses.

President Clinton, responding to a report in The Washington Times on the accusations of Sheryl L. Hall, former White House manager of computer operations, denied any wrongdoing, saying he believed the administration had "complied with every request."

"If the American people knew how much of their money we'd have to spend complying with requests for e-mails, they might be quite amazed, but we certainly have done our best to do that," he told reporters during a White House meeting about security on the World Wide Web.

"There has never been an intentional effort to do that, and I think that we are in full compliance. I believe we are. That's what [White House Chief of Staff John] Podesta told me right before we came out," he said.

According to lawyers and others close to the matter, investigators have centered on accusations that the e-mail messages were not delivered under subpoena to a federal grand jury and three congressional committees as required by law.

Investigators want to know whether White House officials obstructed justice and concealed the documents, the sources said.

"The White House assured us they had given us everything, and we assumed that was true," said a senior Senate investigator involved in the probe of suspected Chinese involvement in the 1996 election. "But maybe it wasn't. We are looking into it again and will try to determine if we need to proceed in a new direction."

House Government Reform Committee spokesman Mark Corallo confirmed that the panel has begun an investigation into the accusations, saying committee lawyers have had "problems from the very beginning getting documents from the White House."

"If it turns out we don't have everything, that will be a problem," he said. "We are looking into this, and we intend to ensure that we get all the documents relevant to our ongoing campaign finance investigation."

Keith Ausbrook, senior legal adviser to independent counsel Robert W. Ray, declined comment on

what actions — if any — his office has taken on the Hall accusations.

But lawyers familiar with the Ray probe, although not assigned to the independent counsel's office, said Mrs. Hall already had been contacted by investigators.

Mrs. Hall told The Times this week that White House officials failed to surrender the e-mail messages to the grand jury or the committees for a period covering August 1996 to November 1998.

Instead, she said, the White House listed the messages as "classified" documents to delay the probe into 2001 — after Mr. Clinton leaves office.

She said contractors working at the White House discovered a computer glitch in May 1998 showing that 100,000 White House e-mail messages involving nearly 500 computer users had not been turned over as part of a search to comply with subpoenas from the grand jury and the committees.

Mrs. Hall, who now heads computer operations at the Treasury Department, said the glitch was found when contractors Northrup Grumman Corp. traced a programming error on a White House server to August 1996.

The error involved e-mail messages to and from 464 White House computer users. The problem was fixed in November 1998, she said.

She said the missing messages were discovered when the contractors found that one of four White House Lotus Notes e-mail servers handling the mail for the 464 White House computer users had been mislabeled and that a search of e-mail under the subpoenas was incomplete.

Mrs. Hall said e-mail from that server was not properly managed for a two-year period — meaning the messages were not collected by the mainframe computer during the subpoena-record search.

She said when the contractors advised the White House of the problem, they were warned not to discuss it and told the documents had been classified.

"In fact," she said, "a White House official told one of the contractors they had a jail cell with his name on it if he discussed the matter."

Mrs. Hall said at least 4,000 of the e-mail messages involved or were related to Miss Lewinsky, the former White House intern with whom the president has admitted having an affair.

She said others concerned the White House's

receiving secret FBI files on former Reagan and Bush administration officials; information on the selection of corporate executives for overseas trade trips; and messages concerning campaign finance activities in the 1996 election.

Mrs. Hall, assigned to the White House in October 1992 from the Naval Sea Systems Command, left after being demoted for questioning the propriety of the administration's use of a database for political purposes.

She has filed a lawsuit in the case, accusing first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton and nine White House political appointees of job harassment and reprisals for her complaints.

The suit was filed in U.S. District Court in Washington by Judicial Watch, a public-interest law firm.

The White House e-mail had been sought under subpoena by a federal grand jury, the Senate Judiciary Committee, the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee and the House Government Reform Committee. The messages also were sought by Judicial Watch in separate pending suits involving Filegate and "Chinagate."

In her suit, Mrs. Hall said the first lady oversaw the political misuse of the White House Office Database (WHODB).

She said she was abused at Mrs. Clinton's behest after voicing objections to using career White House employees and the WHODB system for illegal political activities.

Cattlegate

Hillary=s Health Care

White House Lawyers Fined for Coverup

USAToday 12/19/97

A federal judge ruled Thursday that White House lawyers withheld a key fact about Hillary Rodham Clinton's health-care task force. He ordered the government to pay \$285,864. In a scathing opinion, U.S. District Judge Royce Lamberth said government lawyers and White House aide Ira Magaziner

provided a "dishonest explanation" of the composition of a working group to shield its records. Relying on the explanation, courts exempted the records from disclosure. Government lawyers never corrected the statement, conduct Lamberth called "most outrageous.@"

Magaziner Fallout

The Washington Times 7/9/98

When former White House health care policy director Ira Magaziner blamed lawyers for his misstatements to a federal judge in a lawsuit, he may have jeopardized the chance one of those attorneys had for advancement.

That is the situation former associate White House counsel Beth Nolan finds herself in.

Today, she is expected to be grilled about her role in the suit against first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton's health care task force when she goes before the Senate Judiciary Committee to seek confirmation as head of the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel.

"She's going to have a hard time," said a committee source.

Mr. Magaziner is the Clinton aide a federal judge accused of lying to protect the secret meetings of the first lady's health care group in 1993. The White House was fined \$285,000 in the case and is now appealing, as is Mr. Magaziner.

Billing-gate

Filegate

Tripp Among Names on New 'Filegate' FBI List

The Washington Times 7/20/98

Linda R. Tripp is among nearly 1,000 people whose secret FBI background files were obtained by the Clinton administration, according to new "Filegate" documents obtained by The Washington Times.

Mrs. Tripp and hundreds of other Bush and Reagan administration appointees -- including top CIA, Pentagon and National Security Agency officials -- were recently named for the first time by the FBI as people whose dossiers were turned over to former White House employees D. Craig Livingstone and Anthony B. Marceca. The new Filegate list, which contains more than twice as many names as were previously disclosed, also includes former FBI agent Gary Aldrich, whose book, "Unlimited Access," savaged lax security practices in the Clinton White House.

"It's outrageous," Mr. Aldrich said of his appearance on the list. **"This administration has had a pattern of intimidation of potential witnesses against them."**

Mr. Livingstone and Mr. Marceca, both longtime Democratic operatives, have been accused of improperly obtaining the FBI files in late 1993 and early 1994 to find dirt on Republican appointees. **Filegate victims are represented by Judicial Watch, a legal foundation that recently obtained the new, FBI-generated list through the discovery process in a \$90 million lawsuit against the administration.**

The most eye-catching new name on the list is Mrs. Tripp, the star witness in independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr's sex-and-lies investigation of President Clinton. The revelation that the White House obtained her secret FBI background file raises new questions about efforts by Clinton-friendly forces to discredit Mrs. Tripp in the Starr probe.

Like many Filegate targets, Mrs. Tripp was a "holdover" employee from the Bush administration. She was kept on by the Clinton administration because White House Counsel Bernard Nussbaum argued in June 1993 that Mrs. Tripp was the "substantive, savvy and experienced professional" he "desperately" needed as his executive assistant.

But Mrs. Tripp quickly found herself in possession of damaging information on several White House scandals including the suicide of Deputy White House Counsel Vincent J. Foster Jr. and Mr. Clinton's physical encounter with White House volunteer Kathleen E. Willey. At one point, according to New York literary agent Lucianne Goldberg, Mrs. Tripp even witnessed fellow employees copying FBI files into White House computers.

Administration officials became increasingly suspicious of Mrs. Tripp, who felt the Clinton White House lacked the decorum of the Bush White House. One year after agreeing to keep Mrs. Tripp on staff, Clinton officials asked the FBI for her background file.

According to the FBI, the file contained at least one letter and one memo, although the subject matters have not been disclosed. It may also have contained a copy of a security clearance form that Mrs. Tripp filled out in 1987, when she worked for the Defense Department, on which she asserted she had never been arrested.

According to Mr. Aldrich, who in 1994 was responsible for conducting FBI background checks on White House employees, Mrs. Tripp's file also may have contained information on a 1969 incident in which she was detained by police.

In August 1994, two months after her FBI file was obtained by the White House, Mrs. Tripp was transferred, against her wishes, to the Pentagon public affairs office. A few weeks later, Mr. Clinton appointed Wall Street Journal reporter Kenneth Bacon as the Pentagon's top spokesman, which meant he was also Mrs. Tripp's boss.

In January of this year, Mrs. Tripp gave Mr. Starr secretly recorded tapes of former White House intern Monica Lewinsky claiming that she had an affair with Mr. Clinton and that he had asked her to lie about it. As the scandal exploded, White House officials searched their files for "anything and everything" on Mrs. Tripp, according to Terry W. Good, director of White House records management.

In March, Mr. Bacon was asked by a reporter for New Yorker magazine whether Mrs. Tripp had asserted on her security clearance form that she had never been arrested. Mr. Bacon instructed his chief deputy to leak the information to the reporter, Jane Mayer, with whom Mr. Bacon had once worked at the Wall Street Journal.

Within days, the magazine published a story that revealed Mrs. Tripp's teen-age arrest and her denial of it 18 years later. Critics of Mrs. Tripp said the discrepancy undermined her credibility in the Lewinsky case.

Defense Secretary William S. Cohen called the Pentagon leak "certainly inappropriate, if not illegal," because Mrs. Tripp's files were "supposed to be protected by the privacy rules." Mr. Bacon apologized for not consulting the Privacy Act or lawyers for either Mrs. Tripp or the Pentagon before authorizing the disclosure.

The leak is under investigation by Mr. Starr and the Pentagon inspector general. Mr. Starr has also investigated aspects of the Filegate scandal, although it is not clear whether that investigation is active.

Other new names on the Filegate list include Adm. William O. Studeman, who was NSA director and deputy CIA director during the Bush administration; Adm. David E. Jeremiah, whom President Bush appointed as vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; John C. Whitehead, deputy secretary of state under Presidents Bush and Reagan; and Adm. Bobby Ray Inman, William Casey's top deputy at the CIA and a Clinton nominee for defense secretary before he withdrew from consideration.

Previously disclosed Filegate targets include James A. Baker III, secretary of state under Mr. Bush, and Reagan press secretary James Brady. Earlier lists also revealed the White House amassed files on people extremely close to Mr. Clinton, including his secretary, Betty Currie -- who is now a key witness in the Lewinsky probe -- and adviser James Carville, whose own compilation of files is frequently used to attack Clinton adversaries.

It is not clear why the new list omits some names that had been included in earlier lists, such as former Bush Press Secretary Marlin Fitzwater. It is also not clear whether the FBI will reveal even more names, pushing the list to more than 1,000 people.

Livingstone=s Visit to Clinton

Silicon Valley Logic July 9, 1998

April 28, 1998-- According to Secret Service logs, Bill Clinton had a rare meeting with Craig Livingstone, ex-White House security man and the keeper of the infamous "FBI files," on December 7, 1993. Incredibly, that meeting took place the very day after FBI logs show that Livingstone and his men first began to request the "unjustifiably obtained" FBI files!

FBI logs show that starting on December 6, 1993, "a series of 481 requests which bear the characteristics of a single alphabetical series" were sent from Livingstone's office in the White House, all with the notation "ACCESS," indicating that they were to be used to facilitate security clearances. This series of files is the same that was later found by the FBI to have been "improperly sought," and which contained confidential and personal information on many enemies of the Clinton

administration. White House entry logs show that Livingstone entered the residence the very next day, on Dec. 7, 1993, at 7:23 p.m. to meet with POTUS - the president.

The meeting on December 7th was one of only two face-to-face meetings on the record between Bill Clinton and Livingstone, who was later fired for his role in the FBI files controversy.

Complete details on the illegitimately-obtained FBI files can be found at this location on the FBI's web site. <http://www.fbi.gov/whthse/whreq.htm>

In a statement made on June 14, 1996, the FBI said, "We now know that many of these 481 requests, while facially valid, were without justification and served no official purpose. In recognition of this fact, the White House Counsel's Office has voluntarily surrendered to the FBI more than 400 folders containing FBI records since June 6, 1996." The FBI began its inquiry into the inappropriately-obtained files on June 5, 1996, at the instruction of FBI Director Louis J. Freeh, after he learned that the White House had, in December 1993, sought background information relating to Billy Ray Dale, several months after he had been fired from the White House travel office. Dale's file was one of those requested in the series that began on December 6, 1993, and ranged alphabetically from "A" to "G."

The White House was aware long before June, 1996 that its FBI file gathering operation was improper, quotes the FBI: "An employee of OPS had determined, over time, that these materials had been inappropriately gathered." But instead of admitting its mistake immediately, the White House archived these files for future use, and did not return them to the FBI until June 6, 1996, the day after Louis Freeh began his investigation into the matter.

President and Mrs. Clinton claimed not to have participated in the hiring of Livingstone, which is in direct conflict with statements from their own senior staff to FBI agents, who said Livingstone was brought on board at the White House with the first couple's consent..

Craig Livingstone's attorney recently boasted that his client was clear of potential prosecution, but it is likely that this latest revelation will make the future testimony of Mr. Livingstone of great interest to those investigating the FBI files matter. Ironically, the Clinton administration originally laid the blame for the FBI files mess on the Secret Service, which is currently standing in defense of Bill Clinton against Kenneth Starr.

Indonesiagate

Clinton denies swap for satellite

The Washington Times 5/18/98

President Clinton denied yesterday that satellite sales to China were influenced by campaign donations, but three top Senate Democrats said charges of illicit Chinese influence on the administration demand a thorough investigation.

Mr. Clinton made his comments yesterday in Birmingham, England, when asked about reports of

new evidence that the Chinese government funneled money to the Democratic Party in the 1996 elections.

"I can tell you that the decisions we made, we made because we thought they were in the interests of the American people," Mr. Clinton said, adding that if someone tried to influence those decisions, it should be investigated.

On "Fox News Sunday," Sen. Joseph R. Biden, Delaware Democrat, called for a full investigation: "It bothers me, quite frankly. ... This is serious stuff, and it should be pursued.

"If, in fact, there is any evidence that any political official ... anywhere in the administration ... knew that there was a correlation of quid pro quo, it should be ferreted out. The person should be indicted and put in jail, no matter who it is."

Two other Democrats who appeared on network news talk shows yesterday -- Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan of New York and Sen. Robert Kerrey of Nebraska -- also called for an investigation. In fact, on

ABC's "This Week" Mr. Moynihan renewed his request for an independent counsel to probe China's "attack on our political system."

Mr. Kerrey, ranking Democrat on the Senate Committee on Intelligence, said on "Meet the Press" that "troubling" reports that a Chinese military official donated money to the Democratic Party should be investigated.

California businessman Johnny Chung is said to have told the FBI the Chinese People's Liberation Army was the source of substantial campaign contributions to the Democratic Party in 1996.

According to published reports yesterday, the Justice Department has opened a preliminary investigation into whether political donations influenced Mr. Clinton's decision to approve the export of satellite technology of China.

The president's 1996 action allowed two space firms, Loral Space and Communications Inc. and Hughes Electronic Corp., to export satellites to be launched atop Chinese rockets.

Asked yesterday if he believes an independent counsel should investigate Mr. Clinton and Vice President Al Gore, Mr. Moynihan said, "In the context of those technology transfers and so forth."

At issue in the Justice Department probe is whether Mr. Clinton's decision was affected by \$600,000 in donations to the Democratic Party by Bernard L. Schwartz, chairman of Loral Space.

Communiongate

No Celebrity Guests at Holy Communion

The Washington Times 4/10/98

Give him an A for chutzpah. Only Bill Clinton would relegate Holy Communion to a photo-op. And now we know what Mike McCurry, who gets the A+ for chutzpah, wants to be when he grows up. He was auditioning for U.S. Theologian General with his lecture to Cardinal John O'Connor about the fine points of the doctrines of the church of Rome. His next pupil may be the pope.

When the cardinal, charged with defending the faith of his church, told his flock that a Protestant such as Mr. Clinton was not entitled to partake of Communion in a Catholic church -- Catholics believe that through a mystical phenomenon the wine and wafer become the actual blood and body of Christ, and must be preceded by confession -- most of us naturally assumed that Cardinal O'Connor knew what he was talking about.

You might think, then, that the White House would muster an explanation of how it happened, mumble an apology and promise not to let the president loose again at a Catholic altar. But nothing is sacred to this gang of adolescents, for whom the most exalted things are merely gimmicks that can be put to cheap political ends.

The president, a Southern Baptist, should know better, and probably does. Baptists do not usually partake of Communion, which they call "the Lord's supper," in churches of other denominations. These distinctions are merely trivial to those hostile or indifferent to religious faith and the forms and customs of the worship of the faithful. But they cannot be trivial to the men charged with instructing the faithful.

When Chris Matthews interviewed the Rev. Jerry Falwell for CNBC, he seemed incredulous at the very idea that the sacred should trump the profane. "You're saying," Chris asked, "... that if the president of the United States were to visit your church, be among your congregation on some extraordinary occasion, that you would bar him from communion?"

Mr. Falwell replied, as if explaining the immutability of the multiplication tables to a particularly thick third-grader: "The fact is he could not take communion in most, or certainly many Baptist churches. Certainly not in the one where I've been pastor for 42 years because of the fact that he's not willing to come forward, confess his sins and seek help. ... And not only our church: I can think of several thousand other leading Baptist churches in America whose pastors are former leaders and presidents of the Southern Baptist Convention." (This is rarely a problem because most people know enough to practice courtesy and discretion.) Politics is the art of compromise, but the church in its divisions is a bulwark against the compromise of the faith, or it is nothing. Not so long ago even atheists and infidels understood this.

Bill Clinton, who does not, has put the trappings of religious faith to tawdry political uses before. He hadn't seen the inside of a church in years when he lost his bid for re-election as governor of Arkansas in 1980, and when he attempted a comeback in 1982 he searched for the largest, most prominent congregation in the state.

What serendipity: The largest congregation was the Immanuel Baptist Church in Little Rock, and Immanuel was not only big and prominent, but the telecast of its Sunday-morning service was watched by a considerable portion of the population of Arkansas. And there was more good news:

The choir was seated directly behind the pulpit, and thus in full range of the camera throughout the pastor's 25-minute sermon. What better photo-op could there be but to become the First Choirboy of Arkansas?

And so it came to pass, and the governor, who couldn't necessarily croak a note on key, soon was seen singing lustily of amazing grace and the wondrous mystery of the Cross, every Sunday morning, always at the preacher's elbow. It was worth the votes to spare a man the inconvenience of a run-off. The governor, who had in fact been a Baptist Sunday school boy in his Hot Springs youth, could quote Scripture. He often salted his speeches with Biblical allusions, and later, when he became president of the United States and was stumped for a verse, he could make one up. A little learning, as the man who blew his chance to be a Rhodes scholar was fond of demonstrating, could indeed be a dangerous thing.

Only God knows what resides in the secret places of the heart, of course, but the cardinal is entitled to defend the doctrines of his church --without Official Review by the Theologian General -- and the rest of us are entitled to make what we will of Mr. Clinton's shabby use of one of the most solemn rituals of the Christian faith.

He acted as if he were the celebrity guest at a campaign fund-raiser. But, to be fair, he stopped short of asking the priest ("No! No! Mr. President, that's a priest, not a waiter!") for white wine and a spot of brie on the wafer.

White House Legal Office Balloons to 34 Staffers

The Washington Times 3/11/98

The White House counsel's office has swollen to become the largest and most expensive West Wing legal operation in history. Initially a four-person office in early 1993, President Clinton's legal shop has grown to 34 lawyers, paralegals and researchers at a cost to taxpayers of \$2.36 million in salaries annually, according to internal administration budget papers.

In addition, the payroll list shows that the White House has borrowed 12 lawyers from other agencies to help out, most of whom earn \$73,000 or more.

Are Tax Dollars Funding Clinton Defense Schemes?

The Washington Times March 9, 1998

Congressional appropriators are scrutinizing the White House scandal-fighting team to see whether the administration is misusing taxpayer dollars to defend President Clinton and discredit independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr.

"There's a whole question of what taxpayer money is being used for these efforts," says a spokeswoman for Rep. Robert L. Livingston, Louisiana Republican and chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.

The panel's subcommittee charged with overseeing the White House budget will question Clinton aides this week on how much time and money is being diverted to defending the president's personal

affairs and fighting the Whitewater and Lewinsky scandals.

It is also expected to push for a General Accounting Office audit of the administration's spending of public dollars on the Clinton defense effort. But the White House says it has a strong defense: It is merely responding to the crush of media queries about the scandals and the necessity of White House employees to find adequate lawyers.

Former President Bush's chief counsel, C. Boyden Gray, says the Bush White House never provided legal referrals or debriefed attorneys for witnesses, such as those who may have discussed the Iran-Contra issue. "I don't think it's legitimate. I don't think it is fair for the taxpayer to pay for private legal work," says Mr. Gray.

He says the White House legal office had eight staffers under Mr. Bush, compared with 32 staffers and 12 lawyers borrowed from other federal agencies under Mr. Clinton.

A House Appropriations Committee aide says members want to determine how much money he spent collecting articles about Mr. Starr and Clinton critics and also if he or other Clinton aides ever verified the information in those articles and other items -- some of which wrongly suggested that one of Mr. Starr's deputies is a homosexual.

"What's appalling is the suggestion that the type of stuff that this team has been looking into includes attacks such as if somebody is gay," says a congressional official.

Congressional officials say they want to look at three branches of the White House -- Mr. Ruff's office, the scandal response team headed by Jim Kennedy and special counsel Lanny A. Breuer, and Mr. Blumenthal's operation.

Whitewatergate

Susan McDougal's Decision to Keep Quiet

The Washington Times 4/24/98

In August 1996, Susan McDougal appeared ready to talk to ABC about Bill Clinton's role, if any, in an illegal loan related to Whitewater. But then something happened, and she went to jail rather than open her mouth at all.

So writes Chris Vlasto, an investigative reporter at ABC News who pursued Mrs. McDougal for three years before she agreed to be interviewed by Diane Sawyer. And in an off-the-record pre-interview at the hotel bar the night before, Mrs. McDougal promised to answer all of the network's questions. But the next day her brother, Bill Henley, and her fiance, Pat Harris, showed up and everything changed, Mr. Vlasto writes in the Wall Street Journal.

Mrs. Sawyer: Did Mr. Clinton know anything about your loan?

Mrs. McDougal: That's probably something that my attorney would not want me to talk about. [To

Mr. Henley and Mr. Harris: I hate that, guys!] God, I hate this, Diane! Sorry!

Mrs. Sawyer: Did he?

Mrs. McDougal: Jeez, I hate that though!

Mr. Henley: That's the only answer you have.

Mrs. McDougal: That's the only answer I have.

Her fiance told Mr. Vlasto that Mrs. McDougal "had to save something for the prosecutors." Five days later, she was cited for contempt of court for refusing to answer any questions from independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr.

All of this puzzled Mr. Vlasto, who recalled that back in 1994, Mrs. McDougal told him: "I know where all the bodies are buried."

Whitewater Prosecutors Split Over Charging Hillary

The Washington Times April 20, 1998

Whitewater prosecutors have written at least one draft indictment of Hillary Rodham Clinton, but they remain divided over whether to charge the first lady with lying about legal work she did for a failed Arkansas real estate project.

Lawyers and others close to the Whitewater probe said the draft became "a work in progress" after Mrs. Clinton's January 1996 grand jury appearance, when prosecutors concluded she made false statements under oath in denying doing legal work for the 1,050-acre Castle Grande venture.

Sources said prosecutors remain divided over how to proceed in the case.

Some believe Mrs. Clinton should be indicted for false statements she made to the grand jury and to federal banking regulators at the Resolution Trust Corp. and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. about her Castle Grande work. They also think she and White House officials tried to cover up her involvement in the venture.

Others, while not convinced she was telling the truth, have said inconsistencies in Mrs. Clinton's sworn statements should be addressed in reports independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr will deliver to the federal appeals court and Congress.

"There is concern among some about how successful they might be in bringing a criminal indictment against Mrs. Clinton for obvious reasons, but there is no lack of desire to do so," said one lawyer familiar with the probe. "The requirements here are greater than just dotting the i's and crossing the t's."

Any indictment decision, the sources said, will be made by Mr. Starr in consultation with his top deputies and will hinge on two major points: whether there is sufficient evidence to contradict her sworn testimony, and whether prosecutors can win the case in court.

"No one wants to bring the case to court and lose," said a second lawyer also familiar with the probe.

Prosecutors, however, are convinced that it is Mrs. Clinton's own words that continue to fuel the controversy.

For example, the sources said, Mrs. Clinton said in sworn statements to the RTC and the FDIC that she did limited legal work for Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan Association, which helped bankroll the Castle Grande project, and did little or no work for Castle Grande. She told the same story to Whitewater prosecutors at a July 1995 White House deposition and is believed to have repeated the tale six months later to the grand jury.

But prosecutors say a review of the records shows that sworn statements by Mrs. Clinton are contradictory and misleading. The sources said her involvement with the failed project was only fully detailed with the discovery of Rose Law Firm billing records in the White House living quarters in January 1996, two years after they had been subpoenaed by Mr. Starr.

A week before the billing records were found, the RTC said in a Dec. 28, 1995, report it had little information on Mrs. Clinton's ties to Madison or Castle Grande. After the records' discovery, the RTC concluded Mrs. Clinton was more involved with the two entities than was previously known.

The records show Mrs. Clinton billed Madison for 60 hours of legal work; spoke with Madison officials about Castle Grande project on 14 occasions; discussed legal matters with Madison's owners, James or Susan McDougal, 16 times; had 28 meetings with Rose firm lawyers on Madison; and met with state regulators about Madison at least twice.

A major area of concern, the sources said, is an option agreement regulators said "facilitated" a questionable \$300,000 payment to Seth Ward, the Madison official to whom the first lady spoke about Castle Grande. The agreement was written by Mrs. Clinton and her Rose firm partner, Webster L. Hubbell.

The transfer guaranteed Mr. Ward a payoff and negated his liability in the project. While the option was never exercised, it disguised the reason for the payment and created a paper trail to justify the outlay to Mr. Ward, who is Mr. Hubbell's father-in-law.

Prosecutors have focused on Mrs. Clinton's billings between February and May 1986 for legal conferences involving the option's approval and the Ward payoff, the sources said.

Mrs. Clinton told the RTC in May 1995 she had no memory of providing legal services for Mr. Ward and said in a sworn statement she did not know the Castle Grande name, believing the project was called IDC -- after the property's former owner -- even though the Castle Grande name was widely associated with the site.

Former RTC lawyer Patricia Black, now associate inspector general at the FDIC, told the Senate Whitewater Committee in 1996 it was "quite likely" she would have tried to question Mrs. Clinton as part of the Madison inquiry had she known of the billing records.

She said Mrs. Clinton's legal work on the option would have been of interest because Mr. Ward, as a Madison employee, was part of "insider deals that resulted in a substantial loss to the institution."

Madison was closed in 1989 at a cost to taxpayers of \$50 million.

The sources said prosecutors recently re-interviewed H. Don Denton, the chief lending officer at Madison. Mr. Denton, who testified before the Whitewater grand jury, told regulators that during the spring of 1986, he cautioned Mrs. Clinton about Castle Grande and she dismissed his advice.

Prosecutors, the sources said, also have questioned Mr. Denton about Mrs. Clinton's role in back-dating the Ward option. They said the option, dated Sept. 24, 1985, may have been rewritten in the spring of 1986 to increase the payment to Mr. Ward from about \$75,000 to \$300,000.

The sources said prosecutors also have focused on the destruction of records describing Mrs. Clinton's ties to Castle Grande as regulators closed in on Madison in 1988. They said the documents disappeared just before the Federal Home Loan Bank Board audited the thrift and were destroyed in what is believed to have been part of a plan to protect the Clintons from media scrutiny.

James McDougal, who died March 8 in a Texas prison, told prosecutors that Madison's records were moved to a small warehouse just before the audit.

Mrs. Clinton admitted taking part in a 1988 Rose firm "housekeeping effort" that included the destruction of her Madison and Castle Grande files.

It is not clear why Mrs. Clinton destroyed the records, since litigation concerning Castle Grande and Mr. Ward began that same year and continued through 1990.

Hubbell Associate Summoned to Whitewater Grand Jury

USA Today 04/04/97

President Clinton said Thursday that two top aides were acting "just out of human compassion" in making calls trying to line up work for Webster Hubbell when he left the administration under a cloud in 1994.

As the president defended his associates, a Little Rock grand jury investigating payments made to Hubbell summoned a businessman who had hired the former associate attorney general at the request of Clinton friends. The grand jury also heard testimony from James McDougal, the convicted former business partner of Clinton.

The White House acknowledged earlier this week that chief of staff Erskine Bowles and his predecessor, Mack McLarty, helped Hubbell after he resigned as associate attorney general amid an investigation of charges that he defrauded former law partners and clients.

Hubbell was later convicted and spent 18 months in prison.

Investigators are trying to determine whether the White House arranged financial help for Hubbell to discourage him from cooperating in the Whitewater probe.

At a picture-taking session, Clinton said he saw nothing wrong with the calls made by Bowles and

McLarty.

"I do not believe they were improper," the president said. "From what I know about them they were just - they were people who were genuinely concerned that there was a man who was out of work, who had four children.

"And as I understand it," the president said, "they were trying to help him for no other reason than just out of human compassion."

He reminded reporters of what he called a "critical fact" in the story: "At the time that was done, no one had any idea about what the nature of the allegations were against Mr. Hubbell or whether they were true. Everybody thought there was some sort of billing dispute with his law firm and that's all anybody knew about it so, no, I do not think they did anything improper."

After leaving the White House, Hubbell received about \$100,000 from the Lippo Group, an Indonesian company that has been at the center of investigations into whether foreign money was funneled to Democratic campaigns.

White House press secretary Mike McCurry said the president "is not in a position to render a judgment about what Mr. Hubbell did or did not do when he had been retained by the Lippo Group. It's not his position to judge what was then a private citizen in his own pursuit of gainful employment. I mean, he doesn't render an opinion on something like that."

In Arkansas, Bernard Rapoport of Waco, Texas, spent two hours testifying before the grand jury. "I just told them the truth, and I don't know anything. That's what I told them," he told reporters.

The White House acknowledged Wednesday that McLarty was part of an effort to ask Rapoport to hire Hubbell.

Rapoport paid Hubbell \$18,000 in 1994 at the suggestion of Texarkana, Texas, oilman Truman Arnold, who hired Hubbell after getting a call from McLarty. After Hubbell went to prison in 1995 for tax evasion and mail fraud, Rapoport contributed \$5,000 to an education fund for Hubbell's children.

Courthouse sources who spoke on condition of anonymity said McDougal appeared before the panel. The sources provided no further details.

McDougal, who ran the Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan at the center of the Whitewater investigation, was convicted of 18 felonies. He faces sentencing April 14.

House investigators, meanwhile, issued 17 subpoenas for documents from companies and individuals who hired Hubbell after he left the Justice Department. Among those subpoenaed were Rapoport; his Texas insurance company; and Arnold, as well as Time Warner, Sprint, Pacific Telesis and other companies that retained Hubbell, said a Republican source familiar with the inquiry.

The House Government Reform and Oversight Committee also sought information from Washington attorney John Philips, who arranged to hire Hubbell, said the source, who spoke on condition of

anonymity.

The panel is seeking information about the services that Hubbell performed for the companies and what he was paid.

Among those subpoenaed was New York lawyer Susan Thomases, once a confidant of first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton, the source said. Thomases is being ordered to produce documents that have anything to do with Hubbell's employment by Lippo Group.

The panel also issued subpoenas for financial records of the Clinton Birthplace Foundation to determine the extent of donations by Asian business interests, the source said.

Starr Investigates Hubbell

USAToday 3/12/98

Webster Hubbell, the former Justice Department official and law partner of Hillary Rodham Clinton, expects to face new criminal tax charges in the Whitewater investigation, individuals familiar with his plight said Wednesday.

Hubbell pleaded guilty in 1994 to tax evasion and mail fraud for stealing from his former Arkansas law firm and its clients. He agreed to cooperate with the Whitewater probe.

Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr's office has been investigating Hubbell's taxes again as part of a broader investigation into hundreds of thousands of dollars Hubbell received in consulting fees in 1994.

The money came from jobs that a group of President Clinton's friends helped arrange for Hubbell in 1994 after he resigned as Clinton's associate attorney general and was under investigation by Whitewater prosecutors.

Starr, investigating possible obstruction of justice, wants to determine whether those payments were designed to influence Hubbell's cooperation. Investigators have expressed frustration at Hubbell's inability to recall key dealings involving the Clintons. Hubbell and the president have both denied there was any effort to buy Hubbell's silence.

Individuals familiar with Hubbell's plight, speaking only on condition of anonymity, said the former Arkansas lawyer expects to be indicted on new tax charges related to the financial assistance.

McDougal Sentenced to 3 Years for Whitewater Role

LITTLE ROCK, Ark. - A federal judge Monday sentenced James McDougal to three years in prison for 18 felonies, after Whitewater prosecutors said that President and Mrs. Clinton's former business partner has "truthfully and substantially aided" their investigation.

McDougal had faced a maximum of 84 years in prison.

U.S. District Judge George Howard also ordered McDougal to pay a \$10,000 fine, pay \$4.27 million

in restitution to the federal government and serve three years of probation, including one year of house arrest.

With little money and no friends left in the Clinton camp, McDougal finds himself in a situation markedly different from that of Whitewater witness Webster Hubbell.

Hubbell benefited from a White House-inspired effort to find him employment after he resigned as associate attorney general in 1994 during a billing dispute involving the Little Rock law firm where he had been a partner with Mrs. Clinton. He later pleaded guilty to criminal charges in that case and served a prison term.

Now prosecutors are investigating whether the White House discouraged Hubbell's cooperation by arranging for people to hire him. Hubbell and administration officials deny any payoff was involved.

McDougal, Clintons: Who told the truth?

USAToday 3/9/98

Of all the problems Kenneth Starr's Whitewater investigation has faced, James' McDougal's death may be the most difficult to overcome. A former friend and partner of President Clinton and first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton, McDougal became their principal and potentially most knowledgeable accuser.

It took Whitewater prosecutors 22 years to win McDougal's cooperation. It came only after they convicted him of **18 felonies**. Once he started talking, he gave prosecutors details of two real estate developments - Whitewater and Castle Grande - that have been at the center of the criminal investigation since it began in 1994.

Left unanswered at his death was who was telling the truth, McDougal or the Clintons.

Why did he turn against the president? McDougal was once asked. **AI just got sick and tired of lying for the fellow,**@ was McDougal's memorable reply.

The Whitewater Connection

Dateline NBC

At time of his death, Foster was one of the Clintons' key advisors Whitewater. He represented them when they sold their stake in Whitewater in 1992 and was overseeing preparation of tax returns relating to the sale. Among the documents in Foster's office at the time of his death was a Whitewater file with a note that said: Whitewater is a "can of worms you shouldn't open." The note raised speculation about improprieties in the Whitewater investment.

White House Ordered to Hand Over Whitewater Notes

USA Today 06/23/97

The Supreme Court Monday refused to free White House lawyers from having to turn over notes of their conversations with Hillary Rodham Clinton to Whitewater prosecutors.

The court, without comment, rejected the White House's argument that the notes are protected by attorney-client privilege.

That means the notes must be surrendered to a federal grand jury in Little Rock, Ark.

The action is a victory for Whitewater prosecutor Kenneth Starr, who had urged the high court not to review the case, saying it "would delay a highly sensitive criminal investigation." According to court papers, he has said Mrs. Clinton is a "central figure" in his investigation.

Travelgate

Travelgate may Figure in Impeachment

Detroit News 10/5/98

WASHINGTON C By the time Congress completes its inquiry into Bill Clinton=s impeachability, you=re likely to hear a lot about Billy Ray Dale.

Dale ran the White House Travel Office for eight years C until May 20, 1993. On that fateful day, he and his staff were herded into a room, fired and given an hour to clear out. Dale says the White House Awas a family@ when he arrived in 1961. (He was once even Caroline Kennedy=s Santa.) More than 31 years later, he was stuffed in a seatless van and hauled away.

Dale didn=t know it, but he was about to become a poster boy for the abuse of presidential power.

Hours after the putsch, then-White House lawyer William Kennedy III demanded that the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) mount a criminal inquiry, claiming he was acting on Athe highest authority.@

The G-men dutifully cooked up a set of charges against Dale: embezzlement, kickbacks, cooking accounting ledgers and living beyond his means. Hollywood producer Harry Thomason predicted a public-relations bonanza: AThis is going to be a great story C Bill Clinton cleaning up the White House!@

Instead, the administration got a black eye. Reporters knew Dale and trusted him. He had handled their flight arrangements on presidential trips for years.

Furthermore, the facts didn=t add up. The books weren=t a mess, as the FBI claimed: Dale had used an accounting system created by the White House computer office. Under normal circumstances, he and his staff could lay hands on any financial document within 10 minutes.

But they had been set up. Catherine Cornelius, a distant cousin of the president, had been dispatched to spy on the department C and possibly to help the aforementioned Thomason grab some of the lucrative White House air-charter business.

Cornelius swiped some records, copied and misplaced others, and generally made a mess of things. When an auditor from Peat Marwick swooped in and asked Dale to produce some paperwork, the files in question were missing. Says Dale, "He determined from that incident that we had sloppy record keeping."

The FBI redoubled its efforts to find dirt on Dale. It scoured his bank records and financial data. Agents fanned out across the country. They asked a woman in Dallas if she was Dale's mistress, since he had given her a \$1,500 check. She was his sister. "I had a brother who died," Dale explains. "I repaid money he had borrowed from her years before."

FBI agents accosted his daughter after she returned from her honeymoon. They interrogated her for eight hours, repeatedly reducing her to tears. They asked who attended her wedding C any reporters? Any Republicans? What did they talk about at the reception? How did she pay for her honeymoon?

Another daughter got a slightly milder grilling. Ditto for his son, who arrived home from a business trip one evening at midnight C only to find a G-man parked in his driveway, clutching a subpoena.

The nightmare lasted 30 months C and a jury threw out the case in just 20 minutes.

"After all that time," Dale says, "the FBI could find not one person that I had done business with or had associated with who could testify against me. That gave me a good feeling."

But his tribulations weren't over. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) put him through an audit that lasted three years. Guess what it found: He had overpaid.

Outraged Republicans in the House of Representatives voted to cover Dale's legal bills. But then-Sen. David Pryor of Arkansas, a Democrat, put a hold on the measure, effectively killing it. (Pryor now heads Bill Clinton's legal-defense fund.) Dale got his money only because of some astute parliamentary maneuvering by Sen. Orrin Hatch, R-Utah.

And now, Dale is far more dangerous than Monica Lewinsky. Consider a couple of comparisons based on his case.

Richard Nixon: He asked the IRS to go after political enemies. The agency refused and audited him instead.

Clinton: The IRS not only went after Dale. It also audited Paula Jones and more than a dozen prominent conservative organizations.

Nixon: He asked the FBI to snoop on some of his enemies. It refused.

Clinton: The FBI went after Dale C and turned his file over to the White House months after Dale's ouster.

Most poignant is the difference between Dale and Bill Clinton's well-paid thugs. When asked why he hadn't tried to cash in on his experience, Dale explains: "There are people who have told me that

you=ve got to tell dirt on people in order to write a book and get it to sell. ... The people I know stuff about? I just don=t want to talk about it.

ABut I see people on television defending the president, and I know things about them. I know what their credibility is for me. I=ve had to cover for them. And it just burns me up.@

High Court will Hear Appeal on Foster Notes

The Washington Times March 31, 1998

The Whitewater investigation of Hillary Rodham Clinton's role in the White House travel office firings ran into a delay yesterday as the Supreme Court agreed to hear an appeal from the attorney for the late Vincent W. Foster Jr.

James Hamilton says notes he took of a conversation with Mr. Foster, who was deputy White House counsel when he died in 1993, should remain confidential.

Whitewater prosecutors argue they are entitled to the notes because Mr. Foster, had he lived, would have been an important witness in the investigation of whether White House aides lied to conceal a role by Mrs. Clinton in the purge of the travel office.

Mrs. Clinton denies having a role in the dismissals, but a memo belatedly turned over to Whitewater investigators in 1996 says she was behind the firings and that Mr. Foster was instrumental in carrying out her instructions on the matter.

In the probe of a purported presidential affair and cover-up, President Clinton is invoking executive privilege in an attempt to protect the confidentiality of conversations involving some aides and Mrs. Clinton. The issue still is in U.S. District Court in Washington.

Ethics review ordered on Clinton
USAToday 1/28/2000

LITTLE ROCK, Ark. - The Arkansas Supreme Court on Thursday ordered its professional conduct committee to investigate complaints that President Clinton lied and obstructed justice in the Paula Jones sexual harassment case. The committee has authority to suspend the Clinton's law license or recommend he be disbarred if it rules against him. Two complaints were filed. The first came from an Arkansas lawyer on behalf of the Atlanta-based Southeastern Legal Foundation. U.S. District Judge Susan Webber Wright subsequently filed a complaint after she found Clinton in contempt of court during the Jones case. The White House had no comment.

Clinton Cabinet

Hazel O=Leary Leaks Secrets

The Fox News Channel's Carl Cameron revealed on Tuesday's Special Report with Brit Hume, aired at 6pm ET/9pm PT, that former Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary may have personally leaked secret

nuclear weapons info to U.S. News back in 1995. He also uniquely (compare to news agendas outlined in #1 above) picked up on how the Clinton administration plans to loosen export rules for super-computers.

An hour later on the Fox Report the network's Bill O'Reilly previewed how on his show that night at 8pm ET he would discuss with Congressman Curt Weldon the U.S. News leak as well as how O'Leary "gutted" security. O'Reilly cited her decision to make badges for all security levels look alike and how she allowed the security contractor at Rocky Flats, Kaiser Hill LLC, to cut the number of guards by 40 percent while still getting the same payments from Energy. When O'Leary left Energy, O'Reilly revealed, she went to work for that same security company -- Kaiser Hill LLC.

At the top of his show O'Reilly relayed what all CyberAlert readers know: "You may have noticed that the Chinese espionage story is not being covered all that much by TV news."

FNC is the exception with Carl Cameron its lead reporter. On the June 8 Special Report with Brit Hume he opened his story by showing Attorney General Janet Reno and FBI Director Louie Freeh leaving a closed congressional hearing on how they handled Chinagate. Leading into a soundbite from Senator Orrin Hatch, Cameron observed that Republicans are worried that "law enforcement is trying to cover up a botched investigation." Cameron then allowed Senator Patrick Leahy to remind viewers that Reagan and Bush share the blame with Clinton so the situation should not be turned "into some kind of a partisan football."

Cameron then got to the fresh information: "But now come allegations that former Clinton administration Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary leaked classified nuclear weapons information personally in 1995 to U.S. News & World Report. After the magazine published this [on screen: picture of diagram run in the magazine] classified design information on the W-87 warhead, an investigation began to find the leak. Sources say DOE brass abruptly canceled the probe to prevent O'Leary embarrassment. Lawmakers now want that suspected cover up investigated."

Congressman Curt Weldon on the House floor: "Who did the investigation and who did they find out leaked this particular diagram to U.S. News & World Report in 1995. It wasn't the Reagan administration Mr. Speaker and it wasn't the Bush administration. It was this administration."

Cameron: "The Clinton administration was also singled out for harsh bipartisan criticism in the congressional Cox Report for selling so-called dual-use technology, like super-computers to China, despite evidence that China used them illegally for weapons development. Now just two weeks after that report, new indications that the White House and the Commerce Department want to export more super computers to an additional 100 countries. Some lawmakers think that despite the Cox Report criticism, priorities at the White House remain reversed."

Senator Trent Lott: "There is something that trumps trade and commerce and that is our own national security."

Cameron ended by reporting that late in the afternoon Lott called committee chairs to his office to talk China scandal strategy. National Security Adviser Sandy Berger, Cameron noted, has been called to testify by the Senate Intelligence Committee and if he refuses he could be subpoenaed or Republican leaders may demand his resignation.

+++ See the leaked diagram in a hunk of the Cameron story which MRC Webmaster Sean Henry will post Wednesday morning in RealPlayer format. Go to: <http://www.mrc.org>

Cameron's piece reminded me of an April 9 front page investigation in Investor's Business Daily titled, "The Folly of *Denuclearization': Los Alamos Leaks Point To Test Ban Treaty Flaws." IBD's Paul Sperry revealed: "As part of the Clinton administration's so-called denuclearization goal, lab directors were actually prodded by former Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary and her senior staffers -- many of whom were anti-nuclear activists B to open their doors to visitors from other nuclear states and share otherwise classified information."

To read an extensive excerpt, go to the April 13 CyberAlert: <http://www.mediaresearch.org/news/cyberalert/1999/cyb19990413.html#4>

Cameron also referred to Clinton plans to loosen export restrictions for computers. The Los Angeles Times ran the story on Tuesday. Under the headline of "Easing Expected for Computer Export Rules," reporter Peter Gosselin opened his June 8 piece: The Clinton administration is preparing to loosen government controls on the sale of powerful computers to more than 100 countries only two weeks after a congressional committee charged it with carelessly permitting sales to China.

The Commerce Department has proposed easing restrictions on sales to most countries in Asia, Africa, Latin America and Central and Eastern Europe, administration sources said Monday. In addition, virtually all restrictions are likely to be lifted on sales to Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, which recently became members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

In a move that seems certain to anger U.S. computer makers, however, the administration will not ease restrictions on China and almost 50 other countries....

Administration officials, who spoke only on condition of anonymity, said that the White House has yet to settle on how much to loosen controls on sales to Asia and other regions but that it generally agrees with industry claims that current restrictions have been overtaken by technological advances.

The government regulates the overseas sale of computers based on their speed, which it measures according to how many millions of theoretical operations they can perform in a second. To sell to the countries for which the administration is preparing to ease restrictions, computer makers must obtain government licenses for any machine that can perform more than 10,000 such operations per second. The industry wants the limit tripled to 30,000.

The administration's plans to ease some export controls are almost certain to be viewed as a slap at the Cox committee's findings that China has obtained U.S.-made computers powerful enough to be useful for weapons design and other military purposes.

Although Cox has said in the wake of the panel's report that he still favors computer sales to emerging nations, including China, the report found that China acquired some of its advanced computers through third-party nations that resold American machines, something likely to become

more frequent if restrictions are eased and sales to these nations grow.

Inside Politics

News and political dispatches from
around the nation

By Greg Pierce

THE WASHINGTON TIMES

Dee Dee, too

First it was former presidential adviser George Stephanopoulos who questioned President Clinton's fitness for office. Then former White House Press Secretary Michael McCurry said Chelsea Clinton was more level-headed than her parents. Now Mr. Clinton's first spokeswoman has joined the chorus of criticism.

Dee Dee Myers, in an appearance Monday on CNBC's "Hardball With Chris Matthews," was asked whether she would have gone to work for Mr. Clinton had she known more about him.

"If I had it to do over again, knowing what I know now, of course not," Mrs. Myers replied. "But you don't have the benefit of hindsight when you're making those decisions."

No place like home

Arkansas state Rep. Sandra Rodgers was in tears yesterday when she ran from the House chamber in Little Rock. Her fellow legislators had just rejected her request for \$500,000 to be put toward converting President Clinton's boyhood home into a museum.

Many representatives who voted against the bill said it had nothing to do with Mr. Clinton, but with the source of the money. The project would have been funded immediately, instead of having to compete later with scores of other local projects.

Miss Rodgers took it personally, though. "If they want President Clinton to know that they don't support him, that's fine with me. I'll try to convey that message for him," she told

the Associated Press, her voice breaking. "I'm just really mad

Mike McCurry isn't a member of the Cabinet but he is a major face in the White House. Here are some of his quotes.

Described his job as Atelling the truth slowly.@

Responded after the New Yourk Times=s William Safire called the first lade a Acongenital liar@:
AThe president, if he were not the president, would have delivered a more forceful response to that on the bridge of Mr. Safires=s nose.@

AI was a kid in the 1970's. You know, did I smoke a joint from time to time? Of course I did.@
This is clearly telling kids that it is acceptable to try drugs.

Bad Faith

The Washington Times 7/27/98

Attorney General Janet Reno clearly is not acting in good faith in refusing to seek an independent counsel to probe campaign finance abuses in the re-election campaign of President Clinton, the Wall Street Journal says.

And that makes the newspaper wonder if her Justice Department is acting in bad faith on a number of other cases, including one involving independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr.

"To begin, it is hard to believe that this department could be trusted, in the matter of investigating alleged leaks from Mr. Starr's office, with rummaging through the independent counsel's most sensitive documents with no possibility of that material finding its way to the White House," the newspaper said in an editorial.

"Has the department's investigation of the Teamsters been tanked? Has Ms. Reno impeded the work of Espy Independent Counsel Donald Smaltz, as he charged two months ago? What explanation is there for the department's failure to comply with the Vacancies Act, drawing the wrath of even Democratic Sen. Robert Byrd? Why have the Internal Revenue Service's two requests for an investigation of Illinois Senator Carol Moseley-Braun's egregious fund-raising practices elicited no response at Justice?"

Interior Decorators

The Washington Times 6/4/98

"In honor of the accomplishments of Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual individuals, I call upon all managers, supervisors and employees to observe this month with appropriate ceremonies, activities and/or programs that raise the awareness of Gay and Lesbian individuals."

--Memo issued this week to every employee of the Department of Interior, under the watch of Secretary Bruce Babbitt.

Outside counsel to probe Labor Secretary Herman

The Washington Times 5/12/98

Attorney General Janet Reno asked a federal appeals court yesterday to name an independent counsel to investigate accusations of influence peddling against Labor Secretary Alexis Herman and determine whether she solicited \$250,000 in illegal campaign contributions.

The request before a three-judge panel of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in Washington followed a five-month preliminary probe in which Justice Department lawyers were divided on whether an outside counsel was warranted.

Miss Herman will be the seventh high-ranking Clinton administration official to be investigated by an independent counsel over suspected criminal behavior.

Miss Reno said that while her department's preliminary inquiry "developed no evidence clearly demonstrating Secretary Herman's involvement in these matters," a further probe is called for. She noted that "a great deal" of the charges by Miss Herman's chief accuser, Laurent Yene, had been "corroborated, though none of it clearly inculpates Herman."

Mr. Yene also told investigators that Miss Herman, when she was a White House assistant to President Clinton, directed her longtime friend Vanessa Weaver to solicit campaign contributions to the Democratic National Committee --including donations from a foreign national barred from contributing to U.S. campaigns.

Espy's Former Chief of Staff Sentenced to 27 Months

Washington Post March 19, 1998

The top aide to former agriculture secretary Mike Espy was sentenced yesterday to a 27-month prison term for lying about \$22,000 he received from two Mississippi individuals who obtained large government farming subsidies.

The sentence for Ronald H. Blackley, 47, Espy's former chief of staff, was the longest sentence to date in an independent counsel's investigation of Espy's dealings. Espy is awaiting trial on charges that he actively solicited \$35,458 worth of gifts from companies he was supposed to be regulating.

Tyson VP, lobbyist charged in Espy probe

USA Today 1/16/98

The federal government filed a **15-count indictment** against a Tyson Foods vice president and the firm's top lobbyist Thursday for giving illegal gifts to former Agriculture Secretary Mike Espy. Archibald L. Schaffer III, the Tyson executive, and lobbyist Jack L. Williams were indicted on wire fraud, mail fraud, giving \$12,000 in gratuities to Espy and making false statements about the gifts. Tyson Foods pleaded guilty in December for giving the gifts and agreed Monday to pay a \$4 million fine plus \$2 million toward the costs of Independent Counsel Donald Smaltz's investigation.

Cisneros' former mistress pleads guilty

USA Today 1/16/98

LUBBOCK, Texas - Linda Jones, the former mistress of ex-Housing Secretary Henry Cisneros, tearfully pleaded guilty Thursday to 28 charges connected to a federal investigation into his hush-money payments to her.

The deal calls for her to spend 31/2 years in a federal prison, but can be voided if she does not cooperate with prosecutors.

Cisneros indicted on 18 counts

Former Housing Secretary Henry Cisneros was indicted Thursday on 18 felony counts of conspiracy, obstructing justice and making false statements to the FBI about payments to a former mistress.

Three other people, including the former mistress, were also charged in the 21-count indictment brought by Independent Counsel David M. Barrett in U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

Barrett alleged that Cisneros made the false statements to FBI agents conducting a background investigation when he was nominated to President Clinton's Cabinet in 1993. Cisneros allegedly lied about the size and nature of his payments to former mistress Linda Jones.

The **66-page indictment** issued Thursday also referred to an unspecified number of other extramarital relationships Cisneros allegedly lied about.

Cisneros is also the subject of a separate IRS investigation.

In September, Ms. Jones was indicted on **26 counts** of conspiracy, bank fraud, money laundering and obstruction of justice. Also in September, her sister, Patsy J. Wooten, and brother-in-law, Allen R. Wooten, were indicted on 18 related charges.

Herman denies corruption allegations

WASHINGTON - President Clinton came to the defense of Labor Secretary Alexis Hermanon Thursday, a day after the disclosure she is being investigated about allegations of corruption in office. "I don't believe that for a minute," the president said of the alleged influence peddling.

Herman is the second member of Clinton's current Cabinet under Justice Department scrutiny, law enforcement officials say.

The allegations concern the sale of Herman's influence while she was a White House aide during 1994-96, including helping someone obtain a Federal Communications Commission license for a satellite telephone system, according to ABC News, which first reported the story.

Babbitt case to get restricted probe

The Washington Times 2/12/98

Attorney General Janet Reno will seek the appointment of an independent counsel to investigate accusations that Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt lied to a Senate committee about his role in denying an Indian casino license. Miss Reno called yesterday for the investigation to be limited to whether Mr. Babbitt's testimony or his decision to reject the casino license involved "any violation of federal criminal law." Justice Department officials had recommended that she seek outside counsel in the case, saying the complexity of the accusations required further investigation. Mr. Babbitt, in a statement, said he was disappointed by the decision. "If it's true that only an independent counsel can resolve a matter like this, ... then I think the list of hidden costs one has to pay for public service has just grown a little longer," he said. President Clinton expressed confidence that his interior secretary would be cleared, calling Mr. Babbitt "a man of the highest integrity."

A senior administration official said the White House already had braced for the independent counsel probe. It will be the fifth outside counsel to investigate a current or former senior administration official, including Mr. Clinton, former Agriculture Secretary Mike Espy and Henry G. Cisneros, the former secretary of housing and urban development.

An independent counsel also was named to investigate Commerce Secretary Ronald H. Brown's involvement in a suspect business deal. That probe ended when Mr. Brown died in a plane crash in April 1996.

Drugs in the White House

Drugs in the White House? Allegations old and new

Two years ago, Sen. Lauch Faircloth, R-N.C., said: "If any credible evidence surfaces concerning drug use by President Clinton while he was governor of Arkansas, it would be a national scandal."

Check out the Web site "Ye Olde Green Dragon," named for a Boston pub that was a Revolutionary founding fathers' hangout (<http://www.accessone.com/~rivero/POLITICS/politics.html>) for the full scuttlebutt on this somewhat underreported aspirant to membership in the Clinton Scandal Club.

Longtime allegations regarding drug use by Clinton include statements from at least two of Clinton's women (OK, OK, alleged women), former Miss Arkansas and Little Rock talk show host Sally Perdue and Gennifer Flowers, and Roger Clinton, among others. According to a 1996 Investors Business Daily editorial (<http://www.accessone.com/~rivero/POLITICS/whatdidhesnort.html>), the Secret Service reported then that more than 40 White House staffers brought in by Clinton had had such serious (and recent) drug problems that they had to enter a special testing program for security reasons. The Secret Service continues to testify about White House drug use at this time.

As of August 12, you could hear Jack Christy on KIEV-Seattle radio's George Putnam show speaking on the subject of cocaine use in the White House via the Green Dragon site front page. See also coverage of the KIEV radio show at <http://www.accessone.com/~rivero/POLITICS/KIEV.html>.

Also not to be missed: photographs of cocaine smuggler and Democratic contributor Jorge Cabrera with Al Gore and Hillary Clinton (<http://www.accessone.com/~rivero/POLITICS/cocaine.html>).

Whether the President is "soft on drugs" in terms of national policy is a mere matter of ideological bickering -- there are strong arguments both for and against a hawkish drug policy -- compared to the question of whether drug users are currently running the White House and sitting in the Oval Office. Even if one takes the most libertarian view possible on drugs, subscribing to the proposition that it is no one's business but one's own what one chooses to snort, smoke, or inject, these allegations are still very bad news indeed.

Using drugs and fulfilling a position of national responsibility may both be, in some sense, personal choices. But they are completely incompatible personal choices. Either you can snort cocaine or you can drive -- whether you are in charge of a car, or a school bus, or a train, or a family, or a country. You have neither the ability nor the right to do both.

The Green Dragon site also offers substantive resource pages on -- among other topics -- the Vince Foster coverup (http://www.accessone.com/~rivero/POLITICS/FOSTER_COVERUP/foster.html), the Lewinsky scandal, and the notorious FBI "enemies" files list, corrected version (<http://www.accessone.com/~rivero/POLITICS/FILEGATE.html> -- warning: this URL contains a substantial amount of data).

The horse's mouth

Where do the economic pundits -- you know, all the talking heads and interpreters who give you your market information -- get their current economic numbers? You have three guesses. ...

If you're stumped, drop in to the White House's very own Economic Statistics Briefing Room (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/fsbr/esbr.html>), for starters. This no-frills Web page provides point-and-click access to an array of current federal economic indicators, with links to information produced by several Federal agencies, maintained and updated by the statistical units of the agencies themselves. And, if hard economics secretly makes your eyes glaze over, you can pop over to the Social Statistics Briefing Room afterward (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/fsbr/ssbr.html>) for similarly maintained current federal data regarding crime, demographics, education, and health.

You can also take a look at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York's site (<http://www.ny.frb.org/>), a driving force in monetary policy that monitors various economic indicators affecting it.

Worldwide political phone book

The Address Directory for the Politicians of the World (<http://www.trytel.com/~aberdeen/>) has contact information -- addresses, phone/fax numbers, Web sites, and/or email addresses, as available -- for national leaders and provincial governors all over the world. If you need to reach the

president

of Macedonia pronto, here's where to find out how.

Tongues galore

The Human-Languages Page (<http://www.june29.com//HLP/>), a comprehensive catalog of language-related Internet resources, offers links to online language lessons, translating dictionaries,

native literature, translation services, software, language schools and more.

The AltaVista Translation Services page (<http://babelfish.altavista.digital.com/>) will translate a piece

of plain text, or an entire Web site of your choice, into another language -- English into French,

German, Portuguese, Italian, or Spanish, or (conversely) any of those languages into English, are the

currently available options. Click on a link on the translated Web page, and the new page will be

translated also. Computer translation is never perfect, of course, so beware of the moments of

madness that will inevitably ensue. (On the plus side, imagine the hours of wholesome fun you could

have, translating English expressions into other languages and then back again just to see what you

wind up with). But the site is remarkably savvy about idioms. I tried to fool it by offering it the

English sentence, "I told him that was a very different kettle of fish." It returned a perfectly correct

French response: "Je lui ai dit qu'était une affaire très différente." A bit less colorful than the original,

but not so darned bad for a computer.

On the lighter side

Check out <http://www.cartoonbank.com> regularly to see archived New Yorker cartoons. I only wish

they'd make more cartoons available at a time: you'll be in and out of the site in about ten minutes.

If you're looking to waste some real time, I can NOT recommend wading through the much-hyped

Worst of the Web offerings (<http://www.worstoftheweb.com/>). Worst of the Web will indeed

provide you with many links to very, very bad Web sites -- but the trouble is, these sites are not

funny-bad, they're bad-bad. I mean REALLY bad. A much better bet for sustained amusement is

The Useless Pages (<http://www.go2net.com/internet/useless/>), which turns up a few major

gems,
page

such as the massively erudite, splendidly clueless "Jane Austen's Grammar Violations"
(<http://uts.cc.utexas.edu/~churchh/austheir.html>).

Lisa Ronthal is a New York City writer who lives on the Internet. She can be reached as
lronthal@hotmail.com

Ron Brown financial deals with Indonesia.

The Gore-Brown Connection
World Net Daily 8/18/98

Newly released documents obtained from the U.S. Commerce Department have raised new connections between Vice President Gore, and Ron Brown's trade missions. The newly released documents show former Gore campaign advisers were included in several Brown led trade conferences and missions. One former Gore advisor who received a special slot at the 1995 "Big Emerging Markets Conference" (BEM) trade conference was also the founder of Molten Metals Inc., a company linked to Gore during the 1997 Thompson Senate hearings.

The "Big Emerging Markets Conference" or BEM, included government and commercial representatives from Argentina, Brazil, China, India, Mexico, Poland, South Korea, Turkey and the United States. The July 1995 BEM Conference in Washington also included John Huang, Nora Lum and the American representative of CITIC, a Chinese government owned bank linked to international arms traffic.

"Welcome to the Big Emerging Markets Conference," states an introduction written by Secretary Brown. "This important and high level event has been created to focus on what President Clinton has cited as one of the 'key components of this Administration's commercial and trade policy:' our intensive focus of the Big Emerging Market (BEMs)."

Two U.S. key companies invited to the BEM conference were Molten Metals Technology of Waltham, Mass. and Fluor Daniel, a California company. Molten Metals

President and founder, William Haney, III, is listed along with Charles Oliver, President of Fluor Daniel Inc. William Haney was also a former Gore 1992 campaign staffer.

Molten Metals was linked in 1997 by the Thompson Committee to illegal donations and contract kick-backs involving Vice President Al Gore. The company filed for Chapter 11 in December, 1997 due to the scandal. Molten Metals, despite money troubles, currently runs two nuclear facilities for the U.S. Department of Energy site in Oakridge, Tennessee.

One connection to Gore was the \$5 billion Energy Department contract awarded to Fluor Daniel to manage the Hanford Connecticut nuclear power plant. Peter Knight, a former lobbyist for Fluor Daniel, managed the 1996 Clinton/Gore re-election campaign. Before joining the Clinton/Gore campaign, Knight represented Fluor Daniel and Molten Metal as a lobbyist. Knight also represented Lockheed Martin; a major subcontractor for Fluor on the Hanford project. Interestingly, Lockheed Martin also donated \$100,000 to Democrats shortly before the Hanford contract was awarded.

The Senate committee focused on the relationship between Knight and Tom Grumbly, who was a former assistant secretary for environmental management at DOE. Grumbly oversaw the DOE management of the Hanford site. Both Gore and DOE's Grumbly visited Molten Metals. In fact, when the firm's stock began to take a nose dive in 1997, the Energy Dept. issued a public statement saying it favored the firm's radioactive waste disposal technology. Yet, the Energy Department's inspector general and the House Commerce Committee both raised questions on how Molten Metals could qualify to receive \$27 million in funding from DOE and millions of dollars in additional contracts.

The new documents show that such questions were not asked of the 1995 BEM attendees, especially when the attendee had Gore connections. The Commerce documents clearly show that Molten Metal's contact with the Clinton administration predated the Gore visits and that they were included in a favored trade conference.

Most of Molten Metal's work is being done at the Oakridge, Tennessee site, better known for producing

U235 for our strategic nuclear weapons arsenal. Why is a company unable to find credit and under Chapter 11 protection running a U.S. nuclear weapons facility?

Gore's involvement with Molten Metals contaminates the so-called "green" Vice President. Money donated from a questionable contractor in the nuclear power industry is ecological proof that Gore is more interested in green for his campaign than radioactive wastes which glow green for about 900 years.

Furthermore, President Clinton had to withdraw proposals to transfer U.S. nuclear technologies to China just prior to his 1998 visit. The reason for the withdrawal was not ecological -- because the atomic sales to the PRC were pushed as helping to solve the "green-house gas" global warming problem. The Clinton/China satellite technology scandal ruined the multi-billion dollar taxpayer financed deals to build atomic power plants in China. Thus, most of Clinton's 1998 visit to China was political hugs, kisses, and sightseeing but no nukes for Jiang Zemin.

Another example of the attendees invited to the 1995 BEM Conference is Bai Xingji, the Chief Representative of the China International Trust and Investment Corporation or CITIC. Before coming to the 1995 BEM conference for CITIC, Bai was the director of the UN IDO Center for International Industrial Cooperation and the deputy director of the Ministry of Foreign Economic Trade (MOFERT).

For all practical purposes CITIC is the bank of the People's Liberation Army, providing financing for Chinese Army weapons sales and western technology purchases. CITIC is also an unusual bank because, and according to CITIC's mission statement, it is dedicated to commercial and economic activity for a better Marxist-socialist world. A true indication of CITIC's power is the fact the \$20 billion conglomerate serves as chief investment arm of China's central government and holds ministry status on the Chinese State Council.

International arms dealer Wang Jun, President of Poly Technologies visited the White House and had coffee with President Clinton. Wang Jun was also chairman of the China International Trust & Investment Corp., CITIC. Poly Technologies is the commercial arm of China's

Commission for National Science, Technology and Industry for National Defense (COSTIND). The GAO noted in one recent report that COSTIND basically runs the Chinese military-industrial complex.

Yah Lin "Charlie" Trie arranged Wang's participation at the White House coffee. Wang's company, Poly Technologies, is better known as the arms outlet for the Chinese People's Liberation Army (PLA), selling everything from automatic AK-47s to nuclear tipped missiles. CITIC, however, has arranged direct deals for wholly owned companies of the PLA.

In August, 1993, the U.S. taxpayer backed Eximbank guaranteed a \$72.5 million loan from a commercial bank to a Hong Kong telecommunications firm controlled by CITIC. The loan allowed the CITIC controlled firm, China Orient Telecomm, to purchase a commercial satellite from a division of Lockheed Martin.

In May 1998, a Chinese Long March booster lifted off from Xi-chang, carrying the new \$100 million, U.S. built, communications spacecraft that is now operated by a Chinese telecommunications firm with corporate ties to the People's Liberation Army (PLA). China Orient Telecomm Satellite Co. is operating the new PLA/ChinaStar in a geosynchronous orbit. China Orient Telecomm, according to Aviation Week and Space Technology, is "a company directly connected to the Chinese military. ... It is widely expected that ChinaStar will be used for military communications and in supporting PLA business interests."

President Clinton personally approved the sale of an advanced communications spacecraft to China Orient Telecomm. China Orient Company is also owned in part by Wang Jun and Poly-Technologies.

Wang's CITIC was also a co-guarantor of the bank loan to Asia Satellite Telecom Co. Ltd., or AsiaSat, in which CITIC had a controlling interest. AsiaSat, a company founded in 1988, made a March 1996 satellite purchase from Hughes to build the AsiaSat-3 with a \$220 million loan from a consortium of banks.

Asiasat-3 was placed into an incorrect orbit by a Russian Proton booster rocket launched from Baikonur in 1997.

In 1998, Insurance companies paid off the satellite and transferred ownership to Hughes. Hughes recovered Asiasat-3, using a special lunar orbit technique to bring it back into a position around the earth.

AsiaSat-3, a commercial satellite sold to China, lost and recovered by Hughes, is more than just a \$220 million piece of orbiting electronics. Hughes is now offering the satellite to the U.S. Navy for military purposes. Mark J. Schwene, Hughes Global Services Vice President, was quoted in Aviation Week as saying "Possible markets for the satellite include providing capacity over ocean regions for the Navy as well as providing sufficient communications services in times of crisis to meet military communications surge requirements."

If you believe Hughes -- the Clinton spin that satellites have no military value for China is a falsehood. Otherwise, why offer a used Chinese satellite to the U.S. Navy for "times of crisis"?

After reading the U.S. Commerce documents -- this author is left with the impression that if real Bug-Eyed-Monsters (BEMs) had visited the 1995 BEM conference then Ron Brown would have willingly sold them the means to destroy planet Earth. Clearly, nuclear and missile means were on the table for the red Chinese.

However, Little Green Men did not visit the White House from the red planet. Instead, red soldiers with green in their bank accounts came to Washington in 1995. The truth lies hidden deeper in the Clinton administration than any secret from Area-51. The real space-joke is on us, the U.S. taxpayers, for financing Chinese Army satellites.

Hazle o leary

Fund Raising

The Money Bomb

<http://www.insightmag.com> 9/28/98

By Timothy W. Maier

Beneath the surface of Bill Clinton's sex scandals quietly grows an even greater threat to the White House. Will Democrats' dirty money sink the president?

he videotape rolled but the bomb didn't drop. President Clinton's evasive responses to the grand jury failed to ignite the doomsday explosion that some critics predicted. But although he bought some time, it may not be enough. Sex, lies and Lewinsky may be the least of Clinton's concerns. Two grand juries and three Justice Department inquiries are probing possible criminal charges concerning public abuse of power, and their findings could become part of the impeachment probe. It may turn out to be not about dirty sex but about dirty money.

. . . . A quick glance of what lies on the horizon for the White House and its allies shows that the president is not out of the woods yet.

. . . . * Kenneth Starr's Washington grand jury is pursuing possible perjury and obstruction of justice charges against key White House aides in connection with Whitewater, Filegate and Travelgate. But Starr also must sort out the inconsistent testimonies of Clinton, Lewinsky, Betty Currie and Vernon Jordan.

. . . . * First lady Hillary Clinton may lose her public aura of victimhood as Starr continues to pursue possible criminal charges against her. Justice sources tell Insight the independent counsel is looking at charging the first lady with fraud, theft and perjury in connection with the mysterious discovery of billing records linking her to her work on the Castle Grande project -- a 1989 Arkansas real-estate venture that in the end was a "sham" project that cost taxpayers an estimated \$4 million.

. . . . "He could indict her right now," says a Justice source. "The only reason Starr brought her back twice to the grand jury is because she didn't tell the truth the first time around."

. . . . At issue is whether Mrs. Clinton lied to federal regulators and a federal grand jury when she alleged she did very little work for Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan and on the Castle Grande project. According to published accounts she worked on the project and had numerous conferences with Seth Ward, a Madison insider and father-in-law to former Associate Attorney General Webster Hubbell.

. . . . * A New York grand jury is pursuing charges of campaign-finance abuse in connection with the Teamsters' election. Last year federal-election officers nullified union

President Ron Carey's 1996 reelection on grounds of fraudulent campaign financing. Shortly afterward, three members of Carey's election team pleaded guilty in federal district court in Manhattan to funneling money illegally to the union chief's campaign. Democratic political operatives, liberal nonprofit advocacy groups and AFL-CIO officials all have been implicated. Sources close to the probe claim prosecutors have drawn up indictment papers on former White House chief of staff Harold Ickes, accusing him of "conspiracy, embezzlement and labor bribery."

. . . . *Attorney General Janet Reno has launched a 90-day inquiry into allegations of perjury against Ickes. The allegations surround testimony Ickes gave to the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee in late 1997 concerning the administration's involvement in a strike at Diamond Walnut Co. In a Senate deposition on Sept. 22, 1997, and in testimony before the committee on Oct. 8, 1997, Ickes denied any knowledge of actions taken by the administration to aid the Teamsters during the strike. Ickes has been contradicted by the testimony of his former aide, Jennifer O'Connor, who told the committee she was instructed by Ickes to place a call to "find out if the U.S. trade representative had spoken to the Diamond Walnut head."

. . . . *While the 90-day probe of Ickes' actions is limited to the charges of perjury, if an independent counsel is appointed the trail could lead to Clinton and Vice President Al Gore, who are both under a 90-day inquiry into fund-raising calls they made from the White House. The Ickes probe also could focus on the Democratic National Committee, or DNC, evading Federal Election Commission laws by funneling \$42 million to state parties for ads on behalf of the Clinton-Gore campaign. The role the president and vice president played also will come under scrutiny. While the New York Times recently reported that only Ickes will trigger the independent-counsel statute, Democratic legal sources privately say Gore is in serious trouble.

. . . . And don't take the president's rejection of resignation at face value, suggests San Diego attorney Pamela Naughton, who led the impeachment of Mississippi Judge Walter Nixon on perjury charges. She says Clinton won't hang on to the presidency if a deal can be cut to pardon him for crimes. "In my mind, Clinton is saying, 'I'll resign if necessary,' but freedom is his priority."

. . . . The most devastating damage may come from the grand-jury probes, which may produce indictments that force Clinton's money men to testify before Congress. If Clinton grants pardons to aides before he leaves office --as President George Bush did following the 1992 election -- it could result

in a political nightmare for Gore in 2000. "I don't see how Clinton can pardon Ickes," says a senior Democratic legal source. "Ickes is in the middle of everything. The president is not going to stick his head out for Ickes."

. . . . And if he did, the public might react. Ever the great poll watcher, Clinton, knows there are numbers today on his side -- a factor Republicans cannot ignore with November elections around the corner. While disturbed by Clinton's behavior, the public still dislikes the idea of impeachment. Polls taken after the public release of the videotape show more than 60 percent of Americans believes the Lewinsky affair is a private matter and Clinton should not be removed from office.

. . . . One senior justice source following the case tells Insight, "On a certain level his testimony made himself more sympathetic. I thought the questions sounded crazier than he did because the prosecutors were overtrying the case." At the same time, this source says, "Clinton's responses reminded me of [D.C.] Mayor [Marion] Barry. I think Clinton was thinking, 'the bitch set me up.'"

. . . . So the clock moves forward, and if the White House controls that clock, Republicans could face obstacles in pushing impeachment. House Judiciary Chairman Henry Hyde of Illinois warned this process will likely go well into 1999, leaving Republicans wondering if they really want to elevate Al Gore to the White House in the middle of a presidential election.

. . . . But the same polls show the public favors impeachment if it can be proved that Clinton asked others to lie or obstructed justice or approved the taking of some 900 confidential FBI files.

. . . . If corruption exists, the road to get there goes through Ickes. He is the wild card in the scandal. Pursued on three fronts -- in Washington, New York and by Reno's 90-day inquiry into illegal campaign contributions -- Ickes may want to cut a deal. If he does, the one issue that neither political party appears to want to pursue eventually may be made public: dirty money.

. . . . Charles Lewis, executive director for the Center for Public Integrity, hopes the hearings will explore dirty money but doubts they will. "There were tens of millions of dollars raised by the Clinton campaign inappropriately," he says. "But the problem is the Republicans may have done the same thing, so they're not going to go near it." If the impeachment inquiry starts looking at the Dole campaign, it could be shut down just as the GOP shut down the hearings chaired by Sen. Fred Thompson of Tennessee, Lewis believes.

. . . . This is unfortunate, he adds, since "there's no more

important issue for a democracy on how it chooses its leaders. If one side uses tens of millions of dollars it is not allowed to use, the specter is that someone is buying the election. The legitimacy of the process comes under question."

. . . . One problem with pursuing the dirty-money issue is that no one has definitely declared what's illegal. "It looks and smells like it could be illegal," Lewis adds. "Clearly the FBI agents believe it is illegal. The federal-election auditors and the FBI director believe it might be illegal, but the case has not yet been presented in a court of law. How does Congress deal with the subject if no one has been convicted of it?"

. . . . The opportunity may come. Ickes and White House aide Sidney Blumenthal both may face possible obstruction of justice and perjury charges. Even if the grand juries fail to indict, the dirty-money scandal still could pop up during impeachment hearings.

. . . . John Williams, chief of staff for the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee Chairman Dan Burton, says the Indiana Republican plans to turn over relevant information on possible obstruction charges to Hyde's Judiciary Committee. Burton's committee claims to have uncovered \$800,000 in illegal campaign contributions, although Williams adds the real figure may be in the millions.

. . . . Prior to Burton's revelation of an affair in the early 1980s, he received signed "extortion letters" from an unknown source threatening to expose his past. "They demanded money," Williams says, but he declined to provide details. In addition, Burton claims he has received Federal Express packages of materials relating to his committee's investigation that had been opened and the contents apparently photocopied. All of these incidents now are under FBI investigation, Williams says. And these incidents certainly could find their way onto the Senate floor once the hearings begin. House Majority Whip Tom DeLay of Texas has asked the FBI to look into allegations of attempts to intimidate the committee.

. . . . It's a move criticized by Michael Ratner, coauthor of *Representing Witnesses Before Federal Grand Juries*, who calls such a probe a violation of the First Amendment or at least of its spirit. The GOP "can't have it both ways -- they can't release all this prosecutorial information and then say 'You're not allowed to look at who we are,'" Ratner says. Juries would not be searching through the prosecutor's evidence, he says. "If you look at the nature of impeachment, it is not the same as a criminal trial. They've been talking about the moral fiber of the president, and the background of the people judging him is relevant. That they themselves do not have the moral fiber they laud shows them up as doing a

political hatchet job on Clinton."

. . . . Still, Watergate showed that the most damaging evidence may be what is not discovered until the hearings begin, says University of Georgia legal scholar Ron Carlson, author of *Criminal Justice Procedure*. During Watergate, Alexander Butterfield exposed the Nixon taping system. With Clinton, perhaps a road not yet traveled may be revelatory. Clinton critics privately allege possible offshore accounts used to help bankroll campaigns. Law-enforcement sources tell Insight that Reno's team of investigators are monitoring offshore accounts but so far have been unable to prove the allegations.

. . . . "Once the toothpaste is out of the tube and the genie is out of the bottle, who knows what will come out of the woodwork?" Carlson says. The publicity garnered by hearings may lead to more information. "Hearings are often dangerous because of surprising developments. That means, the Chinese money, all that stuff, could come in."

. . . . * Ex-commerce officer and DNC fund-raiser John Huang once again could come into the spotlight. Huang brought in more than \$2 million for his bosses, but much of the money has been returned because of its questionable origins. Last year the *Wall Street Journal* and *Insight* reported that a New York branch of the Bank of China dropped money into accounts held by Charlie Trie that wound up in democratic coffers. A Justice Department-FBI task force probing foreign campaign donations uncovered the wire transfers to Trie, a longtime friend of Clinton, whose \$640,000 in contributions to the president's legal-defense fund was returned last year. The *Journal* said government investigators reported the transfers were in increments of \$50,000 and \$100,000 and occurred in 1995 and 1996 -- the same year that Trie became significantly involved in fund-raising for Clinton.

. . . . Similarly, the Bank of China wired \$150,000 to Los Angeles businessman Johnny Chung shortly before he wrote a \$50,000 check to the DNC and delivered it to Hillary Clinton's chief of staff, Maggie Williams. The Bank of China is owned by the Beijing government and according to U.S. military intelligence records obtained by *Insight* has been deeply involved in espionage activities to influence and gain access to foreign politicians since 1956.

. . . . But the dirty-money angle may not see the light of the day. Clinton's attorneys may want to prevent Congress from taking such a broad scope on impeachment. They could fight expanding that probe on technical legal grounds, which would serve as a delay tactic and likely fail, Carlson says.

. . . . The legal argument in the Starr report is comparable to an indictment, whereas the report Leon Jaworski forwarded to the

House Judiciary Committee during Watergate was a summary without recommendations. "Starr took the step of laying out 11 grounds of impeachment -- and there is basic criminal law -- that you can charge someone with something that is not in the indictment," Carlson says. "Should the House do that, the White House could argue that would be violating its charter."

. . . . But Carlson says that argument is weak more or less a diversionary or delaying strategy. "I think the House is writing on a clean slate. Back in Watergate they did not have a point-by-point impeachment report, but no one can say you are bound by Watergate. This is a fresh start."

. . . . Diversionary tactics still can buy time for a president who is skilled in such ploys. Clinton has stonewalled investigators by claiming and then withdrawing executive privileges. The White House also has produced documents months after they have been subpoenaed, such as with memos suggesting Gore lied to the FBI about his knowledge of how campaign money was going to be personally used.

. . . . Meanwhile, a public weary of Clinton's "legally accurate" answers yearns for truth. That may come from two grand juries that are quietly pushing forward with indictments that could make the Lewinsky scandal a footnote in the book of crimes at 1600 Pennsylvania Ave.

Probe Looks at Trips, Fund Raising

By Kevin Galvin

Associated Press Writer

Thursday, September 17, 1998; 7:47 p.m. EDT

WASHINGTON (AP) -- Commerce Department officials asked the Democratic National Committee to generate a list of candidates for a 1994 trade mission to Russia, according to a Democratic Party memo.

That memo plus others from the party headquarters and the Commerce Department also show that Commerce officials urged the DNC to develop a list of businesses in each congressional district as a resource at a time when Democrats were gearing up for the 1994 elections.

The memos, obtained by The Associated Press, offer new evidence in investigations into whether Clinton administration officials improperly used government-sponsored foreign trips to boost Democratic fund raising. Congressional investigators have been looking into the allegations for years.

One of the new documents compelled a federal judge to broaden

evidence-gathering powers granted to a Clinton critic who is pursuing a lawsuit regarding the trips.

Democratic Party and Commerce officials have steadfastly denied any direct link between the trade missions and donations to the party.

“To our knowledge no trade mission participant was ever selected because they were a DNC supporter,” said Democratic Party spokesman Rick Hess.

When a list of Democratic contributors was found in a Commerce Department official's files last year, a department spokeswoman said it was a personal document, not an official memo.

But in a Jan. 13, 1994, electronic-mail memo to his colleagues at the DNC, staff member Eric Silden reported that Commerce official Sally Painter had called “to ask for a list of candidates for a trade mission to Russia.”

Silden's e-mail suggested that DNC staffers use a list of suggested participants for a trade mission to Belgium as a starting point for coming up with a list for the Russia trip.

The memos contrast with the testimony of the former head of the Commerce office of business liaison, which arranged the trade missions. Melissa Moss had told the Senate she didn't know of any DNC lists and such lists weren't used that way by her office.

“Is this a typical way that OBL helped determine which companies to invite on trade missions?” Moss was asked about the possibility DNC lists were used to pick trade mission participants. “No,” she answered.

Adding to the impression that work at the Commerce Department was closely attuned to politics are a memo from Painter to Moss, and a memo from the White House Office of Political Affairs to Painter.

On Aug. 6, 1993, Painter wrote to Moss: “We contacted Rick Boylan of the DNC about the possibility of creating a list of businesses within each CD,” or congressional district.

The project was rejected by DNC officials as being “too cumbersome on DNC staff,” according to Painter's memo. The memo also said that a list of California businesses was being created, regardless, “since the state has become a major project for RHB.” The late Commerce Secretary Ronald H. Brown was a major player in Democratic politics.

Painter asked Moss whether the DNC shouldn't still be urged to compile

lists for "other key states, (ie Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, etc?)"

A memo to Painter from Reta J. Lewis of the White House Office of Political Affairs urges Painter to consider taking "fellow Clinton classmate, early Clinton campaign supporter and DNC Managing Trustee" Gerald McGowan on a trip to the Far East.

Commerce spokeswoman Maria Cardona said department officials have no comment on "what did or didn't happen" before William Daley became secretary in February 1997.

"When Secretary Daley came into office he instituted strict trade mission guidelines to ensure a fair and objective selection process (that) prohibits participation of any company referred by any political party," Cardona said.

Silden's e-mail also recounted the criteria Painter provided for selecting mission participants: Painter wanted ranking officials at companies that did business overseas and were at least 51 percent American-owned.

"It shows that the criteria for selecting trade mission members were not related to fund raising or political support," the DNC's Hess said Thursday.

Neither Moss nor Painter returned requests for comment Thursday.

The Painter memo gave new life to a lawsuit filed by Judicial Watch, which is pressing a 1995 lawsuit to discover whether Brown issued trade-mission invitations to companies to raise campaign money for Democrats.

U.S. District Judge Royce Lamberth ordered on Sept. 11 that the DNC be subpoenaed for "any and all documents and things, from January 20, 1993, to the present, which refer or relate in any way to the U.S. Department of Commerce and/or its secretarial trade missions...."

Clinton's Fund-Raising Under 90-day Investigation

CNN AllPolitics 9/8/98

Attorney General Janet Reno on Tuesday ordered a 90-day investigation of President Bill Clinton's fund-raising during his 1996 re-election campaign.

At the end of the preliminary inquiry Reno could decide to seek the appointment of an independent counsel to investigate White House fund-raising if investigators find "specific and credible evidence" that campaign finance laws have been violated.

"I have commenced a preliminary investigation ... involving President of the United States William Jefferson Clinton concerning political advertisements during the 1996 election cycle," Reno wrote to the three-judge court that oversees the independent counsel law.

The attorney general has so far resisted appointing a special prosecutor to investigate Democratic fund-raising, but this is third such 90-day probe Reno has sought on campaign finance in the last month.

In the past two weeks Reno also authorized a second 90-day probe of Gore and a preliminary investigation of former White House Deputy Chief of Staff Harold Ickes. Any of the three investigations could result in an independent counsel.

Historic Vote Cites Reno for Contempt

The Washington Times 8/7/98

A House committee voted Thursday to hold Attorney General Janet Reno in contempt of Congress for refusing to turn over confidential memos from two top law enforcement officials recommending she seek appointment of an independent counsel to probe 1996 campaign finance abuses.

It marked the first time the Government Reform and Oversight Committee has voted to hold anyone -- much less the top law enforcement official in the nation -- in contempt. The vote is an effort by Committee Chairman Rep. Dan Burton, Indiana Republican, to force Miss Reno to seek appointment of outside counsel.

"This is a historic moment," Mr. Burton declared.

"If it appears that the attorney general is not upholding the law, then the people have a right to know what's happening. That's why we're here today," he said.

Republicans conceded that the contempt citation, which was approved 24-19 along strictly party lines, will not be considered by the full House before September, when lawmakers return from their August recess. The attorney general could face up to one year in jail and a \$1,000 fine if the House found her in contempt, a misdemeanor.

Kennedy defeated Nixon by fewer than 115,000 popular votes. He got as many votes as he had because of his father's payoffs to the teamsters union.

Teamsters President Banished by Board

The Washington Times July 28, 1998

Teamsters President Ron Carey was expelled yesterday from the union he once pledged to reform after a watchdog group ruled that he participated in an elaborate scheme to launder money into his 1996 re-election campaign.

The Independent Review Board (IRB) expelled Mr. Carey and William W. Hamilton Jr., the union's former political director, for their **roles in giving \$1.1 million in union funds to the Democratic Party, the AFL-CIO and liberal advocacy groups -- all of which were expected to funnel portions back into the Carey campaign.**

"Carey closed his eyes because he knew or suspected that those contributions were to generate a personal benefit to him," ruled two of the three IRB members, William H. Webster, former head of the FBI and CIA, and Grant Crandall, a labor lawyer.

The third member, Frederick B. Lacey, a former federal judge, went even further, saying Mr. Carey "did not tell the truth" when he denied knowing the contributions would help his campaign.

"Based upon his demeanor as a witness, and the facts and circumstances at the time the contributions were made, I find Carey was not a credible witness," wrote Mr. Lacey, IRB chairman. "I am convinced that he did authorize the contributions."

Mr. Hamilton has been indicted by a federal grand jury and three Carey campaign aides have pleaded guilty in the money-laundering scheme, which propelled Mr. Carey past challenger James P. Hoffa in the 1996 election. Mr. Hoffa, whose aides discovered the scheme and told the FBI, is considered the front-runner in a new election set for later this year.

Mr. Carey worked at Local 804 for years before sweeping to the international presidency in 1991 by promising to rid the union of corruption. **He immediately announced the Teamsters, which had endorsed Presidents Reagan and Bush since 1980, would support Bill Clinton for president.**

During much of Mr. Carey's first five-year term in office, **he and Mr. Clinton exhibited a striking interdependence. The Clinton administration intervened on behalf of the Teamsters in numerous matters, even agreeing to "lean on" executives in one labor dispute. At the same time, the Teamsters poured millions into the Democratic Party. After being blindsided by Mr. Hoffa's surprisingly strong showing in the 1996 Teamsters campaign, Mr. Carey's aides turned to the Democrats for help.**

In one of many incarnations of the money-laundering scheme, Carey aides conspired with the Clinton-Gore campaign and the Democratic National Committee to swap illegal contributions, according to federal court records. Other labor unions and liberal advocacy groups also participated in the money-laundering schemes.

Money poured into the campaign coffers of Mr. Carey, who was able to narrowly defeat Mr. Hoffa. After the election, a federal grand jury began an investigation into the money laundering.

A federal election officer nullified the results of the 1996 election, which the federal government had overseen at a cost of \$20 million. This infuriated congressional Republicans, who refused to provide funding for a re-run election.

A federal judge is scheduled to hold a hearing today on the question of who will pay for the new election, which is expected to cost about \$8 million. Some in the Justice Department have warned that unless Congress reconsiders, the union will be left to conduct its own election without federal

supervision.

Reno Put on Notice to Name Prober in Campaign Finance Case

The Washington Times 7/24/98

Sen. Arlen Specter said Thursday he will take Attorney General Janet Reno to court if she ignores the recommendation of her own top investigator to seek an independent counsel to probe fund raising in the 1996 Clinton re-election campaign.

The Pennsylvania Republican, a former federal prosecutor and a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, said he was preparing a writ of mandamus to the U.S. District Court in Washington, which would compel Miss Reno to request the appointment.

Mr. Specter described as "devastating" the report to the attorney general this week by Charles LaBella, the career prosecutor handpicked by Miss Reno to head a Justice Department fund-raising task force.

Mr. LaBella, after a lengthy investigation, recommended the naming of an independent counsel to investigate accusations of illegal fund-raising activity by the Clinton campaign.

Miss Reno steadfastly has rejected calls by congressional leaders to seek outside counsel. But Thursday she promised to review the matter in light of Mr. LaBella's report.

She said she was listening to a "wide range of lawyers" within the department "who have had long experience with the Independent Counsel Act, ... not just one lawyer, but everybody."

"We make sure we try to consider all arguments and reach the best decision, based on the history of the act, the legislative history, and other factors," she said at her weekly press briefing. "And that's what we will do in this situation."

Mr. LaBella, in his 100-page report, joined FBI Director Louis J. Freeh in seeking an independent counsel to probe suspected fund-raising abuses.

Mr. Freeh, a former federal judge, called for an outside prosecutor in November 1997, saying the attorney general was obliged under the Independent Counsel Statute to ask a federal appeals court panel to name an outside prosecutor in the case.

In a confidential 27-page memo to Miss Reno, Mr. Freeh said the campaign finance task force probe had led FBI agents "to the highest levels of the White House, including the vice president and the president. ...

"It is difficult to imagine a more compelling situation for appointing an independent counsel," the FBI director concluded.

Mr. Specter said Miss Reno had reneged on earlier promises to rely on professionals in her department in such decisions.

"Now we have both Louis Freeh and Charles LaBella coming down on the side of appointing an independent counsel," Mr. Specter said, adding that Miss Reno "has a mandatory duty on covered persons and she has abused her discretion on conflict to others."

Rep. Dan Burton of Indiana, chairman of a House committee probing fund-raising abuses, said Mr. Freeh and Mr. La Bella have been called to appear July 30 at a hearing to discuss the issue.

"Because the attorney general has so egregiously shirked her duty in this matter and ignored the advice of the professionals closest to the case, it is important that the committee examine this issue," Mr. Burton said.

Jim Nicholson, chairman of the Republican National Committee, called the LaBella report "a turning point" in the task-force probe.

"Time's up for Attorney General Reno," he said.

Now that Mr. Freeh and Mr. LaBella have called for an outside prosecutor, Mr. Nicholson said, Miss Reno "has no choice but to act, and to do so immediately."

Sen. Joseph I. Lieberman, Connecticut Democrat, called Mr. LaBella's recommendation "significant."

He said it "gives me pause to think about my previous position." Mr. Lieberman has opposed efforts to seek an independent counsel in the case.

It was in May that Mr. LaBella, who is returning to San Diego to become interim U.S. attorney, first called for an independent counsel to investigate campaign fund raising by Mr. Clinton and Vice President Al Gore in 1996. He put that suggestion in writing in a formal report this week to the attorney general.

Sen. Orrin G. Hatch, Utah Republican and chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, also has challenged Miss Reno's position, saying during a Judiciary Committee hearing last week that she was "required to seek an independent counsel" under the statute.

Mr. Hatch also criticized the task force, saying 11 indictments it had obtained were against "the most conspicuous targets, those who gave illegal donations to the Democratic National Committee or re-election campaign" but it had "come up empty" on the complicity of others within the administration or the DNC.

Gore=s Campaign Calls

Reno Extends Probe of Gore Phone Calls

The Washington Post 10/4/97

Talking to reporters in Tampa, Fla., Gore said, "we will continue to cooperate fully during this stage

of the preliminary review and I remain confident that everything I did was legal and correct."

Asked if the decision represented a setback, Gore replied, "No, not at all. This is not surprising. It was predicted from the very beginning by many of the legal analysts." **The vice president has acknowledged making some 46 phone calls from his White House office to solicit contributions during the 1996 re-election campaign.** On Sept 3, Reno initiated a 30-day review -- the first step in the independent counsel process -- to determine whether there is information suggesting that the calls resulted in the the commission of a crime.

(Gore basically said he was proud to do it. He said he had to in order to save the country from the Republican congress. I heard him say that but I can=t find it in print.)

Miss Reno Regrets, and the GOP Yawns

The Washington Times 7/24/98

Janet Reno is fortunate that all chivalry is not dead. If she were a man, she might get a kick in the pants from Congress. Or she might not.

Chivalry is dead in the Clinton household, as we all know, and the president appears to be keeping the pressure on the attorney general to be a good girl and behave herself. He's desperate to keep an independent grand jury from taking a hard look at how he and Al Gore skinned campaign contributors in '96, and what the contributors got in return. If he has to make his attorney general look like a spineless lackey to do it, well, that's just a risk a gentleman has to take.

The suspicion grows -- mushrooms, you might say -- that what the Chinese contributors got was a blind eye to arms violations. Anyone who gets the shakes at the thought of Chinese nuclear missiles aimed at a dozen American cities can take a certain solace, as the president and vice president no doubt do, that it was Chinese money that helped the president win 370 electoral votes en route to re-election.

Miss Reno insists that it's her own hard head that prevents her naming a special prosecutor, as nearly everyone not in the employ of Democratic officeholders thinks she should. But nobody's head could be that hard in the face of insistent advice from her ranking associates who think a special prosecutor is inevitable.

Her latest nightmare is a 100-page recommendation from Charles LaBella, who has just completed an in-house preliminary report, that the investigation be turned over to an outside prosecutor because Justice Department lawyers are unlikely to resist pressure to cook the results of their investigation. Mr. LaBella told the attorney general that she had misinterpreted the independent-counsel law by creating an artificially high standard for invoking it.

Or maybe it's not a misinterpretation at all. Maybe the author of this artificially high standard is the same lawyer who wrote Monica Lewinsky's talking points. This kind of stubbornness could come only from the White House to an attorney general who is terrified that if she doesn't obey, she might have to look for work elsewhere.

Mr. LaBella's recommendation, delivered last week as he booked a flight home to San Diego to take a new job as an interim U.S. attorney (he knows he'll be looking for work elsewhere soon), follows similar hard-nosed advice from Louis J. Freeh, the director of the FBI. These two gents, hardly Republican partisans, are flabbergasted that Miss Reno has dawdled so long over a decision that anyone else -- everyone else -- would see as a no-brainer.

Miss Reno tried to sound sober and thoughtful. "We're reviewing the report now," she said. "As I have said from the beginning, I review all new information or conclusions or anything that is relevant to the issue of whether an independent counsel should be appointed."

Maybe so, but she has said similar things in the past, only to decide that she finds nobody in the henhouse but the chickens. "I don't want to jump to conclusions," she said. "I want to make sure I carefully review every aspect of it. There are a range of lawyers within the department who have had long experience with the independent counsel act, and what we do is hear from everybody, not just one lawyer, but everybody, and we make sure that we try to consider all arguments, and reach the best conclusion."

Translation: "If the Republicans sing their usual soprano arias, we might be able to stall past the November elections."

Rep. Dan Burton of Indiana, whose House committee has been looking into foreign campaign "donations" to the Clinton-Gore campaign, says that Mr. LaBella, Mr. Freeh and FBI agent James Desarno have been invited to a hearing on July 30. "Because the attorney general has so egregiously shirked her duty in this matter and ignored the advice of the professionals closest to the case," he says, "it is important that the committee examine this issue."

He'll need a lot of help, but only a few Republicans rode to his side. Sen. Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania, a former prosecutor, called the LaBella report "devastating" and promised to go to court to compel the attorney general to follow the law and make an appointment.

The New York Times, which first reported the transmission of the LaBella letter in yesterday's editions, raised a wan, vain hope on the editorial page: "Firestorm is an overused word in Congress, but if [Miss] Reno does not make the appointment, the Republican Senate leadership ought to ignite one -- today."

Alas, most of these guys, who rely on pollsters and focus groups to tell them what time it is, couldn't start a firestorm in a gunpowder factory. Bill Clinton and Janet Reno are counting on them, one more time.

Light That Fire

The Washington Times 7/24/98

The New York Times says Attorney General Janet Reno has run out of excuses since Charles LaBella, the former head of the Justice Department campaign finance probe, has joined FBI Director Louis J. Freeh in urging appointment of an independent counsel to investigate campaign fund raising.

"The two people in the American government who know most about this case -- the lead prosecutor and the top investigator --are convinced that the trail of potentially illegal money leads so clearly toward the White House that Ms. Reno cannot, under federal law, be allowed to supervise the investigation of her own boss.

"When it comes to campaign law, this is the most serious moment since Watergate," the newspaper said in an editorial Thursday.

"Firestorm is an overused word in Congress, but if Ms. Reno does not make the appointment, the Republican Senate leadership ought to ignite one -- today."

Lobbyist Indicted in Finance Probe

The Washington Times 7/14/98

Pauline Kanchanalak, a lobbyist for a Thai property development company who gave the Democratic National Committee more than \$330,000 in campaign contributions, was indicted yesterday on charges of funneling foreign donations to the DNC and several state Democratic Party organizations.

A **24-count indictment** handed up in U.S. District Court in Washington charged Mrs. Kanchanalak and her sister-in-law, Duangnet "Georgie" Kronenberg, a business partner, with conspiracy to impede the Federal Election Commission, lying in campaign documents they submitted to the FEC, and **obstructing justice** by removing corporate documents and erasing computer hard drives.

The indictments bring to **11 the number of persons charged so far** in the Justice Department's campaign finance investigation, which began in November 1996.

China Adventures

The Washington Times 7/2/98

As President Clinton continues his journey throughout Lippo Land ... er China, the number of witnesses refusing to testify in the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee's foreign-money investigation -- including how many Chinese yuan were funneled to the Democratic National Committee -- now tops 100.

Thirty-six witnesses, we've learned, have now either fled the country or live outside the country and refuse to be interviewed. Another 68 witnesses have exercised their Fifth Amendment right not to testify. Grand total: 104.

The list includes DNC fund-raiser John Huang, presidential pal Charlie Trie, Lippo Group's James and Mochtar Riady, and Macau financier Ng Lap Seng, who underwrote hundreds of thousands in contributions by Mr. Trie.

Report: Gore misstated fund-raising

USA Today 2/10/98

A draft of the final Senate report on fund-raising abuses in the 1996 presidential election suggests Vice President Al Gore and some top campaign advisers misstated their fund-raising activities and that several Democratic money men were connected with the Chinese government.

A section of the draft report - portions of which were obtained by The Associated Press - said the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee collected evidence making it obvious "that despite his various denials," Gore "was well aware" that an event he attended at a Buddhist temple near Los Angeles in April 1996 was designed to raise money for the Democratic Party.

Gore originally said he thought the event was community outreach, but later acknowledged he knew it was donor-related and that his staff failed to tell him it was a formal fund-raiser.

The Senate committee, which compiled the report following months-long hearings and interviews last year, also concluded that President Clinton's top political aide at the time, Harold Ickes, illegally "seized the reins of financial power" at the Democratic National Committee to "squeeze as much money" out of the party as possible for the 1996 re-election campaign.

Meanwhile, The Washington Post said in Tuesday's editions that the report stated that Mochtar and James Riady - head of the Indonesia-based Lippo Group conglomerate and longtime Clinton supporters - "have had a long-term relationship with a Chinese intelligence agency."

The report said that relationship appeared to be "based on business interests" to obtain Chinese assistance in international business opportunities "in exchange for large sums of money and other help."

The committee also said, according to the Post, that it had "unverified information" that John Huang, the former Lippo executive and onetime Democratic fund-raiser, may have a direct financial relationship with the Chinese government. Huang has denied such allegations through his lawyer.

The Democratic Party had to return \$3 million in 1996 campaign donations - most of it raised by Huang or Yah Lin "Charlie" Trie - because of concerns the money came from foreign or other improper sources.

Senate investigators traced more than \$1 million wired to Trie from Asia, including \$470,000 from his business partner, Macao property developer Ng Lap Seng.

Trie, a friend of Clinton since the president was Arkansas governor, is awaiting trial on federal charges of conspiring to make illegal donations and to obstruct congressional and Justice Department investigations into his fund-raising activities.

The Post said much of the information on the alleged China links was based on U.S. counterintelligence intercepts.

Renting out the Lincoln Bedroom

USA Today 2/25/97

Two years before the Democratic fund-raising controversy erupted, President Clinton scribbled his enthusiastic approval to a top aide's plan to use White House visits to encourage big donors, according to administration officials. "The president was enthusiastic about having his friends and supporters to the Lincoln Bedroom." One White House official said a written approval from Clinton on a memo outlining the plan showed the president "supported the idea that his friends and supporters...should be encouraged to do so in the future with a night over at the White House." Press secretary Mike McCurry said Clinton "was enthusiastic about having his friends and supporters to the Lincoln Bedroom." But the aide who came up with the plan, Terence McAuliffe, said his memo never specifically mentioned overnight stays in the White House.

Charlie Trie Indictment

ABC News 1/28/98

"We learned today about the first major indictment in the campaign fundraising investigation. ABC's Linda Douglass reports that Charlie Trie, the elusive Little Rock businessman and friend of the President, has been charged with several counts, including obstruction of justice. During the 1996 campaign Mr. Trie funneled hundreds of thousands of dollars in illegal foreign campaign contributions to the Democratic Party. But although he has been charged, he has not been arrested because he cannot be found."

Analysis: Tapes raise suspicions of coverup

USA Today 10/20/97

"Leaving aside the legal issues, the tapes show Clinton really did differ from all of his predecessors since Nixon in utterly obliterating the difference between governing and getting re-elected," says William Kristol, editor of the conservative Weekly Standard. "Bush, Reagan and Carter understood that most of what they did was being president of the United States."

In the Clinton administration, he says, "these videos make clear how utterly the government was consumed by the permanent campaign."

Chung Charged, Expected to Plead Guilty to Illegal Clinton Funding

The Washington Times 3/6/98

California businessman Johnny Chung, a focus of campaign-finance-abuse investigations by the Justice Department and Congress, was charged Thursday with illegally funneling money to the Clinton-Gore re-election committee by reimbursing donors he had asked to contribute. Mr. Chung, a frequent White House visitor who gave a \$50,000 campaign check to first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton's chief of staff at the White House in 1995, was accused of income-tax evasion, bank fraud and conspiracy to violate federal election-campaign laws.

Court documents said Mr. Chung also sought to launder donations to Sen. John Kerry's 1996 re-election campaign in Massachusetts.

Campaign Finance Probe Gains Steam

USA Today 10/20/97

Add former president Jimmy Carter to those calling for an independent investigation of President Clinton's fund-raising efforts.

Fund-Raiser for Democrats is Indicted by Grand Jury

The Washington Times 2/19/98

Democratic fund-raiser Maria Hsia was indicted yesterday on charges she sought to hide illegal campaign contributions made after a 1996 fund-raiser attended by Vice President Al Gore at a California Buddhist temple.

The six-count indictment, handed up in U.S. District Court in Washington, accuses Mrs. Hsia, 47, an immigration consultant, of conspiring to defraud the United States and causing false statements about the source of contributions to be filed with the Federal Election Commission.

The indictment said Mrs. Hsia used money belonging to the Hsi Lai Temple to make disguised and illegal campaign contributions to federal, state and local candidates and their political committees.

Those receiving the money included the Democratic National Committee (DNC); Clinton-Gore '96; the 1994 re-election campaign of Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, Massachusetts Democrat; and the 1996 re-election campaign of Rep. Patrick J. Kennedy, Rhode Island Democrat.

Legal Defense Fund for Clinton Formed

USA Today 02/19/98

President Clinton is getting some help to pay his mounting legal bills in the form of a new legal defense fund that will be able to raise money and will accept contributions of up to \$10,000 a year.

The fund was started by fellow Arkansas Democrat David H. Pryor, who retired from the Senate in 1997, and will be run by Anthony Essaye, the managing partner in the Washington office of Rogers & Wells and a longtime friend of White House counsel Charles F.C. Ruff.

It was Ruff who suggested last December that Essaye organize a new legal defense fund to replace one that was being closed at the end of the month due to declining contributions and the ongoing fund-raising controversy. Essaye asked Pryor to organize it, and the former senator put together a five-member board of trustees and formed the fund.

Perot on Washington officials: 'They lie'

USA Today 1/16/98

He also chided Vice President Al Gore's description of a fund-raiser at a Buddhist temple as a "community outreach" event. "There was outreach, that's true. They were reaching out for illegal money," he said.

DNC workers in the White House

(DNC officials had access to confidential information and governmental resources--which is illegal)
USA Today 2/25/97

Romer urged the White House to follow up on actions last week when it removed five employees of the Democratic National Committee from White House jobs because of the bad image created and reassign others as well.

"It would be better that we have no one over there on the DNC payroll," Romer said. Their presence raises questions about whether they are doing government or political work, and "we ought to keep a bright line between them if we can," he said.

Romer said three people on the Democratic Party payroll were on the staff making advance arrangements for events by President Clinton. White House spokeswoman Mary Ellen Glynn confirmed that "there are people on the DNC payroll who regularly do advance for the White House, especially during the campaign."

Chinese Connection

Indonesian Connection

More Clinton Friends Claiming the 5th

USA Today 2/20/97

John Huang, a key figure in the Democratic fund-raising controversy, is **seeking limited immunity** in exchange for his cooperation with a House investigating committee.

Huang and former associate attorney general Webster Hubbell refused Thursday to turn over documents subpoenaed by the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee. Two dozen subpoenas have been issued by the panel.

Huang and Hubbell invoked their Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination in refusing the panel's demand.

In a letter to the panel, Huang's lawyer agreed to turn over some documents and signaled for the first time that he wants a deal in exchange for giving up more information.

Huang apparently wants immunity from prosecution based on the documents he turns over.

Two other figures in the controversy, businessman Charles Yah Lin Trie and Thai businesswoman Pauline Kanchanalak, instructed their lawyer Thursday not to accept Senate subpoenas seeking business records tied to their fund-raising for Democrats.

Hubbell is a former law partner of Hillary Rodham Clinton who just ended a 17-month sentence for tax evasion. He was ordered to produce documents about payments he received from Clinton allies in

1994. Those payments included an estimated \$250,000 from the Lippo Group, the Indonesian conglomerate in the center of the fund-raising debate.

Huang, a former Commerce Department aide and fund-raiser for the Democratic National Committee, once headed the U.S. operations of Lippo.

Fund-raising Subpoenas Target Clinton's Inner Circle

USA Today 4/9/97

Rep. Dan Burton (R-Ind.), is reaching deep inside President Clinton's inner circle with the latest batch of subpoenas issued Tuesday by his House panel investigating accusations of Democratic campaign finance violations. The subpoenas went to White House chief of staff Erskine Bowles, his predecessor Thomas McLarty, top Clinton aide Bruce Lindsey, Clinton confidant Vernon Jordan and Clinton aide Marsha Scott. The committee wants information about efforts they made to help find work for former associate attorney general Webster Hubbell. Former Clinton senior adviser George Stephanopoulos, now an ABC consultant, was subpoenaed for information about Johnny Chung, the Democratic National Committee fund-raiser who gave a \$50,000 check to Hillary Clinton's top aide at a White House event.

White House looks into Secret-Sharing Allegation

USA Today 4/9/97

President Clinton directed White House lawyers Tuesday to look into allegations that top-secret intelligence was shared with the Democratic National Committee. The Washington Post alleges the White House supplied secret intelligence information to the Democratic National Committee to block a Latvian businessman with alleged ties to organized crime from attending a fund-raising dinner with Clinton.

Hubbell says He Lied to Clinton

USA Today 04/04/97

While his aides were finding work for Webster Hubbell, President Clinton invited the former associate attorney general to his Camp David retreat to ask him whether he was a thief. "I didn't tell him the truth," Hubbell now admits.

Hubbell, an old Clinton pal and key Whitewater figure, said in an interview late Thursday that the president believed his July 1994 lie. The deception came at a critical time: White House aides were trying to secure financial help for their friend Hubbell, but said they were unaware he was under criminal investigation for bilking the Little Rock, Ark., law firm where he had been a partner with Hillary Rodham Clinton.

Had they known the truth, Hubbell says the aides would not have helped him land jobs after he left the Justice Department under an ethical cloud. Now those friends, including chief of staff Erskine Bowles and presidential counselor Mack McLarty, face questions by Whitewater prosecutor Kenneth Starr.

Starr wants to know whether presidential pals, aides and supporters tried to buy Hubbell's silence. Hubbell and the White House both deny the jobs were a payoff.

Hubbell's story was in line with remarks by Clinton earlier in the day. The president said McLarty and Bowles had acted "just out of human compassion" and that what they did was entirely proper because they believed Hubbell had done nothing wrong.

Hubbell spoke to The Associated Press by telephone amid signs that Starr was delving deeper into that very question. Among the signs:

Sources confirmed that McLarty, who helped arrange employment for Hubbell while serving as Clinton's chief of staff, received a subpoena from Starr. Bowles, another who helped Hubbell, also was expected to get a subpoena soon. Both intend to cooperate, officials said. A Texas businessman who hired Hubbell, Bernard Rapoport, was summoned before a Little Rock grand jury by Starr. The grand jury also heard testimony from James McDougal, the convicted former Whitewater business partner of the Clintons. A House committee investigating improper political fund-raising practices prepared another round of subpoenas, including one to an attorney who arranged to hire Hubbell.

Speaking by telephone from Little Rock, a repentant Hubbell said he was sorry for lying to Clinton on their walk through the woodsy presidential retreat in Maryland's Catoctin Mountains. Months after denying the allegations to Clinton, Hubbell pleaded guilty to bilking the Rose Law Firm.

"The president asked me if I'd done something wrong," Hubbell said. "And I didn't tell him the truth."

Hubbell's soft voice cracked as he added: "I never told him the truth."

"I hurt my friends. Not just by committing the crime but in how I dealt with it afterwards," Hubbell said.

Asked if Clinton felt Hubbell owed him an apology, White House spokesman Mike McCurry said today, "You can imagine the president's disappointment."

Though he does not know for sure, Hubbell said he suspects Clinton will forgive him someday "because he's a forgiving man."

A key question for prosecutors is when White House officials assisting Hubbell first knew he was under criminal investigation. Hubbell said he could not remember exactly when he realized he was under investigation, saying he was in a state of denial that lasted long after his resignation.

Hubbell, one of the president's closest confidants, abruptly resigned from the No. 3 job at the Justice Department in March 1994 amid reports of the billing dispute.

At least three top administration officials, including McLarty and Bowles, made calls to find Hubbell work in the days that followed, and Hubbell reportedly landed several hundreds of thousands of dollars of work.

Expressing deep regret for misleading Clinton and other friends, Hubbell said they had no reason to believe he was guilty or needed to be silenced.

"The president and first lady did not know and I did not tell them I committed a crime until I pleaded guilty," Hubbell said. The guilty plea came in December 1994.

Four months after leaving Justice, Hubbell said he was summoned to Camp David to play golf with Clinton. He drove to the retreat and spent the night. He talked privately with Clinton about the allegations; Mrs. Clinton stayed inside a Camp David cabin and missed the chat.

White House special counsel Lanny Davis confirmed that Hubbell was invited to Camp David for a "social weekend" over the Fourth of July holiday.

Hubbell said he has not talked to the Clintons since Thanksgiving 1994, when they called to tell him about news reports that said he would be indicted.

"The first lady ... urged me to fight it," Hubbell said.

After leaving the Justice Department, Hubbell received about \$100,000 from the Lippo Group, an Indonesian company at the center of investigations into whether foreign money was funneled to Democratic campaigns.

In Arkansas, Rapoport spent two hours testifying before the grand jury Thursday. "I just told them the truth, and I don't know anything," he said.

Rapoport paid Hubbell \$18,000 in 1994 at the suggestion of Texarkana, Texas, oilman Truman Arnold, who hired Hubbell after getting a call from McLarty. After Hubbell went to prison in 1995 for tax evasion and mail fraud, Rapoport contributed \$5,000 to an education fund for Hubbell's children.

House investigators, meanwhile, prepared 17 subpoenas for documents from companies and individuals who hired Hubbell. Among those subpoenaed were Rapoport, his Texas insurance company and Arnold, as well as Time Warner, Sprint, Pacific Telesis and other companies that retained Hubbell, said a Republican source familiar with the inquiry.

The House Government Reform and Oversight Committee also sought information from Washington attorney John Philips, who arranged to hire Hubbell, said the source, who spoke on condition of anonymity.

White House has Big-Donor Jitters

USA Today 04/08/97

New York investment banker Felix Rohatyn seems poised to claim the prize he's been seeking: U.S. envoy to Paris.

But a factor that initially helped make him a contender for the plum posting - more than \$300,000 in

contributions he's made to the Democrats during the past two years - nearly ended up undermining his campaign for it.

The White House, battered by disclosures of big donors being rewarded with coffee in the Map Room and sleep-overs in the Lincoln Bedroom, has become jittery about anything that might smack of a payback.

The result: Everything from nominating ambassadors to selling F-16s to Indonesia is being colored by the campaign finance controversy. The scandal has become a complicating factor that makes life a little harder for the administration even on issues only tangentially related.

"It's one more thing you've got to think about," says White House spokesman Mike McCurry. "On so many things, we're trying to move much more carefully and prudently. Things that otherwise would not be an issue, you just have to anticipate somebody trying to make an issue out of it."

When the White House staged a public-relations offensive last Friday on behalf of the chemical weapons treaty, for instance, aides discussed whether to send chemical manufacturing executives to brief reporters on the economic beating their industry would take if the United States failed to ratify the global accord.

Then a warning flag was raised. Some of those executives probably were political donors. A Commerce Department official was used to make the point instead.

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott even blames spillover from the campaign finance affair for a lack of progress toward the balanced-budget deal that Clinton calls his top priority, though Democrats counter that Republican disarray is responsible.

"They try to make it look like everything is normal, business as usual," Lott said of the White House on NBC's Meet the Press Sunday. "There's had to have been a distraction with all the daily allegations of . . . scandals and contributions to the campaign . . . and I assume maybe that had something to do with" problems in getting budget talks under way.

Other examples:

A planned sale of fighter jets to Indonesia is now in doubt. Concern about human-rights abuses in occupied East Timor has played a part in the decision to delay the sale. So has sensitivity about the Lippo Group, an Indonesian-based company implicated in the campaign finance controversy.

"I was just about the only critic of the sale last year, prior to these revelations," says Sen. Russ Feingold (D-Wis.). "All of a sudden, Speaker (Newt) Gingrich and others who voted on the other side are saying, 'Maybe we shouldn't do this.'"

Battles over extending most-favored-nation trading status to Beijing and admitting China to the World Trade Organization - key elements of the administration's policy of "engagement" - are expected to be tougher because of allegations that China tried to funnel money to U.S. campaigns.

"My guess is that any compromise that seems to give China the benefit of the doubt on anything will

immediately be pounced on as something of a quid pro quo," says Richard Haass, director of foreign policy studies at the Brookings Institution and a national security aide to President Bush.

The heightened scrutiny made Vice President Gore's trip to China last month a public relations mine field.

Fifteen ambassadorships are open, including at such critical capitals as Moscow, Seoul, Tokyo and Bonn. Officials say several of the nominations are about to go forward.

But officials acknowledge that in some cases the process has taken longer because of sensitivity over appointing big donors, although using diplomatic posts for political reward is standard practice in both parties. And the White House has ordered unusually extensive background checks to avoid any embarrassing revelations.

Even so, Senate confirmation may prove more difficult than usual.

"There will be significantly increased scrutiny, and there may even be a new standard," says Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.).

White House officials deny that the president or his staff has been paralyzed by the campaign finance controversy, and they note that his standing with voters hasn't been hurt. The latest USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup Poll puts Clinton's job-approval rating at a robust 59%.

"We just named the (military) head of NATO, which was not insignificant, and we just named the deputy attorney general, which was not just another happenstance, and we just did the health-care commission," senior Clinton adviser Rahm Emanuel says. "Our energy is focused on the budget and juvenile crime and . . . policy development."

Sen. Bob Kerrey (D-Neb.), chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, says it is Republicans who are preoccupied with the issue by, for example, turning over the Governmental Affairs Committee to the investigation.

Still, at the White House it's as though the floors are strewn with a web of ropes that makes movement in any direction difficult. Clinton must step slowly and with great care to avoid entanglement.

What's more, the campaign finance issue and other controversies now dominate news coverage of the White House. That makes it harder for the president to command attention to the issues he wants to highlight. The counsel's office and the press office are increasingly preoccupied with damage control.

"They haven't cost him much with the American people, but they have cost him whatever momentum his second election generated in Congress, and only Congress can pass things," says University of Virginia political scientist Larry Sabato. "It's already April, and there's been very little progress on most of Clinton's major objectives."

Indonesian Money Wired to DNC

USA Today 10/28/97

Before he left the government to become a Democratic Party fund-raiser, John Huang told an Indonesian couple to make political donations to gain influence in this country, the couple told Senate investigators.

Acting upon Huang's suggestion, Arief Wiriadinata and his wife, Soraya, told investigators they had \$500,000 wired to them from Indonesia and began making donations in late 1995, according to Senate aides, speaking on condition of anonymity.

The money was wired to the couple from Mrs. Wiriadinata's father, Hashim Ning, a business partner of Mochtar Riady, the head of the Indonesian conglomerate Lippo Group that once employed Huang, aides said. Ning has since died.

The couple gave \$450,000 to the Democratic National Committee, which said it returned the donations last fall. The donations were all made at Huang's direction from bank accounts that were set up to receive the wire transfers, aides said. The accounts were used virtually exclusively for political donations, they said.

Before Huang left the Commerce Department in late 1995, the couple told investigators they made two \$15,000 donations to the DNC at Huang's direction, aides said.

Huang, a key figure in the campaign-finance investigation, has refused to cooperate with the Senate investigation, saying he would invoke his Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination if called to testify. His wife has also refused to cooperate.

On the recently released White House videotapes of fund-raising events, Arief Wiriadinata is seen shaking hands with President Clinton at a 1996 coffee at the White House. Referring to a son of Riady, he tells Clinton, "James Riady sent me." "Yes," Clinton replies. "I'm glad to see you."

Wiriadinata, who owned a landscape architecture business in the United States and a computer company in Indonesia, told Senate investigators that all the donations were solicited or recommended by Huang, who promised to arrange business meetings to help him expand his computer business.

That was his motivation for giving money, Wiriadinata said.

The White House and Democratic National Committee have contended that the couple donated out of gratitude because Clinton sent a get-well note to Ning after he suffered a heart attack during a 1995 visit to the United States.

Notes Show Clinton made Funding Calls

USA Today 06/27/97

President Clinton for months left open the possibility he solicited Democratic donations by telephone at the White House. Now investigators have obtained an aide's handwritten notes that say the

president raised a half million dollars by making calls.

"BC made 15 to 20 calls, raised 500K," White House aide David Strauss wrote in excerpts of 1994 notes described to The Associated Press. The notes also reference calls by Hillary Rodham Clinton and Vice President Al Gore.

In addition, the White House has turned over to Congress a handwritten notation from Clinton on a February 1996 memo from presidential aide Harold Ickes that forwarded the names of 10 major corporate donors the president could call, the officials said.

Clinton had Fund-Raising Breakfasts in '94

USAToday 09/25/97

In his earliest known use of the White House for fund-raising, President Clinton hosted a series of private breakfasts with wealthy Democrats to help raise money in 1994 for the party's health care fund, documents show.

"BC will have breakfast - to raise \$," then-White House deputy chief of staff Harold Ickes wrote in notes of a May 9, 1994 meeting obtained by The Associated Press.

The White House said Wednesday that at least 10 breakfasts or lunches hosted by President and Mrs. Clinton in 1994 in the executive mansion were specifically designed to generate "both political and financial support" for the Democratic Party's ad campaign on behalf of their ill-fated health care initiative.

The events pre-date the coffees and telephone solicitations from the 1996 election that are at the heart of the current fund-raising investigations in Congress and the Justice Department.

Several of the donors who attended the 1994 breakfasts gave five- and six-figure donations in the days after their visits, Federal Election Commission records show. Some attendees said Clinton did not specifically ask for donations at breakfast; they were solicited afterwards by fund-raisers.

The White House defended the breakfasts as legal, saying the Clintons' goal wasn't to raise money for their own political use but rather to air ads to repel special interest attacks against their plan seeking universal health care.

"This was a fight about securing health care for every American, and competing with an avalanche that was being used to defeat the president's initiative," White House special counsel Lanny Davis said.

Internal White House documents show, however, that presidential aides viewed the breakfasts as fund-raisers.

For instance, Ickes addressed the issue to then-Chief of Staff Mack McLarty in a May 7, 1994 memo entitled "scheduling fund-raising events."

"We need to schedule several additional breakfasts with the President to facilitate the additional

fund-raising for the health care media campaign," Ickes told his boss.

Davis said the president attended at least eight fund-raising breakfasts, the first on May 5, 1994 and the last on Aug. 23, 1994. Mrs. Clinton also hosted a luncheon in April and a breakfast in June for health care donors, officials said.

"The purpose of the events was to generate support, both political and financial, for health care reform and thank those supporters who had contributed to the Democratic National Committee national health care campaign," he said.

"Of course, the president and first lady asked for people's help in combatting the Harry and Louise ads and other ongoing efforts to undermine the health care initiatives."

"These events provided them with the chance to discuss the administration initiative and to seek their support."

Attorney General Janet Reno is weighing whether to appoint a special prosecutor to investigate the president and vice president. Federal law generally prohibits soliciting federal campaign contributions in government buildings.

Reno's current review is focused mostly on whether fund-raising calls from the White House in 1996 violate a century-old prohibition on soliciting contributions from inside government buildings.

Whether the earlier events will have much effect on those deliberations is not clear - donations to the DNC health care fund were mostly "soft money." The Justice Department has said it believes those donations are exempt from the prohibition on federal property.

An individual familiar with the planning of the breakfasts, who spoke only on condition of anonymity, said the events were designed to assist the party with raising money for a health care fund that was not a top priority for many big donors.

The individual said most of the breakfasts were dominated by "small talk" and not health care policy and that the plan in most cases was simply for the president to have "face time" with donors. Fund-raisers would ask for contributions before or after.

"If you are asking whether the intent was to raise money from these meetings, the answer is yes," the individual said. "The donors weren't naive going in about us wanting to ask them for money but the requests got made afterwards."

The fact that these were political events also weren't lost on donors - either DNC chairman David Wilhelm or the party's chief fund-raiser, Terence McAuliffe, are listed as attending most of the breakfasts.

Some breakfast attendees - sensitive about the recent debate about White House fund-raising - emphatically said they didn't recall Clinton making a specific solicitation.

"At the meeting I was at, there was no talk of donations. And that I'm prepared to swear to that in any

forum," said Miguel D. Lausell, a lawyer from San Juan, Puerto Rico who attended a breakfast with a friend on June 15, 1994.

Lausell said Clinton spoke about minority issues and universal health care.

Lausell wrote a \$100,000 to the DNC health care fund on July 18, 1994. The same day, his wife is listed as writing two checks - one for \$80,000 to the health fund and another for \$20,000 to the party's hard money accounts.

In the months that followed, Lausell was given royal White House treatment.

He was invited back for a second donor event a week after his breakfast, attended an official state dinner at the White House, was recommended for an overnight stay in the Lincoln Bedroom and named a vice chairman of the Democratic Party's fund-raising division, according to documents and officials.

Six days later, McGowan wrote a \$35,000 check to the DNC health care fund. He said the donations was a coincidence and he did not even know his money had gone to the health care fund.

Four invitees to a July 29, 1994 health care breakfast with Clinton all are listed as giving donations to the DNC fund two weeks later: Florida developer Carlos Herrera (\$50,000), San Diego trial attorney William Lerach (\$45,000), Thomas Stout of Washington, Pa., (\$25,000) and Star Solan of Rancho Sante Fe, Calif. (\$45,000.)

Witness says He was Asked to Shred Evidence

USA Today 09/19/97

A Florida businessman told Senate investigators Friday that on the eve of last year's election, then White House deputy chief of staff Harold Ickes urgently sought \$1.5 million in contributions, then later asked him to destroy evidence of the solicitation.

"There was no way I was going to shred a document at the request of a White House official," R. Warren Meddoff testified as Senate fund-raising hearings delved into allegations that the White House was involved in trying to arrange \$55 million to tax-exempt groups in an effort to help Clinton.

Meddoff's allegations included one that Ickes' solicitation came from aboard Air Force One. Federal law prohibits fund-raising solicitations on government property.

Meddoff described himself as a middleman who in October 1996 tried to arrange, with Ickes, \$55 million in donations to tax-exempt Democratic-leaning groups that a wealthy business associate had offered to make after Meddoff had a brief contact with President Clinton.

During that contact at a \$1,500-a-plate fund-raiser on Oct. 22, 1996, Meddoff said, he gave a business card to Clinton with a message written on the back: "I have an associate that is interested in donating \$5 million to your campaign."

He said Clinton then told him he was going to make a favorable decision in a policy area of interest to his company - the lifting of restrictions on humanitarian flights to Cuba.

"You can tell your people I have made a decision and they would be able to fly," Meddoff quoted the president as saying.

A few days later, Ickes called Meddoff from the White House and began a series of discussions about arranging donations from his business associate from Texas, Bill Morgan, to tax-exempt groups tied to Democrats.

Medoff said his boss was expecting a large business windfall and wanted to make a \$5 million donation immediately, followed up an additional \$50 million over the next 10 months. He said when he mentioned to Ickes that Morgan wanted his donations to be tax-deductible - donations to political candidates and parties cannot be deducted - Ickes said there were tax-exempt groups favorable to Clinton that would be available.

A few days later, he said, Ickes called from aboard Air Force One and made an urgent solicitation to get some of the \$5 million early.

"We have an immediate need for \$1.5 million in the next 24 hours. Can you get it to us?" he quoted Ickes as asking. Ickes then faxed his a detailed list of where the money should go.

Ickes has told Senate investigators he does not recall asking Medoff to shred the document and does not believe he did it.

None of the donations were ever made.

Critics see Pattern of Denial, Backtracking

USA Today 10/07/97

Countering Republican allegations of a cover-up, White House counsel Lanny Davis on Monday said that the disclosure of videotapes showing President Clinton hosting coffees for donors, at least six months after fund-raising documents were subpoenaed, was the result of a bureaucratic mix-up.

The White House has cooperated fully with investigators' requests for thousands of documents related to the 1996 campaign, Davis said. The late release of the videos over the weekend was "aberrational."

It was "an honest overlooking of materials," he said, and there is "absolutely no basis for suggesting" there was any purposeful effort to hide the videos.

Republican lawmakers scoffed.

"There is no question this is a part of an effort to delay and obstruct our investigation," said Sen. Fred Thompson, R-Tenn., chairman of the Senate committee investigating campaign finance irregularities. "I certainly do not believe the people with responsibility just discovered these in the last few days."

Thompson and other senators said the White House was dragging its feet on the campaign finance investigation, as it has responded to other congressional probes, including Whitewater, the firing of White House travel office employees and the collecting of FBI files on citizens by some White House staffers.

Clinton's critics - among them, lawmakers such as Thompson, Rep. Henry Hyde, R-Ill., Rep. Dan Burton, R-Ind., and Sen. Orrin Hatch, R-Utah - call it a pattern as old as Clinton's national political career: Clinton or his aides respond to a controversy and hold to their explanation. But when new facts emerge, the White House revises its story.

For example:

S The 103 White House coffees with Clinton were first called "opportunities for citizens to discuss issues." White House officials denied they were fund-raisers.

But internal files subsequently forced Clinton to acknowledge that he expected his guests to be asked later to make larger donations to the Democratic National Committee. And DNC documents released later showed the coffees listed as fund-raisers.

S Clinton originally said fund-raising was a DNC operation and the White House was not involved. Documents later detailed how the White House was micromanaging the effort: Aides would review plans for fund-raisers, sign-off on Lincoln bedroom overnights and schedule Clinton's duties around fund-raisers.

The official explanation changed. "It's long been abundantly apparent that we worked very closely with the DNC day in and day out," White House spokesman Mike McCurry said.

S The White House said a data base created with taxpayer funds was for official purposes only.

Later, the presidential aide who oversaw the project said he envisioned it as a key to keeping track of donors so they could be rewarded, and a Democratic fund-raiser called it a valuable resource.

S Vice President Gore at first called a Buddhist temple event he attended in California a "community outreach."

Shown conflicting documents by reporters, Gore's staff next said there was a "fund-raising element" to it. But other documents released by a Senate committee showed aides knew it was a fund-raiser. Gore then said he was not told.

S McCurry told reporters in December that Bruce Lindsey and other presidential aides did not learn about the Lippo Group's 1994 hiring of Webster Hubbell, a close Clinton friend from Arkansas, until press accounts last year. It is an important denial because Hubbell, who resigned a top Justice Department post in March 1994 under investigation for bilking his clients in Little Rock, is a Whitewater figure. Lippo, an Indonesian conglomerate, is a central part of the Democrats' cash-for-access scandal.

A month later, the White House acknowledged that Lindsey knew in 1994 that Lippo had hired Hubbell. The blame was laid on miscommunication between Lindsey, a White House lawyer and McCurry.

Thompson Bashes White House Over Tapes

USA Today 10/07/97

"Mr. President, this is your campaign, these were your supporters, your friends. This is your White House, this is your Department of Justice. Much of this money that was raised, illegal money, was for your campaign, for your re-election. And these are your tapes and you have a responsibility," Thompson said in his strongest public criticism of Clinton to date.

In unusually biting tones, Thompson said that the "White House is trying to run out the clock on this committee." Its mandate to examine the 1996 elections expires Dec. 31.

"People leave the country, documents are destroyed, defenses are getting together and the evidence gets cold," Thompson said.

He said there is a **"clear pattern of delay, foot-dragging and concealment . . .** by the same people who are here every day to put the spin on what has happened in this room."

AFL-CIO Mum on Testifying Before Panel

USA Today 10/01/97

After its No. 2 official skipped a deposition under subpoena, the AFL-CIO is declining to say whether he will provide testimony to Senate investigators about allegations of an illegal union fund-raising scheme.

AFL-CIO Secretary-Treasurer Richard L. Trumka was subpoenaed to answer questions Sept. 22 before the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee but missed the deposition to attend the labor federation's convention, officials say.

The development occurred as court papers in New York implicated Trumka in a scheme to funnel union money to assist the re-election campaign of Teamsters President Ron Carey last year. Two former campaign aides to Carey alleged Trumka's involvement when they pleaded guilty to embezzling union funds Sept. 18.

Line Item Veto

Clinton Crosses Off 38 Defense Items

New York Times October 7, 1997

AOf the projects he vetoed, 25 were in Republican districts and 13 were in Democratic districts.@

Sexual Misconduct

February 23, 1999

NBC's true colours revealed

By MICHAEL HARRIS

Ottawa Bureau

OTTAWA -- What ever will America do about Juanita Broaddrick? What will those Clinton sycophants in the feminist movement do? What will the sorry U.S. senators do who acquitted the president on political cue?

And what will a cowardly mainstream media do, now that Jane Doe No. 5 has finally been permitted to tell her story to the world, a story that millions of Internet readers have known about for months?

Regrettably, none of the answers is flattering. America will shuffle its feet and look out the window. The feminists will ignore Broaddrick, the better to enjoy their hard-won connections to the male power structure.

ALLEGATIONS

The senators will prattle, a little nervously, about unfounded allegations, hoping no one asks whether they read Broaddrick's sealed deposition before they cast their impeachment vote. (Many of them did.)

The media will shrug and try to remain superior to Matt Drudge. The older I get, the less surprised I am when our institutions fail us spectacularly.

Whether it's the Vatican secretly championing the cause of the murderous Augusto Pinochet, or our justice minister cutting loose the victims of the tainted blood scandal, I have seen the movie before: Power protects power, no matter what. Whenever this happens, any living, breathing notion of justice dies a hard death.

The Bill Clinton story is about privilege and cowardice. That's why he was able to lie his way out of felonies. That's why he was permitted to bomb aspirin factories and rain missiles on Iraq under the pretense of national security, when the real issue was personal security. And it's why he almost managed to rape a woman in Arkansas without anyone being the wiser -- at least in polite media circles. Whatever small lustre attached to this profession comes from the giant-killer factor. A journalist, a victim and the truth occasionally prevail against the corrupt might of the establishment to the benefit of everyone. For anyone who has actually done it, it is the glory of the business; having the means, the colleagues and the courage to stand up and tell the story when no one in authority wants to hear it.

NBC had the means but not the courage in the Juanita Broaddrick affair. Reporter Lisa Myers won Broaddrick's trust and got her terrible story on videotape. It's the account of how Bill Clinton brutally raped the then 35-year-old woman after inviting himself into her hotel room for coffee. When he was finished, he told her not to worry, that he was sterile from a childhood disease. Putting on his

sunglasses at the door, the man who was Arkansas' attorney general at the time advised her to put some ice on her swollen lip, a lip he had bitten during the attack.

WITNESS

At least that's her story. As far as Bill goes, I guess it depends on what you think rape is. Myers did her homework to get the piece to air. She found a corroborating witness who spoke with Broaddrick immediately after the attack. She checked the wealthy woman's past and found no skeletons. NBC even submitted 40 questions to the White House, which went unanswered. But regardless of what she and Washington bureau chief Tim Russert did to confirm the story, NBC brass "raised the evidentiary bar a little higher." Raising the bar for Bill is turning into a favourite American pastime.

Despite the felonies for which Clinton was impeached, Democratic senators insisted that they didn't rise to the level of high crimes and misdemeanours.

It was their conduct that didn't rise to the level of integrity intended in their oath to dispense impartial justice. They let a popular president go for partisan reasons. They pretended that the subject matter of the Lewinsky scandal was too sleazy to even be heard on the Senate floor. By refusing to hear live witnesses at an impeachment trial for the first time in U.S. history, they made the well of the senate sleazier than Monica Lewinsky ever could have. After all, was she so much different from Democratic senators? Both were prepared to protect the president at all costs, even though they knew he was guilty.

The craven NBC managers who decided to break the network's word to Juanita Broaddrick can't hide behind the excuse that their journalist didn't have the goods. The media is in the business of presenting legitimate stories, not air-tight legal defences. In the end, one journalist did step to the plate. I wish I could buy Dorothy Rabinowitz a spring bouquet.

INTEGRITY

It took an editorial writer from the staid Wall Street Journal to do what one of the major U.S. networks and just about everybody else was afraid to do; run the legitimate story of Clinton's alleged rape based on a personal interview with a very believable Juanita Broaddrick. The network still has the taped interview, but so far hasn't aired on the side of justice. Is that a peacock over at NBC, or just a gaudy chicken?

The Clinton story that's too hot to handle
The Washington Times 2/4/99

The White House tried to pressure the Fox News Channel not to broadcast a story about a woman who claims President Clinton raped her 21 years ago and then coerced her into denying it under oath, network sources said yesterday.

White House Press Secretary Joe Lockhart on Tuesday warned a Fox White House correspondent not to run the story, noting that NBC News had interviewed the woman in Arkansas and had not put the story on the air.

Fox ran the story anyway, and Internet scribe Matt Drudge yesterday published Mr. Lockhart's unheeded words of warning,

which the White House did not categorically deny, but said were off the record.

Asked yesterday about pressuring the cable news network, Mr. Lockhart said: "I'm just not going to discuss the private conversations I have, even if others can't keep them private."

Mr. Drudge quoted Mr. Lockhart as telling Fox: "You guys will regret this. Clinton haters have been putting this story out for a decade now, as far back as the '92 campaign."

According to the Drudge Report on the Internet, Mr. Lockhart went on to warn the correspondent: "If you go with the story after NBC News decided not to, there won't be any argument about whether Fox News is

-- Continued from Front Page --

right wing or not."

James Kennedy, spokesman for the White House Counsel's Office, later called Fox to argue that Mr. Lockhart's phone call had been off the record, Mr. Drudge said. The network aired the story without using Mr. Lockhart's quotes.

Persons close to the network said Mr. Drudge extracted the Lockhart quotes from the network's computer system, but another person close to Mr. Drudge said this was not so, that he obtained the quotes by talking with "real live sources."

In any event, persons at the network confirmed the accuracy of the quotes to The Washington Times yesterday.

The use of the quotes irked some Fox journalists, who intended to honor the White House off-the-record request. Mr. Drudge declined comment.

Mr. Lockhart was asked by Bill Sammon of The Washington Times yesterday at his regular White House briefing whether such pressure was heavy-handed spin control or appropriate behavior for the White House press secretary.

"If this is your way, your side way, to get into writing the story, go ahead and write the story," Mr. Lockhart said. "I'm not going to help you. You've already written it."

Helen Thomas of UPI then asked: "Did you pressure a network?"

Mr. Lockhart replied: "If any of you think I'm in a position to pressure anyone, you give me more power than you think I have."

Bill Plante of CBS joined in the questioning: "Did you make the call, as has been reported?"

Mr. Lockhart replied: "I'm just not going to discuss the private conversations I have, even if others can't keep them private."

While persons close to Fox confirmed that the White House tried to spike their story, others close to NBC insisted yesterday

no such pressure had been brought to bear by the White House. That has been the subject of intense speculation in Washington for nearly a week. Some NBC correspondents said the story, based on correspondent Lisa Myers' lengthy interview last month with the woman in question, Juanita Broaddrick, is still being corroborated and might well be broadcast.

They contradicted Mr. Drudge's assertion that the story had been spiked.

Mrs. Broaddrick's attorney, William P. Walters of Greenwood, Ark., yesterday confirmed to The Washington Times that his client broke her self-imposed press silence two weeks ago to tell her story on camera to NBC.

"They have not elected to run it as of yet," said Mr. Walters, who said Mrs. Broaddrick was not paid for the interview. "We do not know if they will run it."

FBI agents working for independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr visited Mrs. Broaddrick in Arkansas in April to ask her about the incident, which is said to have occurred when Mr. Clinton was the Arkansas attorney general. Two investigators for the House Judiciary Committee impeachment inquiry recently questioned Mrs. Broaddrick, who is referred to in legal documents as "Jane Doe No. 5."

At issue is her claim that Mr. Clinton raped her in 1978. Her vivid descriptions of a violent sexual assault were corroborated by a nurse who said Mrs. Broaddrick told her during treatment that she was injured by sexual intercourse with Mr. Clinton "against her will."

Mrs. Broaddrick was portrayed as the victim of a "brutal rape" in a letter subpoenaed almost a year ago by Mr. Starr. That October 1992 letter, written to Mrs. Broaddrick by a friend named Phillip D. Yoakum of Fayetteville, Ark., recalled unsuccessful efforts by himself and Sheffield Nelson of Little Rock, a Republican candidate for governor of Arkansas in 1992, to persuade her to go public with "how you resisted until he ripped your clothes off and how he bit your lip until you gave into his forcing sex upon you."

Mrs. Broaddrick has at various times told the story, and at various times withdrawn it.

Friends and others in Arkansas say she is fearful for her family's business interests, two homes for the elderly and mentally retarded in Fort Smith and Van Buren, Ark., which are licensed by the state of Arkansas and which receive government payments.

Paula Jones' attorneys -- to whom Mrs. Broaddrick recanted her accusation that Mr. Clinton raped her -- produced documentary evidence in federal court that Mrs. Broaddrick contradicted her own denials.

In a March 1998 filing, they called Jane Doe No. 5's story significant evidence that Mr. Clinton "forcibly raped and sexually assaulted her and then bribed and/or intimidated her and her family into remaining silent about this outrage."

The attorneys argued it was relevant despite its age because it contradicted Mr. Clinton's deposition testimony that "in my lifetime, I've never sexually harassed a woman. ... I never have and I wouldn't."

In a tape recording obtained last month by The Washington Times, Mrs. Broaddrick told private investigators for Mrs. Jones that her story was "so horrible" she wouldn't repeat it.

"Bad, bad, bad things, I can't even begin to tell you," she told Dallas investigators Rick and Beverly Lambert at her home on Nov. 13, 1997, in a conversation recorded without her knowledge.

If subpoenaed, she said, "They won't get anything out of me. I'm sorry. ... It's very private. We're talking about something 20 years ago. I'll deny anything."

The Broaddrick tape was subpoenaed in March from Mrs. Jones' attorneys by Mr. Starr, but apparently not forwarded to Congress with the other material.

The Broaddrick case, recounted by Mr. Starr in documents provided to members of Congress, is said to have helped sway wavering House Republicans toward impeachment in December. The Republicans reviewed this and other evidence withheld from public view in a secure room at the Capitol.

When the impeachment was forwarded to the Senate, House Majority Whip Tom DeLay, Texas Republican, said "67 votes may appear out of thin air" to convict the president if senators "spend plenty of time in the evidence room."

Marine officers chauffeured Monica to White House House managers may question her on use of military transportation

WorldNetDaily.com January 25, 1999

Monica Lewinsky may be a more helpful witness to House managers of the impeachment trial than they thought after questioning her over the weekend.

WorldNetDaily has learned that high-ranking Marine Corps officers were used to chauffeur the former intern to her "dates" with President Clinton while she worked at the Defense Department.

Two House prosecutors -- Rep. Bob Barr, R-GA, and Rep. James Rogan, R-CA -- were notified of the new information late last night. Both expressed interest in the

report that military officers were assigned to the task of driving Clinton's girlfriend from her office at the Pentagon to the White House on taxpayer time and at taxpayer expense.

One unconfirmed report that an officer involved in those details later received a big promotion -- to the rank of brigadier general -- was of particular interest to the prosecutors and other members of Congress alerted to the new information by WorldNetDaily.

"This story, if confirmed, would once again elevate the seriousness of the charges facing Clinton and raise questions about the involvement of other senior Clinton administration officials," said one member of the House.

Apparently, no one -- not Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr or other investigators -- has ever asked Lewinsky how she got from the Pentagon to the White House for her visits with Clinton. The assumption had been that she drove herself. There is no evidence to suggest the Marine officers involved understood the nature of the driving assignment at the time. Later, however, when the Lewinsky controversy erupted as a matter of national controversy, resulting in the impeachment of the president, the military officers chose to remain silent.

BILL'S 'SON' RISES TO THE TEST

New York Post

By MAGGIE HABERMAN

A 13-year-old Arkansas boy whose mom claims he was fathered during a paid sex encounter with President Clinton has taken a DNA test to try to prove it, The Post has learned.

Danny Williams - whose mother, Bobbie Ann, has claimed for years that she bedded Clinton and her son was the result - took the test after he signed on with Star magazine, a source told The Post.

The tabloid obtained DNA samples from both Danny and Bobbie Ann "a few weeks ago," the source said.

The Williams' test results aren't yet available, but "it should be fairly soon," said the source.

White House spokesman Jim Kennedy refused to comment. The president has denied ever meeting Bobbie Ann.

Cybergossip Matt Drudge, who is reporting the story on his Web site, quotes a source saying, "It's the stained dress all over again. We've been here before."

The Williams' results will be compared with samples of Clinton's DNA, which "were previously obtained," Drudge said.

It was unclear how the magazine obtained Clinton's DNA and whether it was a fresh specimen.

Star editors refused to comment.

Star investigative reporter Richard Gooding made the initial contact with the Williams family and has been "building the story for some time," Drudge reports.

"He's maintained a good relationship with the family," one source told Drudge. "They trust him. They just finally want to know the truth!"

Three years ago, Gooding broke the news of Clinton aide Dick Morris' toe-sucking trysts with a prostitute that forced the political adviser to step away from the president.

As they await the results, the Williamses have been moved to a secret location to stay out of the media's eye, Drudge says.

Bobbie Ann Williams' name was swirling around long before the paternity test.

Several years ago, she sold her story to the Globe, another supermarket tabloid, becoming one in a string of women to come forward with bedroom tales about Clinton.

Williams has reportedly claimed she was a 24-year-old prostitute in Little Rock when Clinton, then the Arkansas governor, paid her to have sex with him behind a park hedge.

Clinton was 34 years old at the time, Williams claims.

Williams reportedly claims the two had several steamy sex-for-money meetings, including one with another hooker. Williams' claims include descriptions of a log cabin in Hot Springs, Ark., that Clinton used as a hideaway to spend time with her and other prostitutes.

Her story has prompted endless Internet intrigue, including Web pages detailing her history, her alleged ties to the president and pictures of her

son as a youngster.

Williams reportedly passed at least one lie-detector test about her charges.

Danny Boy and child support
WorldNetDaily 1/4/99

What's the definition of irony?

On the last day of 1998, while 13-year-old Danny Williams was awaiting the results of a DNA test he and his prostitute mother believe will prove Bill Clinton is Danny's biological father, the president announced a sweeping new federal child-support crackdown designed to harness all the coercive power of Washington in squeezing America's deadbeat dads.

I'm not kidding. For anyone
who didn't think it was possible
for Clinton to humiliate himself,
his family and his country more
than he already has in sex, lies
and hypocrisy scandals, get
ready for Danny-gate.

Now, in the interest of full
disclosure, this is a story that
has been kicking around for a long time. I first saw the
photo of young Danny about six or seven years ago and
was struck with the likeness to Clinton. But a face alone
does not make for proof. Photos do lie. So do some
down-and-out mothers. But, generally speaking, DNA
tests don't. That's why it will be very interesting to see
what tabloid reporter Richard Gooding comes up with
when Danny Williams' DNA is compared to the sample
Clinton gave Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr's
investigators in the matter of the semen-stained dress.

Danny has reportedly been told his entire life that he is
Clinton's son. His mother, Bobbie Ann, says she
conceived her son during a paid sex act with Clinton.
She reportedly passed a lie-detector test.

How was a story like this bottled up for all these years?
Thank the Clinton attack machine. When political
consultant Steve Dinari, director of Ross Perot's Illinois

campaign, informed George Stephanopolous that he was ready to go public with the story before the 1992 election, he was warned he would never work in Democratic Party politics again.

"It's completely bull----!" barked Stephanopolous. "If you went on the radio and said that Bill Clinton is the father of an illegitimate black child, you will be laughed at. People will think you're crazy. ... You will be embarrassed before the national press corps. People will think, nobody will believe you, and people will think you're scum."

Stephanopolous also broadly hinted that, if the story went away, there might be something in it for Dinari. Hmmmm. Maybe some dinero for Dinari? Blackmail, threats, extortion. The Clinton slime machine has proved time and time again that playing hardball still works in American politics.

But that was then and this is now.

If the DNA match is positive, will Clinton's defenders be able to spin their way out of this web? Thirteen years without paying child support is a long time. What will the ensuing scandal mean to Clinton's staunchest bases of support -- America's black community and U.S. women? And how will the president's newest child-support initiative play politically after this revelation?

In announcing the crackdown on deadbeat dads, the White House said: "Despite record child-support collections, there are still too many parents who flagrantly ignore their obligations to their children, and the president will propose to spend \$46 million to identify, investigate and prosecute these deadbeat parents."

"Since taking office, President Clinton has made child-support enforcement a top priority, and those efforts are paying off for children across America," the statement continued.

Danny Williams will, no doubt, be grateful to hear that. But will it take a DNA test, once again, to get Clinton to admit his offense? Or, this time, with Clinton facing an

impeachment trial, will he ever admit anything? Is anything ever enough with Clinton?

Well, talk about being hoist by one's own petard, in June Clinton signed into law the Deadbeat Parents Punishment Act, creating two new categories of federal felonies for the most egregious child-support violators, a measure he had called for in his 1997 State of the Union address.

So, if it's more high crimes and misdemeanors the Senate is looking for, maybe Bill Clinton's mistreatment of Danny Williams and his mother, Bobbie Anne, for all these years will prove to be the last straw.

Under Clinton's new scheme, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services will establish investigative teams in five regions of the country to identify and investigate cases for prosecution. The Justice Department promises aggressive prosecutions and convictions of this new felony class of crimes. No word on whether Janet Reno will name an independent counsel to look into the issues surrounding the First Son.

Fornigate

Out of the loop

The Washington Times 10/5/98

All four service chiefs were left out of the loop on President Clinton's decision to attack targets in Afghanistan and Sudan, Seymour Hersh reports in the latest issue of the New Yorker. Only Gen. Henry H. Shelton, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was apprised of the decision.

Also, Attorney General Janet Reno insisted that more evidence was needed before blaming Saudi millionaire Osama bin Laden for the embassy bombings, the reporter said. And FBI Director Louis J. Freeh was left out of the planning -- an omission that Mr. Freeh and his top aides believe stems from Mr. Clinton's doubts about the FBI chief's political loyalty.

Testimony on affairs wasn't pursued
The Washington Times 10/5/98

Independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr's decision not to pursue a Secret Service officer's

testimony that President Clinton might have had half a dozen affairs in the White House appears to undercut the Democratic argument that the case is "just about sex."

There is no indication that Mr. Starr's office interviewed the six women whose names were mentioned by the Secret Service uniformed officer, Brent Chinery, to the grand jury July 23. Although the House Judiciary Committee blacked out the names from transcripts of Mr. Chinery's testimony, the unedited portions of his testimony indicate at least some of the

-- Continued from Front Page --

women are White House staffers, including one who possibly "used to work for George Stephanopoulos," a former top Clinton adviser.

Although some Republicans and constitutional scholars have argued that such misconduct in and of itself might be sufficient grounds for impeachment, Mr. Starr made no mention of the women in his 445-page report to Congress that lists potentially impeachable offenses by the president. He also did not pursue Monica Lewinsky's testimony that Mr. Clinton had confessed to having affairs with "hundreds" of women before he was 40.

Instead, Mr. Starr concentrated on accusing the president of crimes committed in the effort to conceal his affair with Miss Lewinsky, who had obliquely threatened to expose the relationship if Mr. Clinton did not secure a satisfactory job for her. These charges are perjury, witness tampering, obstruction of justice, attempted obstruction of justice and abuse of constitutional authority -- each of which the president, through his attorneys, has denied. The charges do not include the affair itself, which the president has acknowledged.

Nonetheless, Mr. Clinton's attorneys last month criticized Mr. Starr's initial report --which did not include the Chinery testimony and other evidence that Congress made public last week -- as "little more than an unreliable, one-sided account of sexual behavior" designed to "embarrass the president and titillate the public." Since then, the attack on the report's salaciousness has become a familiar theme of the president's defenders.

It is not clear whether the House Judiciary Committee, which is expected to vote as early as today on whether to initiate an impeachment inquiry, will be as reluctant as Mr. Starr to pursue reports of additional presidential affairs. It is possible that Congress would consider such behavior by a president reckless and morally repugnant -- and therefore worthy of consideration as an impeachable offense.

Mr. Chinery said his conclusion about the affairs, which was evidently shared by other Secret Service officers, was based partly on observation and partly on rumor or speculation. As evidence that one of the women had an unusually close relationship with the president, Mr. Chinery said if she "had a

problem, she didn't go to ... her boss. She went directly to the president with it. She had a very -- I mean a very close relationship with the president."

The Judiciary Committee did not black out the name of Eleanor Mondale, a CBS News reporter whose visits with the president raised suspicions among the Secret Service, according to Mr. Chinery. Miss Mondale, daughter of former Vice President Walter Mondale, has denied any impropriety, although one of her visits late last year so infuriated Miss Lewinsky that she made a scene outside the White House.

Rumors of multiple affairs by the president have been a concern among White House officials for years, according to evidence made public last week. Mr. Clinton's secretary, Betty Currie, testified that in 1994, she and presidential assistant Nancy Hernreich discussed women who were linked to their boss.

"We had a conversation about women who had been rumored to have been associated with the president and she gave me a list of names that she had throughout her knowledge of the president," Mrs. Currie testified. "And some of the names have resurfaced again. Some I've never heard of."

According to former White House Chief of Staff Leon Panetta, Miss Lewinsky was not the only employee whose closeness to the president caught the disapproving eye of former White House Deputy Chief of Staff Evelyn S. Lieberman. "Evelyn would express concern" about another female friend of the president's, Mr. Panetta testified.

Although the woman's name was redacted from his testimony, Mr. Panetta described her as a White House employee who "moved around in terms of her responsibilities. I think she was at one point kind of the principal liaison to the gay community."

"I think she worked in the Democratic Convention, Harold Ickes," added Mr. Panetta, referring to the former White House deputy chief of staff.

According to Miss Lewinsky, Mr. Clinton found it so difficult to resist other women that he "kept a calendar on how long he had been good." This is consistent with the testimony of longtime Clinton adviser Dick Morris, who told the grand jury of a conversation he had with the president after the Lewinsky story broke in January.

"I said, 'It occurred to me that I may be the only sex addict you know and maybe I can help you,'" said Mr. Morris, whose relationship with a prostitute prompted his ouster from the president's inner circle in 1996. "He said, 'You know, ever since the election, I've tried to shut myself down. I've tried to shut my body down, sexually, I mean. But sometimes I slipped up and

with this girl I just slipped up."

I WAS VICTIM OF CLINTON REIGN OF TERROR: ACTRESS

The New York Post 9/28/98

By STEVE DUNLEAVY

ELIZABETH Ward Gracen, star of a new hit TV show and former Miss America, claims the Clintonistas waged a campaign of terror that scared the hell out of her.

"I spent a small fortune hiring investigators to investigate the investigators of the White House who I honestly believe were chasing me to head off my story," she told me on the set of her new TV show "Highlander: The Raven."

And what was her story?

In the fall of 1983, when Bill Clinton was governor of Arkansas, he invited Elizabeth to a place called Quapaw Tower in Little Rock.

"I believe the apartment was owned by one of his friends," she told me in her trailer in Toronto.

She had earlier used the word "rendezvous," but quickly corrected herself.

"To use the word rendezvous would give the impression it was romantic, but it was far from romantic," she said.

Rumor mills suggested Bubba forced himself on her.

"No, not true. It was consensual. I was married at the time, and so was he. No, I am not proud of it."

How did it all start?

"One of my friends, a girlfriend, was a baby sitter for the Clintons, and she introduced me to him back in 1979. And that was about it. I was Miss Arkansas at the time.

"Then in Hot Springs, I did a public-service announcement as Miss America. He was there.

"He offered me a lift back in his limo, and he flirted with me."

At that stage in the interview, tears well in her eyes, and she says to her boyfriend, an investment banker: "I really should not be saying these things."

We talk again. Composed, polite but not feeling too good, she continues.

"We did have that night in that apartment. Maybe we were there for two hours. It is not something I am proud of."

What happened next, come 1992, was vintage Clinton.

"Everybody in Arkansas, just about everybody - and I was brought up in Russellville, Ark. - knew about Gennifer Flowers and other women. I mean it really was common knowledge."

But whispers got out. Elizabeth had been with him for one night. The machine got going. Telephone calls, some friendly, some not, some downright threatening.

"In 1992, I came out and denied that night together with Clinton," she said.

"I believe if I came out and admitted it, he would never have been president. And nobody wants that sort of responsibility.

"After our night together in Little Rock, I was in New York doing commercials, and he called me at the apartment that I shared with my husband. I just said: 'You have the wrong number.' I didn't want any more to do with him.

"I learned later that movie director Harry Thomason ^a Clinton friend_ and White House big-wig Mickey Kantor sat down with my agent, Miles Levy, and worked out some kind of a deal that would have me deny anything to do with Bill Clinton."

Whatever was said that day in a deli in Los Angeles between Thomason, Kantor and agent Levy, things started looking up for a pretty girl who was struggling with commercials here and there.

"I suddenly got a very good acting job, a mini-series in Croatia, of all places," the 37-year-old said with a slight smile.

"Then I got another good, long-lasting role in Brazil. I thought, well at last they have recognized me. I think I was a little naive.

"I knew nothing about my agent talking to Clinton's friends, but this year, late last year, I started getting calls that made things fall into place.

"Some friendly calls telling me to get out of town to dodge a subpoena from ^independent counsel_ Kenneth Starr. Some nasty calls saying my character was about to be assassinated.

"Luckily, I had work and a boyfriend who travels a lot, and really, who wants to talk about something you regret in 1982.

"Yes, I was out of town a lot."

Elizabeth claims the heat was turned up.

"My friends were being asked mystery questions about tapes," she said.
"Believe me, I don't tape people, and no tapes existed."

She said she got a lot of weird phone calls - and her parents got some, too.

Then the crunch.

"I was with my boyfriend on vacation in St. Martin. We went jogging. We were staying in one of those cabanas. Left behind was a Rolex watch and \$2,000 in cash on the coffee table."

"When we came back, the place was ransacked. The \$2,000 and the Rolex watch were still there. Nothing was stolen. They were looking for tapes that did not exist.

"The gentleman looking after our room said he saw two men in suits enter the place and one man in a suit waiting outside. He didn't challenge them, he thought they were our friends.

"Then the telephone calls again. To me, to my parents' place. I was in an undisclosed location, but the calls came to me. It was pretty much the same kind of call. Get out of town before I get hit with a subpoena.

"On one particular occasion during the Paula Jones case, I disappeared. The next day, a subpoena arrived at my parents' place. I started to keep on getting the calls. I hired lawyer Bruce Cutler and investigators.

"Yes, I was physically scared. We are talking about the presidency of the country here, and between the friendly calls on one hand telling me to get out of town for my own good and then talking about smear tactics on the other, I got scared. Yes, physically scared.

"There were always veiled threats. Always. I did nothing wrong except one stupid night a long time ago. But now this last year has become very frightening."

Today, "Raven" debuts in New York, where Elizabeth plays Amanda, a sword-wielding immortal avenger.

"I wanted Cutler to play a cameo role where he defends me, but I would like Clinton to play a cameo role.

"Then in the series, I could cut his head off with my sword," she added with a

laugh.

"You know we don't deserve this man. I read what Monica Lewinsky was saying. Some people laugh. Some people don't. Some of the things sound strange. But I was her age once, and I was taken in by his charm, regrettably.

"Yes, it was a giddy experience to have the governor of Arkansas take so much notice of you. You always think you are special, which when it comes to him is pretty stupid.

"Monica was taken in by the president. Same charm, same cuddly little boy. Not true. How can any world leader believe him? Really.

"Every week on the show I battle evil. But all those evil people have a charming side. Have I made my point?"

Tragically, Elizabeth, you have.

Clinton's confrontation with Shalala
WorldNetDaily 9/16/98

Bill Clinton roughed up another woman last week, but the hype surrounding the release of Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr's long-awaited report on impeachable offenses obscured the incident.

This time, the woman was one of Hillary's best friends -- and a Cabinet member to boot.

According to reports from inside Clinton's first Cabinet meeting in nearly eight months (that's right, eight months -- it's worth repeating for those of you who still believe Clinton has actually been "doing the work of the country") the president dressed down, rebuked and lowered the boom on Donna Shalala, his secretary of Health and Human Services. For what? For actually having the audacity to question him about his lying, perjuring, adulterous and juvenile behavior -- that's what.

After listening patiently to his latest sniveling, insincere apology, Shalala asked Clinton if he considered his policies and programs more important than whether he provided moral leadership and an example of honesty and integrity.

"I can't believe that is what you're telling us, that is what

you believe, that you don't have an obligation to provide moral leadership," she said, according to one participant in the meeting. "She said something like, 'I don't care about the lying, but I'm appalled at the behavior.'"

That's when Clinton did what he does best -- he belittled the diminutive woman.

"He whacked her," said the source. "He let her have it." He sputtered that if her logic had prevailed in 1960, Richard M. Nixon would have been elected instead of John F. Kennedy. That shut up Shalala and every other Cabinet member in the room.

I think this incident warrants a little more scrutiny, analysis and contemplation. What does it mean? What does it say about Clinton, his inner circle and his chief defenders?

First of all, let's remember who Shalala is. She's a true believer -- a total leftist ideologue, like her friend Hillary. Clinton, for all of his faults -- which are legion -- is not. In fact, he does not really believe in much of anything other than his own ambition and, well, "needs."

Having once been a dupe of the left myself, I understand where Shalala was coming from. I've witnessed many such encounters among the politically correct crowd going back to the '60s. She was confronting Clinton and explaining that he was, through his personal and sexual recklessness, jeopardizing "the cause." The cause, to the Shalala-Hillary axis, is far more important than the man.

Shalala, keep in mind, is no pious prude. She's a feminist. She believes little kids should be given condoms in school and instructed in the fine art of sexual intercourse. She defends teaching that homosexuality is normal and acceptable as an alternative lifestyle. Like Hillary, she thinks it takes a village to raise kids, not families.

But she also understands the sexual revolution she has advocated throughout her adult life is not complete. There are a lot of rubes out there in America who still believe in those antiquated, archaic notions of fidelity and marriage. They need to be led down the road to hell slowly, carefully, the Shalalas of the world believe. Like most feminists, she's also repulsed by images of powerful men using their position to seek out sexual gratification from

employees. When Republicans do it, they call it "sexual harassment."

This is where Shalala was coming from -- not to mention, perhaps, the sisterly kinship she shares with Hillary, who must be more than a little humiliated by Bill's compulsive, serial adultery.

But what about Clinton's response? This has to be, at face value, one of the oddest non sequiturs of his presidency. What does it mean? Clinton isn't involved in an election. Why the comparison with Kennedy in 1960?

Though Clinton is no committed leftist, he's a master at manipulating the left -- speaking the language of the left, appeasing the left as a way to achieve his own personal goals of empowerment. He understands that true believers like Shalala and Hillary see life as a constant struggle toward the goal of global socialism. To such ardent social engineers, the cause is waged every day -- not just on election days.

What Clinton was saying, then, is: "If I go, the evil right-wingers win. The progressive cause loses."

He played the Nixon card. For left-wingers who lived through the Nixon years, his ghost still represents a frightful apparition. They'll never stop knocking Nixon, or Reagan. And, of course, by comparing himself with Kennedy, another sexually reckless president, Clinton put everything in perspective for his inner circle.

It's us vs. them, he explained. Time to pull together for the cause. That's how Clinton beat up Shalala. And it's an insight into how he plans to rally the troops for his own personal Armageddon.

Best Quotes of the Weekend 9/14/98

George Will to Clinton lawyer David Kendall on ABC's This Week:

"He [Clinton] could remember being alone with Ms. Lewinsky when she was delivering pizza but not when she was delivering oral sex?"

Tim Russert to White House Counsel Charles Ruff:

"No less than five women have come forward and complained about the President's sexual behavior. Is there any consideration given, being given by the President to seek professional help?"

Psychologist-Author Says Clinton Mentally Ill: Says President Needs Help, Cannot Remain in Office

Copyright 1998, WorldNetDaily.com 8/25/98

President Bill Clinton is mentally ill, and he will get worse before he gets better is the conclusion of a clinical psychologist who has studied him and written a book on the subject.

Dr. Paul Fick, clinical psychologist and author of the book "The Dysfunctional President," is in an "I told you so" position now that Clinton has admitted his sexual relationship with Monica Lewinsky. Previously criticized for his diagnosis of the president, Fick is now being deluged with calls from talk show hosts for interviews.

Fick says Clinton is a pathological liar and addicted to sex. He lies about everything, not just sex, and he is so compulsive that he is always thinking about sex -- a distraction preventing Clinton from doing his job, says the author.

"Whether it's drugs, alcohol, eating disorders, or sex they engage in the behavior compulsively and they think about it obsessively as a way to distract them from the emotional problems that they have. Dolly Kyle Browning (high school sweetheart) in 1988 said that Clinton told her he's a sex addict. Attorney Joseph Purvis (close personal friend of Clinton) said in 1994 that his problems are because he is the adult son of an alcoholic," said Fick.

People display the symptoms from very mildly to very severely, and the president exhibits them on a very severe basis, according to Fick. There is treatment available, but the first step requires the same first step an alcoholic must take to recover -- full acceptance and admission of the problem. Once treatment begins recovery can be expected in 18 to 36 months.

"There is no way he can remain in office and receive the treatment, and for that treatment to be effective," said Fick, who does not expect Clinton to admit his problem.

His admission that he lied about Monica Lewinsky has brought all other allegations he has denied into question.

It is expected that the more than 500-page report being prepared by Kenneth Starr will provide significant evidence to show a consistent pattern of untruthful behavior, according to a source in a position to know. The report will document a significant number of lies by Clinton, lies that involve the various women he has been accused of having sex with, and lies regarding the China connection, Vince Foster, John Huang, Whitewater and much more.

The focus of the Starr report will be on Clinton's many lies, not his sexcapades, according to the source. Contrary to other reports, Monica Lewinsky does not appear in the Starr report until page 400. Some reports have claimed that the report will deal only with the Lewinsky affair, however it has been learned that the real focus of the report will be on the many instances in which Clinton has lied.

Sen. Bob Kerry once said Bill Clinton is "an unusually good liar." He is such a good liar that now many are asking, "When is he telling the truth?"

"I always wanted to ask Sen. Kerry if he voted for Bob Dole or if he voted for an incredibly good liar," said Paul Fick.

The lies began as a way of covering up the difficult situation in his home as a child, but they quickly became a way of life for young Bill Clinton, according to the author. He had to perfect his ability to live the lies he told to avoid being caught in the lie.

Over the years, Clinton did become "an incredibly good liar" because he has been able to keep track of his lies and "remember who has been told what," according to Fick. Clinton is not living in a fantasy world, however. He is conscious of his lies, and is in fact very calculated.

Fick predicted in 1994 that Clinton would have the problems he is now encountering regarding his sex life. A report over the weekend in the "Drudge Report" about the perversions engaged in by Clinton was no surprise to Fick who says he already knew about them -- and more. Rather than become addicted to alcohol like his stepfather, Clinton developed a compulsive addition to sex, according to Fick.

"If he doesn't get intervention at this point in time, and say he's reinforced by the public to stay in office, I firmly believe he'll act out again before the end of his term. I wouldn't be surprised if during the course of the investigation he's already acted out," predicted Fick in a weekend interview.

Steve Jones, husband of Paula Jones, claims there are at least 100 women who are prepared to testify under oath that they had sex with Clinton. Fick says that based on the interviews he has done for his analysis he is certain the list is at least that large. He said he knows of one woman who was an Arkansas state employee who regularly had sex with Clinton in the governor's office.

Various polls continue to show that many Americans do not seem to think that the personal sex life of the president matters. Fick says they believe that because they do not know the actual facts regarding Clinton's condition and the effect it has on his ability to fulfill his duties.

"We are not observing a man who had an affair and is remorseful for hurting his spouse. We are observing an individual who is consumed with thoughts and behavior related to sex in much the same way that a drug abuser is consumed with thoughts and behaviors about his compulsion. He seeks out fulfillment of his compulsion in much the same way the drug abuser engages in drug-seeking behavior. This is pathological behavior that requires effective treatment," said Fick in his book.

The condition will get worse before it gets better, says Fick. It has a major impact on his ability to devote his time and attention to the presidency because he is either satisfying his compulsive urges or he is thinking about satisfying them.

"Such urges serve to avert his attention from the underlying conflicts of the compulsion and distract him from functioning fully as president," Fick explained. "America's credibility in the foreign policy arena is eroding because of the president's credibility problems."

Lieberman: Clinton Conduct 'Immoral

The Washington Post September 3, 1998

In a somber speech on the Senate floor, Democratic Sen. Joseph Lieberman said Thursday that President Clinton's behavior with Monica Lewinsky was **"immoral and it is harmful"** and Clinton deserves public rebuke.

"In this case, the president apparently had extramarital relations with an employee half his age and did so in the workplace in the vicinity of the Oval Office," Lieberman said.

Such behavior, he said, **"is harmful for it sends a message of what is acceptable behavior to the American public."**

At the same time, Lieberman said it is premature for Congress to take any action before Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr submits a report to lawmakers.

Few Democrats were present to hear Lieberman's remarks. But top Republican leaders, including Majority Leader Trent Lott and the GOP whip, Don Nickles, were present and listening closely from their seats a few yards away.

Lieberman thus became the first member of either party since Clinton's grand jury testimony last month to use the Senate floor to address the issue. Democratic leaders had hoped he would avoid speaking, but within moments after he concluded, two fellow Democrats rose to praise him for it.

Lieberman said that Clinton **"had by his disgraceful behavior jeopardized his administration's historic record of accomplishment."**

His speech were laced with remarks about the morality of Clinton's behavior.

"The president's relationship with Ms. Lewinsky not only contradicted the values he has publicly embraced over the last six years," Lieberman said. **"It has, I fear, compromised his moral authority."**

Democratic officials had said earlier in the week that Lieberman was weighing a call for censure of the president.

Lieberman noted that while some people have already called for Clinton's resignation, presidential supporters want the nation to move beyond the entire episode.

"Appealing as that option may be, the transgressions the president has admitted to are too consequential for us to walk away and leave the impression for our children today and our posterity tomorrow that the conduct he admitted to in the White House are acceptable," he said.

Clinton's conduct, he declared, should be followed ``by some measure of **public rebuke and accountability**" -- although not until Starr sends a report to Congress.

Lieberman made his comments as Republican officials in the House were preparing for such a report, even though there was no indication that Starr had notified them one was coming.

Officials said legislation would be prepared to refer the material to the Judiciary Committee.

Under legislation that governs his appointment, Starr must give Congress a report on any evidence he uncovers that contains evidence of impeachable offenses by Clinton.

Cont.

Lieberman said that Clinton's behavior was wrong, his initial effort to mislead the public about it was damaging, and in Clinton's nationally televised speech on Aug. 17, ``his assumption of responsibility inadequate."

Psychologist-author says Clinton mentally ill: Says president needs help, cannot remain in office

Copyright 1998, WorldNetDaily.com 8/25/98

President Bill Clinton is mentally ill, and he will get worse before he gets better is the conclusion of a clinical psychologist who has studied him and written a book on the subject.

Dr. Paul Fick, clinical psychologist and author of the book "The Dysfunctional President," is in an "I told you so" position now that Clinton has admitted his sexual relationship with Monica Lewinsky. Previously criticized for his diagnosis of the president, Fick is now being deluged with calls from talk show hosts for interviews.

Fick says Clinton is a pathological liar and addicted to sex. He lies about everything, not just sex, and he is so compulsive that he is always thinking about sex -- a distraction preventing Clinton from doing his job, says the author.

"Whether it's drugs, alcohol, eating disorders, or sex they engage in the behavior compulsively and they think about it obsessively as a way to distract them from the emotional problems that they have. Dolly Kyle Browning (high school sweetheart) in 1988 said that Clinton told her he's a sex addict. Attorney Joseph Purvis (close personal friend of Clinton) said in 1994 that his problems are because he is the adult son of an alcoholic," said Fick.

People display the symptoms from very mildly to very severely, and the

president exhibits them on a very severe basis, according to Fick. There is treatment available, but the first step requires the same first step an alcoholic must take to recover -- full acceptance and admission of the problem. Once treatment begins recovery can be expected in 18 to 36 months.

"There is no way he can remain in office and receive the treatment, and for that treatment to be effective," said Fick, who does not expect Clinton to admit his problem.

His admission that he lied about Monica Lewinsky has brought all other allegations he has denied into question.

It is expected that the more than 500-page report being prepared by Kenneth Starr will provide significant evidence to show a consistent pattern of untruthful behavior, according to a source in a position to know. The report will document a significant number of lies by Clinton, lies that involve the various women he has been accused of having sex with, and lies regarding the China connection, Vince Foster, John Huang, Whitewater and much more.

The focus of the Starr report will be on Clinton's many lies, not his sexcapades, according to the source. Contrary to other reports, Monica Lewinsky does not appear in the Starr report until page 400. Some reports have claimed that the report will deal only with the Lewinsky affair, however it has been learned that the real focus of the report will be on the many instances in which Clinton has lied.

Sen. Bob Kerry once said Bill Clinton is "an unusually good liar." He is such a good liar that now many are asking, "When is he telling the truth?"

"I always wanted to ask Sen. Kerry if he voted for Bob Dole or if he voted for an incredibly good liar," said Paul Fick.

The lies began as a way of covering up the difficult situation in his home as a child, but they quickly became a way of life for young Bill Clinton, according to the author. He had to perfect his ability to live the lies he told to avoid being caught in the lie.

Over the years, Clinton did become "an incredibly good liar" because he has been able to keep track of his lies and "remember who has been told what," according to Fick. Clinton is not living in a fantasy world, however. He is conscious of his lies, and is in fact very calculated.

Fick predicted in 1994 that Clinton would have the problems he is now encountering regarding his sex life. A report over the weekend in the

"Drudge Report" about the perversions engaged in by Clinton was no surprise to Fick who says he already knew about them -- and more. Rather than become addicted to alcohol like his stepfather, Clinton developed a compulsive addition to sex, according to Fick.

"If he doesn't get intervention at this point in time, and say he's reinforced by the public to stay in office, I firmly believe he'll act out again before the end of his term. I wouldn't be surprised if during the course of the investigation he's already acted out," predicted Fick in a weekend interview.

Steve Jones, husband of Paula Jones, claims there are at least 100 women who are prepared to testify under oath that they had sex with Clinton. Fick says that based on the interviews he has done for his analysis he is certain the list is at least that large. He said he knows of one woman who was an Arkansas state employee who regularly had sex with Clinton in the governor's office.

Various polls continue to show that many Americans do not seem to think that the personal sex life of the president matters. Fick says they believe that because they do not know the actual facts regarding Clinton's condition and the effect it has on his ability to fulfill his duties.

"We are not observing a man who had an affair and is remorseful for hurting his spouse. We are observing an individual who is consumed with thoughts and behavior related to sex in much the same way that a drug abuser is consumed with thoughts and behaviors about his compulsion. He seeks out fulfillment of his compulsion in much the same way the drug abuser engages in drug-seeking behavior. This is pathological behavior that requires effective treatment," said Fick in his book.

The condition will get worse before it gets better, says Fick. It has a major impact on his ability to devote his time and attention to the presidency because he is either satisfying his compulsive urges or he is thinking about satisfying them.

"Such urges serve to avert his attention from the underlying conflicts of the compulsion and distract him from functioning fully as president," Fick explained. "America's credibility in the foreign policy arena is eroding because of the president's credibility problems."

Clinton's Trouble in the Pulpit: Another Southern Baptist Pastor Turns On Him

Copyright 1998, WorldNetDaily.com 9/4/98

A Southern Baptist pastor who once helped Bill Clinton campaign for governor says he is a sinner and a liar, and wants his Little Rock church to discipline him.

Wiley Drake, pastor of the Buena Park Baptist Church in California, nearly succeeded in getting the recent annual Southern Baptist Convention to vote for his resolution calling for sanctions against Bill Clinton, a Southern Baptist. If the vote were held today he believes his resolution would have passes "overwhelmingly."

Previously there has been silence regarding the Clinton scandals from Clinton's on pastor, Dr. Rex Horne of the Immanuel Baptist Church in Little Rock, Arkansas. Recently he broke his silence and issued a statement that calls for Clinton to repent. He would not comment further when asked about church discipline that could result in disfellowship, or removing Clinton's name from the church records.

For Clinton, More Fire From His Allies

International Herald Tribune 9/9/98

(Look the Democrats are finally showing up)

A close Democratic supporter of the president's, Senator Barbara Boxer of California, said Tuesday that Mr. Clinton's involvement with Ms. Lewinsky "was wrong and it was indefensible."

Echoing the words of another longtime Clinton ally, Senator Joseph Lieberman, Democrat of Connecticut, Ms. Boxer called the president's relationship with Ms. Lewinsky "immoral." She added, "He should have taken responsibility much earlier."

Another Democratic senator, Ernest (Fritz) Hollings of South Carolina, said Tuesday: "We're fed up. The behavior, the dishonesty of the president is unacceptable, and we'll see with the report what course the Congress will take."

Ms. Boxer's comments Tuesday carried a particular sting because she has a family link to the Clintons: Her daughter is married to a brother of Hillary Rodham Clinton. And they came after another prominent Democrat, Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan of New York, said that Mr. Clinton had committed impeachable offenses by lying in a deposition in the Paula Jones sexual harassment case.

A Defense for Clinton Begins to Take Shape

The Washington Post August 24, 1998

In January, he said he did not remember being alone with her and never had an affair with her. Last week, he said they had a half-dozen sexual encounters.

In January, he did not recall any specific gifts he gave her. Last week, he named three he presented just after Christmas.

In January, he was not sure he talked with her about testifying other than making a joke about it. Last week, he said they discussed how to respond to a subpoena.

President Clinton, famed for a razor-sharp political memory, was uncharacteristically forgetful when he was questioned under oath in the Paula Jones civil case last winter about his relationship with Monica S. Lewinsky. Seven months later, forced to justify those answers during unprecedented testimony in a grand jury criminal investigation by independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr, the president's memory improved.

But in those vague and what Clinton now admits were misleading answers last January lie the contours of his defense against accusations of perjury and obstruction of justice. The bottom line, according to some advisers, is this: Yes, he deceived, obfuscated and evaded. No, he was not forthcoming or fully truthful. But technically, they maintain, he did not lie. And even if he did, it should not matter legally because it was an irrelevant line of questioning in an illegitimate lawsuit eventually thrown out of court.

As details continue to emerge about his account following last week's questioning, presidential advisers acknowledge that they are beginning to shape a Clinton defense strategy that relies heavily on nuance, ambiguity and intent.

"What everybody is doing is looking for defenses," said one lawyer close to the Clinton team.

With the independent counsel writing a report to the House of Representatives on possible impeachable offenses, what is known of the evidence against Clinton so far turns largely on what was said in private conversations, statements that his defenders argue are open to interpretation or, at worst, amount to he-said-she-said disputes. Clinton's testimony in the Jones case was so fuzzy that it amounted to what one adviser called legal "jello."

Beyond words, the most tangible elements of a possible obstruction case are the retrieval of presidential gifts from Lewinsky to avoid a Jones subpoena last December and the job search instigated on her behalf by Clinton associates at the same time she was considering how to testify in the Jones case. In both instances, the president's advisers maintain that there is no solid evidence of illegal involvement by Clinton.

The President's Deposition

Clinton insisted last week that his answers during the Jan. 17 deposition were "legally accurate," resting on the semantic argument that the definition of "sexual relations" used in the Jones case did not include oral sex.

Even if that were accepted and even if he can somehow explain Lewinsky's testimony that they also fondled each other in ways that would be covered by the definition, the president's admission that they engaged in sexual activities could expose him to possible perjury land mines in other areas of the deposition as well.

For example, regardless of whether their sexual relationship fit the Jones definition, how could he have testified in January that he had "no specific recollection" of ever being alone with Lewinsky in the White House? And having now recalled giving her an Alaskan stone carving, a throw rug and a pin three days after Christmas last year, how could he have testified just three weeks later that "I don't remember a specific gift"?

Moreover, Clinton denied a sexual relationship with Lewinsky at other points in the deposition without relying on the Jones definition. Clinton said "no" when asked generally if he had "an extramarital sexual affair with Monica Lewinsky." And if Lewinsky told someone that she had a sexual affair with him beginning in November 1995, he testified, "it would not be the truth."

Clinton also allowed his lawyer to make Lewinsky's Jan. 7 affidavit an exhibit in the Jones case and vouched for its truthfulness under oath, even though it falsely denied any "sexual relationship" (Lewinsky, unlike Clinton, was not provided with a specific definition of sex) and falsely asserted they had not seen each other outside official functions after she was transferred to the Pentagon in April 1996. The president's attorney, Robert S. Bennett, raised the affidavit to try to curtail questioning about Lewinsky, telling a judge that it, in his words, said "there is absolutely no sex of any kind in any manner, shape or form, with President Clinton."

Bennett added that Clinton was "fully aware" of the details of Lewinsky's affidavit and later read aloud the line: "I have never had a sexual relationship with the president." The president's response: "That is absolutely true."

To constitute perjury, the person making the statement must know it is false and it must be "material" to the case at hand -- that is, capable of influencing the proceeding in which it was made. Statements that are evasive and misleading do not constitute perjury as long as they are technically true; courts have said it is up to lawyers to make their questions precise.

Clinton defenders argue that any misstatements did not constitute perjury because they were not material to the Jones lawsuit. A federal judge later excluded any additional evidence about Lewinsky from being collected to avoid interfering with Starr's investigation, and she eventually dismissed the lawsuit entirely.

"While you may say he wasn't candid about what went on in the Paula Jones deposition, it still comes back to the fact that it wasn't material to the Paula

Jones case," said a lawyer close to the Clinton camp. "It may not have been the most candid version, but it wasn't perjury."

Some courts have held that materiality of a statement is judged at the time it is made, not in light of later events. The federal appeals court here generally has applied a low threshold for judging what statements are material. Moreover, the materiality argument would not apply if Starr concludes Clinton committed perjury during his grand jury testimony last week.

Nonetheless, some criminal law experts said they thought the way Clinton dealt with the Jones lawyers -- often answering a different question than was asked and talking about extraneous matters -- could help the president defend himself against perjury accusations.

"Some of his answers are so rambling as to be incoherent," said Fordham University law professor Bruce Green. "It's the job of the person asking the questions in the deposition to pin the person down and get an affirmative statement one way or the other."

The Return of the Gifts

Starr's investigators have focused increasingly on gifts Clinton gave Lewinsky, including a T-shirt, pin and book of poetry, and how they were handled during the Jones lawsuit. In their private deliberations, Clinton advisers appear most concerned about the gifts because they may provide the most concrete evidence of impeding the Jones legal team.

"The obstruction or concealment of materials that have already been subpoenaed and are known to be under subpoena is one of the classic cases of obstruction of justice," said Gerard Lynch, a law professor at Columbia University.

In their testimony, Clinton and Lewinsky agreed that they discussed the gifts and how to respond to a subpoena to turn them over to Jones's lawyers. According to sources familiar with their accounts, the president testified that he told her she had to turn over what she had, while she testified that she heard him say she did not have to turn over anything that was not in her possession.

Shortly after their conversation, Lewinsky reportedly testified, Clinton's personal secretary, Betty Currie, contacted her, saying she understood that the young woman had something for her, and went to Lewinsky's Watergate apartment to collect the gifts.

"Retrieving gifts from somebody is a very unusual thing to do and it's hard to imagine what innocent explanation of that could be offered," said Bradford Berenson, a Washington criminal defense lawyer. "If the president instructed

that evidence be hidden so that the Jones lawyers would not get their hands on it, he's committed a very serious felony."

Clinton denied during his testimony that he ordered Currie to retrieve the gifts and said during his televised speech to the nation that he never asked anyone "to hide or destroy evidence." It remained unclear, though, how Currie came to approach Lewinsky to collect the gifts if she was not told to by the president.

The president's defense again comes down to interpretation and intent. If Lewinsky misconstrued him, his defenders argue, then the president cannot be blamed because he did not mean to encourage any obstruction.

"Obviously there's some ambiguity about the gifts," said the lawyer close to the Clinton camp. But "the bottom line is, their stories are consistent and it would take a great deal of exaggeration to make them inconsistent."

Moreover, Clinton allies noted, the fact that he gave her other gifts during a White House meeting on Dec. 28 showed that he was not concerned about them being evidence and confirmed his assertion that he was not aware that previous gifts were returned. And at least some Clinton advisers have floated the argument that it would amount to obstruction only had the gifts been destroyed.

Much as with perjury, the Clinton defense eventually turns to the contention that even if what he did was wrong, it was not that serious legally. One person informed about the Clinton team's thinking suggested that not turning over evidence in a civil lawsuit typically is punished by disbarment, civil sanctions or a default judgment in the case, not criminal charges.

"At the very worst, this isn't a crime," this person argued. "It's a sanctionable offense."

Independent lawyers, though, were skeptical. Lawrence Barcella, a criminal defense attorney, said "hiding evidence in a court case is almost as bad as destroying it." Other lawyers noted that Clinton would have known it was safe to give Lewinsky new gifts on Dec. 28 because the Dec. 17 subpoena would apply only to gifts given prior to that date.

And even the Clinton Justice Department has concluded that hiding evidence in a civil lawsuit constitutes a criminal offense. Federal prosecutors charged two former Texaco executives with obstruction for withholding and destroying evidence in a race discrimination lawsuit. But there may be solace for Clinton in the outcome: They were acquitted.

The Job Search

The job search for Lewinsky provided the opening for Starr to expand his Whitewater probe in January, because it appeared to constitute possible obstruction of justice. But the question of whether the job help provided by the president's associates to Lewinsky was intended to buy her cooperation in the Jones case has come to be viewed by the Clinton team as far less of a problem than it once seemed.

No evidence has emerged publicly so far of a direct quid pro quo; Lewinsky herself testified that she did not see the job help as a big deal and was never told it was conditioned on her testimony, according to a legal source.

Still, the timing and nature of the help may provide Starr circumstantial evidence to build an overall case of perjury and obstruction also relying on the return of the gifts, Clinton's use of Lewinsky's affidavit and her testimony that they developed "cover stories" early in their affair.

Vernon E. Jordan Jr., the Washington attorney and presidential golfing buddy, testified that Currie asked him to help Lewinsky find a New York job on Dec. 8, three days after her name showed up on a witness list provided by Jones's lawyers to the Clinton legal team. In the next month, he also helped her find a lawyer to draft her affidavit, which was submitted on Jan. 16, just after she had received a job offer from Revlon, where Jordan sits on the board of directors.

Clinton said in the Jones deposition that he knew Jordan met with Lewinsky -- at Currie's suggestion, he said -- but thought it was about something other than the Jones case. "I thought he had given her some advice about her move to New York. Seems like that's what Betty said," the president said. But Jordan assumed Currie was calling at the president's behest and told the grand jury that he kept Clinton personally apprised of his efforts on her behalf, according to an associate. He also testified that he asked Clinton whether he had an affair with Lewinsky and was told no, an account verified by the president in his own testimony last week.

All of this amounts to what one Clinton adviser termed "nebulous conduct," and Starr may have a problem proving any intent to influence Lewinsky's testimony. "The issue comes down to: Was there an agreement to change her testimony in exchange for help with a job? The timing doesn't establish that there was any evidence of that," said the lawyer close to the Clinton camp.

The Next Step

The Clinton defense, of course, is a work in progress. With Starr's office laboring to write its report to Congress, the case changes from a legal one to a political one. The House of Representatives will become the grand jury and the White House response may change accordingly.

"Are we talking about a criminal defense or an impeachment defense?" asked Barcella. "One is inherently legal and the other is inherently political."

The White House has begun thinking about how to proceed, but no decisions have been made. For example, will the president's private attorney, David E. Kendall, be in charge of an impeachment defense or will that be left to White House counsel Charles F.C. Ruff or perhaps even a new team altogether?

In addition, fashioning a defense is difficult when all the facts are not yet known. Although Kendall has kept close tabs on much of the testimony provided by other witnesses, even he cannot be certain what will end up in Starr's report. And so, the defense strategy remains a moving target.

As Fordham's Green put it, "It's sort of like you're looking at the tip of the iceberg and trying to describe the whole iceberg."

Clamor Insists Clinton Resign

The Washington Times 8/24/98

Washington buzzed with resignation talk yesterday on new reports that a devastating account of the sex-and-lies scandal by Kenneth W. Starr should reach Congress late next month.

Remarks by Dan Quayle, the former vice president, reflected

the tone of the network political talk shows. Mr. Clinton, he said, "admitted that he lied under oath, he lied to the American people, and has admitted to sexual activity which any principal of any high school in America would be fired for.

"To me," he said on CNN, the cable network, "that is sufficient evidence ... for the president to step down."

Others prominent in the nation's capital expressed similar sentiments. "It's clear Clinton should resign," former Secretary of Education William J. Bennett, said on NBC's "Meet the Press," describing Mr. Clinton as a "felon," "a serial adulterer, and a serial liar." Pressed, he later withdrew the description "felon," "for the moment."

Sam Nunn, the former Democratic senator from Georgia, said in an op-ed essay in The Washington Post that Mr. Clinton may be "required" to resign in the national interest. On ABC-TV's "This Week," Rep. Paul McHale, Pennsylvania Democrat, renewed a call he made

-- Continued from Front Page --

last week for the president to resign.

U.S. News & World Report reports that it had learned that Mr. Starr, the independent counsel, would report to Congress

that the president "suborned perjury and obstructed justice."

"The report will echo the language of the Watergate era -- abuse of power and lack of fitness for office," the magazine reports in this week's editions.

Newsweek magazine, in a cover package on sale today, reports that the Starr account, expected to run 300 pages, may pose enormous legal and political problems for the president.

Newsweek said it has been told the report, expected to be delivered to Congress by late September, will include graphic details of sexual encounters in the Oval Office that will make people "want to throw up."

The widely read Drudge Report on the Internet posted a similar account, that "several news organizations have confirmed a shocking episode [of bizarre daytime sex in the Oval Office] and are now struggling to find ways to report the full Monica Lewinsky/Bill Clinton grossout."

Newsweek reports that it has learned that investigators believe Mr. Clinton's grand jury testimony last week about his affair with Monica Lewinsky, a former White House intern less than half his age, "further entangled him in a web of lies."

"If other witnesses -- notably, the president's secretary, Betty Currie -- fail to support Clinton's side of the story, the president could find himself facing impeachment," the magazine reports.

There was no shortage of Clinton critics, even among Democrats.

"I am so darn mad at the president for having lied," Sen. Joseph R. Biden Jr. of Delaware, ranking Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee and a member of the Judiciary Committee, said on CNN's "Late Edition."

"But what I'm really angry at him for is having done what he did in the first place. It's reprehensible."

Much attention was focused on the opinion piece by Mr. Nunn, once a Democratic presidential contender and former chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

In his essay, Mr. Nunn said Mr. Clinton should stop putting his personal interests ahead of the national interest and fulfill his duties, even if it means resigning.

The president's actions have resulted in a "weakening" of the nation's highest office, "a lowering of our moral discourse, the exposure of our children to a negative role model, increased public cynicism toward elected officials as well as the political and judicial process, and diversion of the national attention from important domestic and international challenges."

Making it clear he believes Mr. Clinton's public confession last week was inadequate, Mr. Nunn said the president must now give a "voluntary and complete disclosure" of all wrongdoing related to the Lewinsky investigation to the

independent counsel, congressional leaders and the public.

"This will require personal sacrifice and may even require his resignation, but it would fulfill the president's most important oath, to preserve and protect our nation."

Mr. Biden said he does not believe Mr. Clinton should resign, but another Democrat, Mr. McHale, reiterated his opinion that he does.

"I cannot accept the proposition that a president who has lied pervasively under oath can continue in office," Mr. McHale said on ABC's "This Week."

"I think the call for resignation is absolutely timely. ... The president's actions were morally repugnant."

On "Fox News Sunday," Sen. Arlen Specter, Pennsylvania Republican and a member of the Judiciary Committee, declined to ask Mr. Clinton to step down. But he said Congress has the duty to impeach Mr. Clinton if Mr. Starr's report warrants such action.

"If the case is there and if it's an open and shut case, I think it's our duty, and I think the House will respond and so will the Senate," Mr. Specter said.

Mr. Biden said he believes the public will remain opposed to impeaching the president, but seemed prepared for an impeachment battle in the Senate.

"Look, Kenneth Starr is no box of chocolates. Neither one of these guys has acted honorably.

"If you want to take him down, take him down. We get back into the Senate, let's get into that ... go after him."

Rather than resign, he said, Mr. Clinton should "go back and talk to the American people one more time" -- this time completely, truthfully and contritely -- about the Lewinsky matter.

Mr. Biden said he suspects Mr. Clinton's seeming lack of contrition in his speech Monday night -- delivered in advance of U.S. strikes against terrorist bases in Afghanistan and Sudan -- may have resulted from a fear of looking "too weak" in the eyes of American enemies, who might retaliate.

"I would like the president to come back and say ... this is what I did ... I'm sorry for having done it. And then if they still want to impeach him, impeach him."

Sen. Daniel R. Coats, Indiana Republican and a member of the Armed Services Committee, shared Mr. Nunn's concerns that Mr. Clinton's credibility among international leaders has been damaged as a result of his lies in the Lewinsky matter.

Several Clinton Cabinet members insist that Mr. Clinton is firmly in control.

"As an American citizen and as a friend of the president, I accept what he said on Monday," Secretary of State Madeleine

K. Albright said on ABC. "I know that he is determined and has the judgment and the ability to be a president that defends the U.S. national interest."

Defense Secretary William S. Cohen told NBC's "Meet the Press," "I have confidence in his ability when it comes to leading the country on national security issues."

Said National Security Adviser Samuel R. Berger on CNN: "I have seen no evidence that any of these controversies have had any impact on America's standing abroad, the president's respect abroad."

Not A Single Republican On That Grand Jury

Silicon Valley Logic 8/19/98

August 18 - In one of the first public statements regarding the grand jury investigating President Clinton, Dick Morris said that he guessed after four hours before the grand jury, "they looked like a bunch of Democrats, and they would probably vote for the President unanimously." Morris hinted that he believed this jury would not be capable of delivering a verdict damaging to the President, due to the jury's racial makeup.

Morris also told the nation on Fox News Channel's "Hannity and Colmes" that the President confessed to him on January 21st that he had done "something" with Monica Lewinsky. Morris claims he never pressed the President for the definition of "something".

A Pathetic Speech -- And Untrue

The Washington Post August 19, 1998

Well, now we know exactly what it takes to get our president to approach the act of telling the truth: a federal prosecutor and a posse of deputy prosecutors, a grand jury, the Supreme Court, the confession of his chief co-conspirator, the testimony of a couple of dozen other witnesses, the urging of his lawyers and his advisers, the ministering of the Rev. Jesse Jackson and, one assumes, the possession by the FBI of conclusive physical evidence.

Bill Clinton went on television Monday night and admitted that he had "misled people," and had given "a false impression" in his seven months of public denial of a sexual relationship with Monica Lewinsky. Because, you see, he did, actually, "have a relationship with Miss Lewinsky that was not appropriate." And, actually, this was not a good thing to have done: "In fact, it was wrong." And Clinton was "solely and completely responsible" for it.

Certainly true. You see, the president really sort of did give a false impression when, on Jan. 26, he wagged a scolding finger and said: "I want to say one thing to the American people. I want you to listen to me. I'm going to say this again: I did not have sexual relations with that woman, Miss Lewinsky." He really kind of did mislead people when he lied under oath, lied on camera, lied in private, lied in public, lied to the nation, lied to his wife, lied to his friends, lied to his Cabinet, lied to his staff, lied to his party, lied to the world, and sent out his staff and surrogates to lie on his

lying behalf.

And, now that he mentions it, I guess our Bill really did do something a little bit wrong in exploiting a silly and star-struck young female employee as a sexual service station. And he maybe shouldn't have encouraged his girlfriend to join him in perjury. And he maybe also shouldn't have obliged Vernon Jordan and Bill Richardson and Betty Currie and Bruce Lindsey and the rest of the gang to help him hide his bit of Oval Office fun.

And it probably wasn't the perfectly moral thing, knowing that he was lying through his teeth, for the president to countenance a long and vicious campaign by his henchmen to savage those who were telling the truth. And it wasn't 100 percent appropriate to force all those innocent people to suffer through grand jury inquisition, and to trash the presidency, and to make fools out of Al Gore and Madeleine Albright and Paul Begala and James Carville and Mike McCurry and Ann Lewis and everyone else who insisted for seven months that the perjurer-in-chief was telling the truth. And, oh yes, groping Kathleen Willey when she came to the Oval Office to ask for a job was probably not a good thing to do. Maybe it wasn't right to lie about that also, and to sic the smear team on Kathy. Ditto Paula, ditto Gennifer. Sorry about all that.

No, not really. Our Bill has never really apologized for anything in his life, and he didn't now. He never used the words "I'm sorry," and he acknowledged "regret" only glancingly and euphemistically. Indeed, as he made quite clear, he wasn't sorry, except, as all adolescents are, for getting caught. His passing imitation of an apology lasted for all of one sentence. By contrast, he devoted nearly nine full paragraphs to offering excuses for his actions, to once again attacking Ken Starr and to urging that the mess he had created be put aside -- without, of course, any punishment for himself. The poor boy, he let us know, has suffered enough. This speech wasn't a mea culpa. It was an everybody-else culpa. It was an insult. It was pathetic.

And it was a lie. Even in confessing his lying, Clinton lied. He said that, in the Paula Jones deposition that started it all, he had given answers that were "legally accurate," but that he did not "volunteer information." What he was referring to was his answer to one question about sex with Lewinsky -- sex as defined in narrow and confusing terms by a legalistic definition. In denying sex-as-defined, he may have managed to stay just barely inside the borders of what was "legally accurate." But Clinton was also asked a question in which sex was described in commonly understood language, not in legalese: "Did you have an extramarital sexual affair with Monica Lewinsky?" To this, the president simply and perjuringly replied: "No."

This man will never stop lying. To borrow a hyperbolic description of

another of the century's historic prevaricators, every word he utters is a lie, including "and" and "the." He will lie till the last dog dies.

Clinton Told Grand Jury of Sex in Oval Office

The Washington Times 8/20/98

President Clinton told the Monica Lewinsky grand jury that the former intern performed oral sex on him in the Oval Office but the acts did not legally constitute "sexual relations," sources close to the probe said yesterday.

The sources, including lawyers, White House aides and others, also said the president has submitted to prosecutors a DNA sample to be compared with a stain on a dress Miss Lewinsky handed over that she said had been stained with Mr. Clinton's semen.

DNA testing had been sought by independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr, who continues to press his perjury and obstruction of justice investigation against the president. Mr. Starr is ready to wrap up the Lewinsky probe and, the sources said, is preparing to deliver an impeachment report to Congress as early as next month.

Meanwhile, the grand jury will hear from Miss Lewinsky

today for a second time as prosecutors seek to clarify Mr. Clinton's account and to test his sworn denials that he perjured himself, suborned perjury from others or obstructed justice in the Paula Jones sexual misconduct lawsuit. It also will hear again from Miss Lewinsky's Pentagon colleague Linda R. Tripp, who already has testified on eight occasions.

Miss Lewinsky has told prosecutors and the grand jury intimate details of what she said was an 18-month affair that included both oral and telephone sex. Mr. Clinton, during a rancorous grand jury session fed by a live television feed to the grand jury from the White House, refused to discuss details of the purported encounters.

Mr. Clinton's DNA, from blood he reportedly gave to prosecutors, would be an important corroborating link between the president and the former intern. The dress, whose significance was believed to have faded in recent days, later was turned over by prosecutors to the FBI laboratory.

White House officials said last night they were outraged by Mr. Starr's request, saying it was a moot issue since Mr. Clinton already has admitted to sexual activity with Miss Lewinsky. They suggested the independent counsel's office leaked the news of the request.

The officials also said that from now on, they will adopt a posture of not commenting on such personal matters, citing Mr.

Clinton's declaration Monday night that he wanted to reclaim his personal life.

"On Monday night, the president acknowledged an improper relationship and apologized for that. He also said it's time to reclaim his privacy and we're going to respect that, and not comment on every leak that comes out of this investigation," said White House Special Counsel James Kennedy.

Mr. Clinton, who celebrated his 52nd birthday yesterday with his family in Martha's Vineyard, Mass., acknowledged in an extraordinary television address Monday night that he had a relationship with Miss Lewinsky, which he described as "not appropriate," but that he was "legally correct" in denying having sexual relations with her during a Jan. 17 deposition under a narrow legal definition outlined in the Jones suit.

Friends of Miss Lewinsky's say she is hurt over the president's characterization of the relationship, that Miss Lewinsky felt that she and Mr. Clinton had a deeper relationship with emotional ties, the Associated Press reported.

One friend said Miss Lewinsky filed an affidavit in January denying a sexual relationship in order to protect Mr. Clinton. WRC-TV said she is so angry she is prepared to contradict the president's testimony when she appears before the grand jury today.

According to the sources, the president admitted to several incidents of oral sex involving Miss Lewinsky -- who reported to the White House in 1995 as a 21-year-old unpaid intern. The admissions came after prosecutors forced him to expand on a prepared statement in which he acknowledged an inappropriate physical relationship with the young woman, the sources said.

Mr. Starr, considering whether to subpoena Mr. Clinton for further testimony, has focused on whether his testimony constituted new accusations of perjury in the 7-month-old probe, the sources said. He also has targeted other denials by Mr. Clinton in the four-hour session, including statements of whether he and the intern were ever alone in the White House.

A comparison of Mr. Clinton's testimony with what Miss Lewinsky tells the grand jury today, along with what she said during an all-day appearance on Aug. 6, is expected to comprise a major portion of Mr. Starr's impeachment report.

Mr. Clinton's testimony in the Jones case, the sources said, was designed to defeat a specific definition of sexual relations outlined by attorneys for the former Arkansas state employee. The president concluded that the definition excluded oral sex performed on him, the sources said.

During the Jones deposition, Dallas attorney James Fisher

defined sexual relations as follows: "For the purposes of this deposition, a person engages in 'sexual relations' when the person knowingly engages in or causes ... contact with the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or buttocks of any person with an intent to arouse or gratify the sexual desire of any person."

When Mr. Clinton was asked in the Jones case whether he had "sexual relations" with Miss Lewinsky, he stopped testifying to read the definition of sexual relations by Mrs. Jones' attorneys. He then denied having a sexual relationship with the former intern: "I have never had sexual relations with Monica Lewinsky. I've never had an affair with her," the president testified.

Miss Lewinsky is expected to be asked today to further describe the encounters she had with Mr. Clinton to determine how he could have avoided any "contact" under the Jones definition, the sources said.

Mr. Clinton referred to the same definition and made a cautious reply when asked if he had ever had sexual relations with Gennifer Flowers, another former Arkansas state employee. "The answer to your question, if the definition is Section 1 there in the first piece of paper you gave me, is yes," Mr. Clinton said, saying it happened once in 1977 and never again.

In conversations Miss Lewinsky had with Mrs. Tripp, the former intern said the president preferred oral sex because in his view it was not adultery. **That echoes an assertion by Arkansas State Trooper Larry Patterson, a member of Mr. Clinton's gubernatorial detail in Little Rock, Ark., that Mr. Clinton told him he had "researched the Bible and oral sex isn't considered adultery."**

Trooper Patterson said he often stood guard during Mr. Clinton's oral-sex sessions.

Meanwhile, the White House dismissed questions on a tie Mr. Clinton wore on the day Miss Lewinsky testified to the grand jury. The New York Times said yesterday the boldly patterned tie had been given to the president by the former intern and Mr. Starr's prosecutors asked Mr. Clinton if he intended to send her a message by wearing that tie during a televised Rose Garden ceremony.

It is unlikely, however, Miss Lewinsky got the message -- if one was intended. She entered the courthouse at about 8:30 a.m., not to emerge for some six hours. Mr. Clinton's Rose Garden ceremony was at 11 a.m. She had given him the tie with the message that when he wore it, she would know she was close to his heart, the newspaper said.

Did President Send Lewinsky a Signal With His Necktie?

The New York Times 8/19/98

When President Clinton strode into the Rose Garden on August 6, his jazzy gold and navy necktie stood out sharply against his white shirt and sent a jolt through certain lawyers around town.

They were not clotheshorses struck by a rare Washington fashion statement. They were prosecutors in the office of Kenneth Starr, wondering if the president might have dressed to obstruct justice -- by sending a secret signal to Monica Lewinsky as she testified before the grand jury.

Ms. Lewinsky, the former intern at the center of the investigation into sex and lies at the White House, had said during her debriefings with prosecutors in recent weeks that she had given Clinton the Zegna tie on his 50th birthday, in August 1996.

According to what Ms. Lewinsky told a close friend, Ms. Lewinsky told the president that because they would not be able to see each other every day, "when I see you wearing this tie I'll know that I am close to your heart."

On the day of her testimony, Clinton was inveighing against handguns in a televised ceremony. Prosecutors apparently wondered, Was the tie a sign, a plea for solidarity?

If it was, it did not work. Ms. Lewinsky did not learn of Clinton's choice of neckties until she turned on the television that evening and saw a clip of him in the Rose Garden, her friends said. That day, she had contradicted her sworn affidavit, testifying that she and the president had had an affair in the White House.

The necktie was evidently covered by a subpoena sent to the White House for gifts and other evidence by prosecutors for Starr. But apparently it was not turned over by Clinton at that time.

Clothing has become something of a leitmotif in Starr's investigation. He has pursued a great deal of circumstantial evidence in his investigation of Clinton, including gifts like a T-shirt that he gave her. One of Starr's potentially strongest pieces of evidence is a navy blue dress, bought at the Gap, that Ms. Lewinsky turned over to prosecutors. They are having it tested to determine whether it bears stains from a sexual encounter with the president.

On Monday, during more than four hours of testimony at the White House, prosecutors asked Clinton why he chose to wear that particular tie on that particular day, one Clinton adviser said. An ally of Clinton described the inquiry into neckwear as an example of how the Starr investigation had gone rambling along irrelevant and peculiar byways. "The obstruction of justice stuff was kind of goofy," one Clinton adviser said Tuesday.

The President was said to have smiled at the question and expressed some bafflement. Perry-Mason-style, the prosecutors then pulled out a photograph of the tie. Clinton was said to have

indicated that it was possible she had given it to him but that he certainly was not trying to communicate anything by wearing it. The exchange was said to have provided a rare light moment in a grueling session.

But the tie has meant a lot to Ms. Lewinsky, who has looked at television reports to see if the president was wearing it. In June, Ms. Lewinsky had noticed that Clinton had worn the tie she had given him on three occasions in recent months: on the day he left for his trip to China, the day he returned from China and several days later, in Atlanta.

Ms. Lewinsky had given Clinton six ties during their 18-month relationship, which began in November 1995.

In a brief speech on Monday night, Clinton contradicted his previous denials and acknowledged that he had had a relationship with Ms. Lewinsky that was "not appropriate" and "wrong." That night, Ms. Lewinsky's friends were dismayed that he seemed to send her no signals whatsoever.

He wore a patterned blue tie, of undetermined provenance.

Former Clinton Friend Files Suit

Monday, August 17, 1998; 9:34 p.m. EDT

WASHINGTON (AP) -- A longtime female acquaintance of President Clinton, who previously said the two had a sexual relationship, contended in a lawsuit Monday that Clinton and associates took action to prevent her from publishing a ``semi-autobiographical" novel.

The lawsuit, by Clinton high school classmate Dolly Kyle Browning, was filed in U.S. District Court while the president was testifying by closed-circuit television to a federal grand jury in the Monica Lewinsky investigation.

According to the lawsuit, Clinton ``acting personally and through various agents, sought to prevent Mrs. Browning's book from being published in ways which included ... defaming and disparaging Mrs. Browning and her book" and ``threatening Mrs. Browning and potential publishers of the book."

Mrs. Browning's defamation suit also named as defendants The New Yorker Magazine and one of its reporters, Jane Mayer. The lawsuit contended the magazine and reporter acted with malice, saying a 1997 article by Ms. Mayer defamed Mrs. Browning and contributed to her inability to get her book published.

White House press aides did not immediately return calls seeking comment.

Floyd Abrams, representing the magazine and Ms. Mayer, issued a statement calling the lawsuit "utterly without merit" and said it "will be vigorously contested."

The never-published book by Mrs. Browning, who lives in Dallas, is about a female character who has a long-standing sexual relationship with the governor of a southern state.

Mrs. Browning previously spoke about an alleged affair with Clinton in a deposition that was part of Paula Jones' sexual harassment lawsuit last March.

In his own deposition in the Jones case, Clinton acknowledged a long friendship with Mrs. Browning, which dates to when they were children in Hot Springs, Ark. But he denied they had a sexual relationship and said Mrs. Browning was "mad at me because I'd never been her lover."

Clinton Speech: GOP Not Satisfied

CNN All Politics 8/18/98

One Republican called President Bill Clinton a "jerk," and another urged him to resign in the aftermath of Clinton's speech admitting that his relationship with Monica Lewinsky was "not appropriate," but denying he lied under oath. Meantime, many Democrats stayed silent, although Vice President Al Gore said he was proud of Clinton for having the courage to admit a mistake.

Republicans control both houses of Congress, where any impeachment proceedings would be decided. Some said they reserved judgment on whether Clinton had now told the whole truth and would wait to see what Independent Counsel Ken Starr says in his report to Congress.

But some Republicans took offense at the portion of Clinton's speech attacking Starr.

Here's a sampling of reaction from both parties:

Vice President Al Gore

"I am honored to work with this great president on his agenda to the nation, and I believe that it's time to put this matter behind us, once and for all, and move forward with the business of the United States of America," Gore said in a statement from Hawaii where he is vacationing.

Former Vice President Dan Quayle

Calling for Clinton to resign, Quayle told ABC "the president should put the country's interests before his own."

Sen. John Ashcroft (R-Mo.)

"I don't think the president explained his behavior. He used a new set of phrases. We have another set of words." Ashcroft also said he was "disappointed in his implicit attack on Ken Starr and in his trying to deflect responsibility."

Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah)

"I think it was an appropriate confession and an appropriate way to speak to the American people," said Hatch, who chairs the Senate Judiciary Committee.

But Hatch also told CNN he was "really offended when he (Clinton) started to attack Ken Starr at the end. If I hear another Democrat complaining about the \$40 million (spent on the probe) I am going to blow my cork ... It is really offensive."

"Wasn't that pathetic? I tell you, what a jerk," Hatch was overheard saying as he left a television studio in Utah.

Rep. Bill McCollum (R-Fla.)

"I thought the president did everything he could to deflect attention from himself as he's been doing throughout this process," said McCollum, a member of the House Judiciary Committee where impeachment proceedings -- if they occur -- would originate. "If (Clinton) lied under oath (in the Paula Jones sexual harassment lawsuit),

I would find it very hard not to vote for impeachment," he told CNN.

Rep. Bob Barr (R-Ga.)

"I'm interested in the evidence, not in what the president wants us to believe," said Barr, who led an attempt to impeach Clinton after the Lewinsky case surfaced in January. "We have a president who says, 'I am a liar. I am a perjurer.' That puts him in a very weak position internationally."

Sen. Arlen Specter (R-Pa.)

(160 K/11 sec. AIFF or WAV sound) "It was rhetorically very powerful but not a speech we can accept at face value. There's a lot of wiggle room on the issue of perjury, which needs a lot of technical analysis."

House Speaker Newt Gingrich

Gingrich was subdued, saying he had "no impressions" of the speech. He said any speculation about the case would be "premature" until Congress receives a report from Starr. Gingrich said there is a "much bigger story here and history will prove that it was best to wait for the report."

House Democratic leader Dick Gephardt

Gephardt said he "cannot condone the relationship the president has acknowledged and I am very disappointed in his personal conduct." But he said he hoped the investigation would

come to a quick close and
the Congress and the White House could return to business.

Said Gephardt: "I am gratified that the president has given his testimony to the grand jury and his explanation
to the American people. I cannot condone the relationship the president has acknowledged and I am very
dissappointed in his personal conduct.

"I do, however, respect the responsibility he has taken for his action and I am hopeful he and his family can
find the peace and privacy they will need to see them through what must be a very painful time in their lives,"

Gephardt said. "It is my most fervent hope for the nation that this investigation can be brought to its long
overdue conclusion, and that in the days ahead, the president and the Congress can pour our energies into a
meaningful agenda for the country."

Rep. John Lewis (D-Ga.)

No president in the history of the nation has been subjected to this "kind of investigation and invasion of
privacy as this president," Lewis said. "We have all made mistakes. None of us is perfect," he said. "The
president has accepted responsibility for his actions and it is now time to ... focus on the issues the American
people have elected us to address."

Sen. Tom Harkin (D-Iowa)

"We are all human. We all make mistakes -- even a president. Most Americans share my belief that it's in our
best interests to put this behind us and move on," Harkin said.

Rep. Barney Frank (D-Mass.)

Frank said he approves of the president's policies, even though he disapproves of his personal behavior. "He
owed the people an apology and he gave it," Frank said. "No matter what he said before, I cannot believe that
would rise under any definition to perjury or impeachment."

Rep. James Traficant, Jr. (D-Ohio)

Sounding skeptical, Traficant told Fox: "If the president lied tonight... I am a Democrat that will vote for
impeachment."

Clinton Critics Attack Television Address

The Washington Times 8/18/98

Denying that he committed perjury and stopping short of admitting to sex with Monica Lewinsky, President Clinton says he nonetheless takes responsibility for a relationship that was "wrong," and believes it is time to move on.

But some congressional critics weren't satisfied and bridled at Clinton's attack on special prosecutor Kenneth Starr, who, sources say, may try to force the president to give fuller answers in a second grand jury appearance.

In a precedent-setting day for the American presidency, Clinton first gave testimony Monday in which he refused to answer specific questions about his relationship with Lewinsky, a former White House intern.

Then, he told the nation in a brief, forceful television address that Starr's investigation had "gone on too long, cost too much and hurt too many innocent people.

"This matter is between me, the two people I love most - my wife and our daughter - and our God," Clinton said.

Initial reaction from both Republicans and Democrats was mixed.

Senate Judiciary Chairman Orrin Hatch, R-Utah, expressed anger at the president's attacks on Starr. "Wasn't that pathetic? I tell you, what a jerk," Hatch was overheard saying Monday night to his entourage as he left a television studio in Utah where he had given a number of interviews.

Still, Hatch said the president's expression of regret may be enough to persuade lawmakers to stop any possible impeachment inquiry if prosecutors did not find evidence of obstruction of justice.

Rep. Barney Frank, D-Mass., said he believed Clinton may have done enough to stave off impeachment. "He owed the people an apology and he gave it," Frank said. "No matter what he said before, I cannot believe that would rise under any definition to perjury or impeachment."

Early polls were solidly in Clinton's favor, with around 60% of people in a CBS/New York Times survey taken just after the speech saying they were satisfied with the president's statement and 40% not satisfied. About 60% said the matter should now be dropped. Sixty-nine percent of those in an ABC News poll said the investigation should end.

However, a USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup Poll found Clinton's favorable rating plunged from 60% to 40% and a 46 plurality said they did not believe Clinton had told the whole truth in testifying. But 72% said the country would be better off if he stays in office and his job-approval rating held steady at 62 percent.

Although Starr is in the final stages of his investigation of an alleged presidential affair and cover-up, his grand jury is still at work and was

to hear testimony Tuesday from former Clinton political adviser Dick Morris.

The president and his family, meanwhile, were due to leave this afternoon for a vacation at Martha's Vineyard in Massachusetts.

Wearing a dark business suit and standing in the same Map Room where he had testified via video camera hours earlier, Clinton said in his TV address that he disputed the most serious charges against him.

"I told the grand jury today and I say to you now that at no time did I ask anyone to lie, to hide or destroy evidence or to take any other unlawful action," the president said.

Seven months ago in the Paula Jones lawsuit, Clinton denied having sexual relations with Lewinsky. "My answers were legally accurate," Clinton said in Monday's TV address. *(That is a lie. He said he barely new Lewinsky and had met her only two or three times. He met and called her over 75 times. For peat sake he had sex with her. How is that legally accurate?)*

But now he says he "did have a relationship with Lewinsky that was not appropriate. In fact, it was wrong. It constituted a critical lapse in judgment and a personal failure on my part for which I am solely and completely responsible."

One source familiar with White House thinking, speaking on condition of anonymity, said **lawyers both inside and outside the White House advising Clinton worried that Clinton's insistence his earlier testimony was "legally accurate" might become "an invitation to Starr and Republicans to hammer away at every word at the deposition to disprove" it.**

Prosecutors reserved the right to call Clinton back for more testimony, sources said. And his dramatic reversal of his earlier denial in the Jones sexual harassment lawsuit left even his own advisers worried about whether he lost credibility that would affect his ability to govern, especially with impeachment proceedings still possible.

"I think we witnessed the effective end of the Clinton presidency," said Sen. John Ashcroft, R-Mo., a potential presidential candidate. "I think his effectiveness as president is over. His moral authority is gone."

Lewinsky has detailed an alleged sexual relationship with the president in her own grand jury testimony, and she has turned over a dress she told prosecutors may have been stained from sex with Clinton.

The president's refusal to answer explicit questions about the nature of his contacts may prevent prosecutors from determining whether he committed perjury when he testified in the Jones case.

Prosecutors told Clinton's lawyers they would have to review the president's answers before deciding whether to seek additional testimony, the sources said. "There is some small chance he might be back," one source said.

Who's Who

The Washington Times 8/18/98

New York Post columnist Steve Dunleavy says **"it would take a village idiot to believe that Hillary didn't know about Monica, Gennifer or the Jane Does over the years."**

The columnist believes the first lady stands by her man because of her "burning ambition as queen of the Hill."

As evidence, Mr. Dunleavy points to an odd fact dug up by a researcher at his newspaper: In the 1997 "Who's Who in America," on page 786, Bill Clinton accords himself a biography about 1-and-a-half inches deep; Mrs. Clinton, on the other hand, devotes 3-and-a-half inches to her accomplishments.

Dramatic Clinton Admission Leaves Impeachment Possible

The Washington Times 8/18/98

President Clinton's dramatic mea culpa still does not clear him of the potential threat of impeachment by lawmakers, many of whom yesterday expressed disgust, disappointment and shame.

Although many Republicans in Congress applauded the president for trying to clarify the truth with the American people and his family, they said his admission to the grand jury only affirmed that he lied under oath seven months ago when he denied having a sexual relationship with Monica Lewinsky.

"When the president announces that he not only lied publicly but also under oath, it draws into serious question his credibility," Rep. Christopher Cox, California Republican, said. "The logical follow-up question is, 'How much of the rest can be believed?'"

"One who had the dignity to spare the nation all of this might resign, but such a person would not have done this in the first place," Mr. Cox added, but said, "Given what it is the president has lied about, it jeopardizes far more the dignity of the office than his legal standing in office."

Despite his harsh questions about Mr. Clinton's integrity, however, Mr. Cox, a former White House counsel to President Reagan, said he would reserve judgment on whether the president should be impeached until he reviews the report that independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr is expected to send Congress.

Other Republicans who serve on the House Judiciary Committee, the panel that would decide whether to bring formal impeachment charges against Mr. Clinton, were more

adamant that perjury is, in fact, an impeachable offense.

"If this president or any president is found to be guilty of perjury, it's clearly an impeachable offense," said Rep. Bob Inglis, South Carolina Republican.

Mr. Inglis said if Mr. Clinton is proven to have committed perjury, he should resign, and if he does not, he should be impeached. "I cannot imagine having an admitted perjurer continue to serve as president of the United States," he said. Sen. John Ashcroft, Missouri Republican, also suggested the president should "seriously consider" resigning.

The chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Rep.

Henry J. Hyde, Illinois Republican, has said previously that "impeachment might very well be an option" for Congress to pursue. Yesterday, however, he said nothing, waiting instead for Mr. Starr to send his report.

Under the Independent Counsel law, Mr. Starr is mandated to forward to the House any "substantial and credible" evidence of an impeachable offense by any individual covered under the law -- in this case, the president. Mr. Hyde has said his panel will review the evidence and then decide whether to seek approval from the full House to proceed with impeachment hearings.

Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Orrin G. Hatch said he would not push for impeachment simply because the president lied.

"I'm one of those people that does not want impeachment, if he tells the truth and if it's not more serious," the Utah Republican said.

But he criticized Mr. Clinton's defenders who have argued his affair with Miss Lewinsky was acceptable because it was consensual.

"What's our country coming to?" asked Mr. Hatch. "The most powerful man in the world and a 21-year-old intern -- consensual or not, it's still abysmal if it happened."

Yesterday's reaction tended to foreshadow the kind of partisanship that would prevail if the House Judiciary Committee moves forward with hearings.

Rep. Robert C. Scott, a Virginia Democrat who serves on the Judiciary panel, said he did not believe the president's change in story represented an impeachable offense, mainly because Mr. Clinton's previous testimony that he never had an affair with Miss Lewinsky was given during a civil case, the Paula Jones sexual harassment suit, which was subsequently thrown out of court.

"There was never a provable case of perjury," Mr. Scott said. "I don't think there's any impeachable act unless he lied under oath today" in his testimony before the grand jury.

CNN 8/11/98

Team Would Make Impeachment Inquiry

By LARRY MARGASAK
Associated Press Writer

WASHINGTON (AP) -- David P. Schippers, chief investigator for the House Judiciary Committee, could hardly be called a Republican partisan if he ends up spearheading an impeachment investigation of President Clinton.

That's because he's a Democrat.

Chosen by committee Chairman Henry Hyde, R-Ill., Schippers and Hyde have known each other since they served together on a panel investigating judicial corruption and other crime issues in Illinois nearly 30 years ago.

Schippers, 68, a former federal prosecutor in Chicago who specialized in convicting top mobsters, heads a nine-member investigative team working for majority committee Republicans. All nine are current and former investigators and prosecutors in Chicago who have handled everything from racketeering and gang violence to sexual harassment.

The team is working on a top-to-bottom review of the Justice Department, but would instantly become impeachment investigators if Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr submits a report of possible impeachable acts by Clinton.

"They wouldn't have to change their shirts," Schippers said of his new staff.

Ranking Democrat John Conyers of Michigan also has added to his investigative staff, naming veteran Washington defense attorney Abbe Lowell to head a five-member team. Conyers said team members will be "more than capable to handle any independent counsel report, if one should come."

In 1973, Schippers was the co-author of an article that reviewed the impeachment inquiry against President Nixon and concluded the evidence suggested that Nixon may have been guilty of subornation of perjury (asking someone to lie

under oath) and obstruction of justice.

Those are two of the possible offenses Starr is investigating, along with perjury. He is trying to determine whether

Clinton lied when he denied a sexual relationship with Monica Lewinsky in the Paula Jones sexual harassment lawsuit

against him, and whether he also encouraged her to lie. She denied an affair with the president in the Jones case but,

according to sources familiar with her testimony, she told a grand jury last week she had a sexual relationship with

Clinton.

A Starr ally, who spoke over the weekend on condition of anonymity, said final decisions have not been made but that

any impeachment report would be expected to focus on possible perjury and obstruction of justice involving Clinton's

relationship with Ms. Lewinsky.

Schippers, a gregarious man with a salt-and-pepper beard, clearly enjoys talking about his mob-fighting days in the

1960s, when he put people such as crime boss Sam Giancana in prison.

Schippers made use of a little-known tactic at the time giving a witness blanket immunity from prosecution, forcing him

to appear before a grand jury and asking a judge to lock him up when he refused to testify.

"The Justice Department people all thought I was crazy," Schippers said.

Giancana was imprisoned for a year after he asserted his Fifth Amendment rights and refused to testify.

Schippers would not comment on how he would handle an impeachment inquiry. But he said that in his days as a Justice

Department attorney he would have prosecuted perjury in a civil case if it had come up.

"It never occurred where I was investigating," he said. "But if I had a case of provable perjury, I would have indicted them."

Prosecutions based on perjury in civil cases are not common.

Schippers and his staff would review and analyze a report for the House, which then would have to decide whether to

authorize the Judiciary Committee to conduct impeachment proceedings.

If the committee later approved articles of impeachment, the Senate would conduct a trial.

As a private lawyer in Chicago, Schippers has represented white-collar defendants as well as federal agents who kicked in doors of innocent people in Illinois looking for drug suspects. But he said he would never represent "hoodlums and drug peddlers."

"I have 10 kids and 25 grandchildren," he said. "I don't want any part of (drug dealers)."

"As for 'the Outfit,'" as Schippers calls the mob, "we had a mutual hatred."

One organized crime figure even asked Schippers, by then in private practice, to represent one of the mobsters he had indicted, he said.

"I said, 'What, are you nuts?'" Then he threw the man out of his office.

Richardson offered Monica a U.N. job that didn't exist

By Bill Sammon
THE WASHINGTON TIMES 8/10/98

.N. Ambassador Bill Richardson, contrary to what he told Congress last month, did not have an opening on his staff when he offered to hire Monica Lewinsky last October, according to informed sources and documents obtained by The Washington Times.

Mr. Richardson, who was recently confirmed as President Clinton's new energy secretary, planned to create a new position to accommodate Miss Lewinsky's desire for employment in New York City, said sources at the United Nations, the State Department and on Capitol Hill. He panicked when the scandal broke in January and scrambled to find a slot that he could claim had existed long before he interviewed Miss Lewinsky, the sources said.

Despite Mr. Richardson's repeated, sworn assertions, he did not create the position until after independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr served him with a subpoena demanding all documents relating to the job offer. Mr. Starr is trying to determine whether the offer was aimed at distancing Miss Lewinsky and keeping her quiet about her relationship with Mr.

Clinton.

"I've heard all this speculation before," said Mr. Richardson's chief of staff, Rebecca Cooper. "Luckily, what allows me to go to sleep at night is knowing that none of this is true."

Mr. Richardson did not return telephone calls, but during his confirmation hearing on July 22, he told the Senate panel that the job he offered to Miss Lewinsky was a low-level, \$30,000 position in New York. After she turned it down, the job was given to U.N. employee Paul Aronsohn, a senior staffer who has handled such high-level issues as nuclear disarmament and the U.N. arrears controversy.

Mr. Aronsohn, who has worked in the U.N.'s political section for four years, is paid substantially more than \$30,000 and was transferred to Washington weeks before Mr. Richardson's testimony, Miss Cooper said.

Explained his spokesman, Calvin Mitchell: "The ambassador is not a personnel officer. He is not to sit in front of the Senate and answer questions off people's personnel files. And he described, in his mind, what the job was to him and how it was perceived and how it was going to function."

Nonetheless, the discrepancies raise serious questions about the veracity of sworn testimony by Mr. Richardson, who until now has been a peripheral figure in the Lewinsky scandal. They also suggest that Mr. Richardson took steps to conceal special treatment he afforded a woman who is telling a grand jury about her relationship with the president.

An 'existing slot'?

Monica Lewinsky was not a household name when Mr. Richardson was asked by White House Deputy Chief of Staff John Podesta to interview "this person" in October, the ambassador testified.

"He did not even know her name when he asked me to interview her," Mr. Richardson testified. "I did not know her name."

The request originated with Betty Currie, the president's personal secretary, who relayed it to Mr. Richardson through his friend, Mr. Podesta, according to testimony by Mr. Richardson before the Energy and Natural Resources Committee.

But Mr. Richardson agreed to interview the former White House intern in his Watergate apartment at 7:30 a.m. He left in the middle of the interview,

leaving Miss Cooper and an assistant to finish up, so he could go to the White House for a meeting.

Within a week, Mr. Richardson instructed his staff to offer the job to Miss Lewinsky. After taking some time to think about it, she declined.

In offering Miss Lewinsky a job, Mr. Richardson did not follow hiring procedures normally used at the U.S. Mission at the United Nations, which include advertising a position and recruiting several qualified candidates. Within hours after the scandal broke on Jan. 21, reporters demanded to know whether such procedures had been followed.

Miss Cooper and Mr. Mitchell responded by publicly stating that if Miss Lewinsky had accepted the job offer, she would have been a "schedule-C" employee, or political appointee. On Jan. 26, five days after the scandal broke, Mr. Richardson's office issued an "administrative instruction" to all employees that said "the usual procedures" for hiring and reassigning "do not apply" to political appointees.

Mr. Mitchell said last week that he does not know whether the instruction represented a departure from previous policy.

"Everyone from the highest official to the lowest mail clerk instantly knew this was about Monica Lewinsky," said one source close to the case. "I mean, this just came out of nowhere. It was obvious that Richardson's people were trying to retroactively cover their tracks."

On Feb. 2, a team of inspectors from the State Department's Office of Inspector General (OIG) showed up at Mr. Richardson's New York offices to conduct a routine audit of management practices. They immediately told U.N. employees that the mission's political branch was significantly understaffed, especially in comparison to the overstaffed press office, according to OIG spokeswoman Tamara Faulkner.

Nonetheless, while the inspectors were still conducting their audit at the New York offices in February, Mr. Aronsohn was inexplicably transferred from the political section to the press section, Miss Faulkner said.

"OIG was surprised during the inspection when an officer was transferred out of the overworked political section and assigned to ... outreach programs" in the press office, the team of inspectors wrote in a report

that was issued in May. "This was done even though the press and public affairs section already has 12 employees, several of whom specialize in public outreach.

"The move does not make sense organizationally, because it created a duplication in outreach responsibilities. There is also the question of the impact of the move on the already overstretched political section."

During his testimony before the Senate committee, Mr. Richardson said there was "no relationship whatsoever" between creation of a public outreach job in the U.N.'s press section and his decision to offer that job to Miss Lewinsky.

"It was an existing slot," Mr. Richardson testified. "It was not created for anybody."

He added: "This position was created way before I established my tenure at the United Nations, so it was with prior ambassadors to the United Nations. It was an existing slot."

Sen. Frank H. Murkowski, chairman of the committee, said: "Who, if anyone, now holds that particular position?"

"The position is held by Paul Aronsohn," Mr. Richardson said.

"And he was offered the position after Ms. Lewinsky?" the Alaska Republican said.

"Yes," Mr. Richardson said. "He was offered the position in January. And he assumed the position."

Mr. Richardson did not explain why the job was not offered to Mr. Aronsohn until three months after it was offered to Miss Lewinsky. Nor did he attempt to reconcile his assertion that the slot existed before October with the OIG's assertion that the slot was not transferred from the political office to the press office until February.

'A fungible slot'

Miss Cooper and Mr. Mitchell gave complex, convoluted explanations of the Lewinsky job offer, often contradicting themselves and each other. For example, at one point during a lengthy interview, Miss Cooper said: "The job that I wanted to fill was one that never existed." At other times she insisted Mr. Richardson was correct when he testified the job had previously existed.

"It's a fungible slot," Miss Cooper said. "You can trace a slot, but you can't say this person held that

particular position because the position has evolved."

Nonetheless, Miss Cooper offered the following explanation:

Miss Lewinsky was actually not offered the slot now held by Mr. Aronsohn, Miss Cooper said. She was actually offered a separate slot in the media wing that had been occupied by a secretary named Regina Griego, who departed around the time Miss Lewinsky was interviewed.

Miss Cooper said she split Miss Griego's job into two new slots --one to handle clerical duties, which included answering phones, and another to handle "public outreach" duties.

Miss Griego's clerical duties were taken over by a "contract secretary" who was moved from New York to Washington, Miss Cooper said. The slot for Miss Griego's "public outreach" duties remains unfilled to this day, Miss Cooper said.

When Mr. Aronsohn was transferred from the political section to the press section in February, his slot was also transferred, Miss Cooper said. Thus, he was able to take over Miss Griego's public outreach duties -- which had been offered to Miss Lewinsky -- without actually filling the slot that had been designated for that purpose.

In essence, according to Miss Cooper, the position that Miss Griego vacated was the same position that Mr. Aronsohn filled -- and the same one that was offered to Miss Lewinsky. Still, she acknowledged the job descriptions for Miss Griego and Mr. Aronsohn, which she refused to disclose, are as dissimilar as "apples and oranges."

Asked why this was not explained by Mr. Richardson to the Senate committee, Miss Cooper said: "It's such a nuance. What the senators were focused on -- I mean, I gotta tell you ... you're kind of getting into things that are really splitting hairs."

Government personnel experts scoffed at the notion that Miss Griego -- who had enough clerical duties to keep the secretary who replaced her occupied on a full-time basis -- was replaced by the far-more-experienced Mr. Aronsohn.

"It was a low-level position that paid around \$30,000," said Mr. Richardson, who added later in the hearing: "Again, it was a low-level position."

Still later, he emphasized: "This was a position that was not a very high-level position."

Miss Cooper said "Paul Aronsohn makes much more" than what Miss Lewinsky was offered, and was recently given a significant pay raise. She also said he gets other compensation that Mr. Richardson was not able to offer Miss Lewinsky, but refused to be more specific.

Mr. Mitchell, while acknowledging Mr. Aronsohn's salary is a matter of public record, refused to disclose it to The Washington Times. Mr. Aronsohn also refused to tell a reporter how much he makes.

"Paul Aronsohn's now feeling a little bit down because he feels like everyone now perceives him as the guy who got the job Monica turned down," Miss Cooper said. "Well, Paul has far more experience than that and he shouldn't view himself that way. People who held this job previously shouldn't regard themselves as the people who held the Monica slot. The job has evolved."

A New York slot

During his hearing, Mr. Richardson took pains to emphasize the importance of keeping the job in question in New York, even after it was shifted from the political section to the press section. The job had been considered by Miss Lewinsky primarily because she wanted to move from Washington to New York.

Later in the hearing, Mr. Richardson said his desire for a New York-based outreach employee predated his meeting with Miss Lewinsky.

"We wanted it way before we even thought of her," Mr. Richardson said. "Move it to New York, because that's where most of the business and constituency groups are. And we stand behind our decision -- we filled the position."

But according to Miss Cooper, Mr. Richardson had transferred Mr. Aronsohn from New York to Washington in early July. She said the ambassador would have explained this to the senators "had they followed up on it. It's really splitting hairs at this point. I mean, I think I would have been annoyed if I were a committee member and Ambassador Richardson digressed into: 'Well, right now he's in Washington because he didn't want to sign a year lease [in New York] and his wife is looking to move here.'"

She added: "The job description you can do from just about anywhere, as long as you have instant lines of communication."

Jobs for silence?

Mr. Richardson's re-emergence in the Lewinsky scandal refocuses attention on one of the central aspects of the case -- whether Mr. Clinton and his associates tried to buy her silence through the promise of jobs. After turning down Mr. Richardson's offer, Miss Lewinsky was offered a job at Revlon in New York, thanks to the intercession of presidential friend Vernon E. Jordan Jr., who is on Revlon's board of directors.

Contempt for Truth

The Washington Times 8/7/98

"Bill Clinton was never about dignity or integrity or respect for others, qualities that should be prerequisites for the presidency," writes New York Times columnist Bob Herbert.

"He raised hopes with his style and his rhetoric, but it turned out there was very little that was authentic about the man. His contempt for the truth is legendary. His idea of ethical behavior is to operate as close as possible to the borders of corruption. His treatment of women, as the world knows, seemed at times both compulsive and atrocious, and became a source of profound embarrassment to the feminists who supported him so strongly," Mr. Herbert wrote.

"Although he is nearly 52, Bill Clinton seems the perpetual adolescent, forever calling on aides and friends to clean up the messes he is forever getting himself into."

The columnist added: "The lesson, of course, is that character does matter. The voters will probably remember that the next time around. In the meantime, Mr. Clinton may or may not be contemplating a mea culpa. It doesn't matter. It wouldn't be any more sincere than anything else he has said. If he had any sense of dignity or personal responsibility, he'd be working on his resignation."

Elusive preparation

White House spokesman Michael McCurry is on vacation, which means Barry J. Toiv, Mr. McCurry's deputy, is this week's stand-up comic. "Good afternoon," Mr. Toiv greeted reporters yesterday. "You're 15 minutes late," observer one. "Hey, I am sorry," said the spokesman. "It is not easy getting up here and saying nothing. It takes a lot of preparation."

Woman Who Disputed Willey Is Indicted

Richmond Resident Accused of False Testimony Regarding Alleged Oval Office Groping
Washington Post January 8, 1999

A Richmond woman who disputed former White House volunteer Kathleen E. Willey's account of an unwanted sexual advance by President Clinton was indicted yesterday on charges of making false statements and obstructing justice in independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr's investigation.

Julie Hiatt Steele, a tangential figure in the Monica S. Lewinsky saga, is accused of giving false testimony to grand juries in D.C. and Alexandria about what Willey told her of a November 1993 incident involving Clinton Steele also is accused of trying to influence the testimony of two friends to whom she allegedly related details of Willey's Oval Office visit.

The Unforgiven

The Washington Times 8/9/98

Sen. Orrin G. Hatch, Utah Republican, suggested this week that President Clinton would be forgiven if he decides to confess to an affair with Monica Lewinsky and apologize for lying about it.

"But what mercy has the White House shown to others? None," USA Today observes in an editorial.

"Future witnesses against any president can only hesitate to come forward, considering how the White House quickly moved to impugn the reputation of both Kathleen Willey, who had testified in a deposition that Clinton groped her, and Linda Tripp, whose taped conversations with [Monica] Lewinsky led [independent counsel Kenneth W.] Starr to investigate in the first place."

Mr. Starr and his staff "likewise have been vilified," the newspaper said.

"If the president lied, all of them were wrongfully maligned."

Fearing the Worst

The Washington Times 8/6/98

One of Geraldo Rivera's friends at the White House hears that lab tests did indeed uncover genetic material on that famous dress owned by Monica Lewinsky.

Mr. Rivera, one of President Clinton's top defenders in the media, said on his CNBC program Tuesday night:

"Just a half hour ago, I spoke to one source very close to the president, who indicated that Mr. Clinton is still, quote, 'In pretty good spirits,' and giving no indication that he's going to change his story. But my source cautioned me: 'That doesn't mean he's not going to.' This very trusted source, who has never misled me, then lobbed this bombshell, quote, 'One lab says it's positive' ... meaning there is human genetic material present on the dress. My source added, finally, in a wistful, almost heartbroken voice, quote, 'I fear the worst.'"

Leno's Line

The Washington Times 8/6/98

"Now, according to The Washington Times, Monica Lewinsky has turned over phone messages in which President Clinton said that he missed her," Jay Leno said this week on NBC's "Tonight" show. "That's what he said, He 'missed her.' ... Well, if that dress is any indication, he didn't miss her by much."

Odd Debate

The Washington Times 8/6/98

"We are so accustomed to watching the Clinton White House swing into blindly aggressive spin that it no longer seems odd that advisers are having a big debate about whether or not the president should tell the truth," writes New York Times columnist Maureen Dowd.

"They are checking their poll numbers, taking the pulse of Democrats on the Hill, ferreting out inside information from the FBI crime lab, testing alternative scenarios -- perhaps, they desperately suggest, the DNA [on Monica Lewinsky's dress] resulted from the president brushing up against Monica during one of their 'official' interactions."

Clinton's Minefield

The Washington Times 8/3/98

NBC's Lisa Myers says she just reread the president's deposition in the Paula Jones sexual misconduct case -- with all his denials of sexual improprieties with Monica Lewinsky and other women -- and sees it as a "literal minefield."

Interviewed yesterday on "Meet the Press," Miss Myers said she believes Independent Counsel Kenneth W. Starr not only has "strong evidence the president perjured himself" about his relationship with Miss Lewinsky but also has "evidence indicating subornation of perjury and obstruction of justice."

She questioned how Mr. Clinton will be able to stick to his story, given all that evidence.

Former Clinton spokesman David Gergen, who was also on the show, says that if the president "did have an inappropriate relationship" with Miss Lewinsky, "I think he'll tell the truth" when he provides grand jury testimony on Aug. 17.

Mr. Gergen said he believes Mr. Clinton will do that to spare the country the specter of impeachment hearings. "I wish he'd come forward a long time ago," he said.

The Real Scandal

The Washington Times 8/3/98

You'll never convince Sen. John McCain that the Monica Lewinsky scandal is the scandal in Washington right now.

"The scandal in Washington is not the Monica Lewinsky scandal. I believe the scandal in Washington, D.C., is the abuse and debasement of the institutions of government by this administration in order to re-elect President Clinton and Vice President Gore in 1996," the Arizona Republican said Saturday on CNN's "Evans, Novak, Hunt & Shields."

Mr. McCain added: "And we now are treated to the most

unusual situation I think we've seen in American political history, and that is the attorney general of the United States -- after the director of the FBI and the person that she appointed to investigate these campaign finance abuses strongly recommended that she appoint an independent counsel -- has refused to do so. That's the scandal in Washington, in my view."

Warren Harding apparently can sleep easy because, Mr. McCain says, "we had the worst conduct of any presidency that I know of in the institution in the way that they went about raising money to re-elect the president in 1996."

The senator cited "terrible abuses" such as "selling trade-mission seats" and "\$50,000-a-night sleepovers in the Lincoln bedroom with the president of the United States acting as a bellhop."

"That's why I'm disappointed that the Lewinsky scandal overshadows what the real scandal is," said Mr. McCain, who sponsored unsuccessful campaign finance reform legislation.

As for Attorney General Janet Reno's refusal to seek an independent counsel to probe campaign finance practices, the GOP senator held that she is "not carrying out her duties under the Constitution," and he wants congressional hearings to find out why.

Look out, Monica

The Washington Times 7/31/98

"The violent demolition of Monica Lewinsky's character and reputation is about to begin," writes New York Post columnist Ray Kerrison.

"If Judge Clarence Thomas thought he had it rough, if Robert Bork thinks he was mugged, if Newt Gingrich thought he was ambushed, it will be as nothing compared with the artillery the White House is about to fire at Monica Lewinsky," the columnist said.

"It is President Clinton's last hope. He has been pinned to the wall. His only way out is to smash Monica Lewinsky, to depict her as a liar and perjurer, strip her of all credibility.

"Fasten your seat belts. It's going to be a rough ride."

Look out, Monica II

Los Angeles Times columnist Mike Downey on Wednesday gave Monica Lewinsky a taste of what she might expect in the days ahead from Clinton supporters and the White House attack machine.

"We are at last going to see what Lewinsky is made of, see

whether she is someone who will sell a confidant down the river, which would make her every bit as much an injudicious Judas as that gum-flapping back-stabber Linda Tripp," Mr. Downey said.

"Because it took two to tango, so if Lewinsky and the philanderer of Pennsylvania Avenue did meet behind closed doors for an unspecified number of afternoon delights, she would transmogrify from a mistress into a monster should she save her own hide by betraying his. Better to be a siren than a snitch."

To Tell the Truth

The Washington Times 7/31/98

"The desire for a president who can be believed and who can govern in an undistracted way is growing," the New York Times says.

"One measure of that could be found in the panel assembled on Tuesday by ABC's 'Nightline.' It consisted of Lanny Davis, the most loyal defender of Mr. Clinton's conduct in office; George Stephanopoulos, who helped put him there; and David Gergen, who was hired to organize Mr. Clinton's first term. Their unanimity on Mr. Clinton's needs as to political survival and his obligations to the American people was striking," the newspaper said in an editorial.

"I think it's time for him to come forward,' said Mr. Davis. Mr. Gergen added that the president 'ought to take charge of his own defense' and 'tell the complete truth' in legal proceedings and then before the nation. 'It's absolutely essential. I think people still doubt his word. And he's having a hard time governing. This is his quagmire. This is becoming his Vietnam.' He added, 'I think if he doesn't tell the truth in this situation, if he's thought not to tell the truth, I think the rest of his presidency is going to be in serious peril.'"

Said Mr. Stephanopoulos: "He should do what he should have done six months ago: Come forward now, tell the truth, take responsibility."

Clinton Will Testify On Tape Aug. 17

The Washington Times 7/30/98

President Clinton will testify Aug. 17 on videotape in the Monica Lewinsky sex-and-lies investigation, ending 12 days of tense negotiations over a grand jury subpoena demanding the president's appearance.

Mr. Clinton's attorney, David E. Kendall, said the session, worked out in closed-door meetings with

independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr, will take place in the Map Room at the White House.

The agreement calls for the withdrawal of the July 17 grand jury subpoena and allows Mr. Kendall and other attorneys to be present for the testimony. It also saves Mr. Clinton the embarrassment of being the first president ever to testify under subpoena and in person before a federal grand jury in a criminal probe.

Meanwhile, two persons close to the probe said Miss Lewinsky's attorneys gave prosecutors a black dress that contains what one of the sources, who is a lawyer, described as "physical evidence that is important to the case."

Reports of a blue dress with a semen stain surfaced when the Lewinsky scandal broke in January. Her attorney at that time, William H. Ginsburg, who has since been replaced, dismissed those accounts as ridiculous.

At the same time, at the federal courthouse several blocks away, Linda R. Tripp broke a self-imposed six-month silence, rebuked her tormentors and described herself as a "suburban mom" who sought to tell the truth after she was "urged to commit a felony" and lie about sexual misconduct by the president.

Flanked by her children, Ryan and Allison, Mrs. Tripp told

reporters at the conclusion of eight days of testimony that she had been "cast aside for telling the truth" and "vilified" for trying to "fulfill my legal obligation" in reporting "actions of high government officials that may have been against the law."

"I am you, I am just like you," she said. "I am an average American who found herself in a situation not of her own making. I have been vilified for having taken the path of truth. I have been maligned by people who have chosen not to tell the truth and who know they are not telling the truth."

The Associated Press reported that senior White House aides said Mr. Clinton is prepared to stick by his denial of any sexual relations with Miss Lewinsky, which would contradict the testimony the former intern has promised to give to the grand jury.

Lawyers and others close to the probe said Mr. Starr is expected to wait until after Mr. Clinton testifies before he calls Miss Lewinsky, the independent counsel's newest cooperating witness. She will undergo debriefings over the next few weeks to prepare her for her grand jury appearance, which will be in person and at the courthouse.

Mr. Starr wants Mr. Clinton to answer questions on whether he had an affair with the former intern and whether he and others told her to lie about it in the Jones suit. The grand jury probe has centered on accusations of perjury, subornation of perjury and obstruction of justice.

Mr. Clinton promised when the scandal broke in January to

answer questions about his relationship with the former intern "sooner rather than later." Since then, however, he refused at least four requests from Mr. Starr to testify voluntarily.

"I think the president is going to want to take some time to prepare ... he will have some blocks of time available that he will spend with his lawyers, and I do anticipate that he'll have to spend some time with David [Kendall] and others preparing for his testimony," said a White House aide.

The White House was assured the testimony would last only one day.

Meanwhile, Miss Lewinsky continues to talk with prosecutors about the president's efforts to cover up a suspected sexual relationship. She has told prosecutors she spoke with Mr. Clinton on how to cover up a sexual relationship with the president. The discussions frame the possibility -- based on mounting circumstantial evidence -- that Mr. Clinton could be charged with obstruction of justice, the sources said.

The 25-year-old former White House intern described meetings at which the suspected cover-up was discussed and said Mr. Clinton suggested how she could testify in the Jones suit to deny the affair, the sources said. She also turned over tapes of messages Mr. Clinton left on her telephone, the sources said.

Miss Lewinsky, who reached a full immunity agreement with Mr. Starr on Tuesday in exchange for her grand jury testimony, told prosecutors Mr. Clinton also suggested:

She could explain away numerous Oval Office visits she had with the president by saying she actually came to visit his personal secretary, Betty Currie, who also was a friend.

She should consider moving to New York City, where the president's longtime friend and confidant Vernon E. Jordan Jr. had found her a job, to avoid having to testify at all in the Jones case.

She should arrange for the White House to retrieve gifts she received from Mr. Clinton, which were under subpoena, and those gifts could be returned directly to Mrs. Currie.

A source close to the former intern also said it should come as no surprise that she and the president discussed ways to keep the affair quiet.

"It wouldn't be unusual to have conversations such as, 'You know, when you come by, you're coming to see Betty.' I can't

confirm with certainty that they sat down and said, 'OK, we're both going to deny if this gets out and here are some of our cover stories.' I'm sure there were conversations about it, but I don't know what they were," the source said.

Miss Lewinsky, as part of her immunity deal, told Mr. Starr's office she had an affair with Mr. Clinton, which began when she was a 21-year-old intern, and that she lied in a sworn affidavit in the Jones case when she denied it.

The affidavit was filed after she met with Mr. Clinton Dec. 28 at the White House and after Mr. Jordan arranged for her to take a public relations position with Revlon Corp. in New York City, where he serves as a director.

Her disavowal of the affidavit could mean Mr. Clinton perjured himself in the Jones case when he testified Jan. 17 under oath he and Miss Lewinsky never were sexually involved.

Mr. Clinton will delay his planned Aug. 15-19 vacation to prepare but will probably leave for Martha's Vineyard immediately after his testimony, said an aide.

Mrs. Tripp said being victimized for telling the truth "is a pretty frightening thing." Her secret tapes of conversations with Miss Lewinsky detailed a long-standing sexual relationship between the former intern and Mr. Clinton and ignited the Lewinsky probe.

"Imagine how you would feel if your boss's attorney called you a liar in front of the whole country. Imagine if that boss was the president of the United States," she said, her voice cracking with emotion.

Mrs. Tripp said administration officials, in attempting to paint her as the villain, "enlisted legions of paid prevaricators," including the entertainment industry, to make fun of her "in a manner so mean and so cruel that I pray none of you is ever subjected to it."

She also vehemently denied that she had any part in preparing a three-page summary, or "talking points," on how to lie in the Paula Jones sexual misconduct lawsuit. Miss Lewinsky told prosecutors that Mrs. Tripp was the source of the document, which she merely typed.

"Allegations to the effect that I contributed to or assisted in any way with the creation of the talking points are as illogical as they are patently false," Mrs. Tripp said.

Did Lewinsky Write 'Talking Points'?

CNN 7/29/98

Now that she has received immunity from prosecution, Monica Lewinsky is prepared to testify that

she and President Bill Clinton discussed how to conceal their alleged sexual relationship, sources say.

Lewinsky's account to Independent Counsel Ken Starr's prosecutors is that "she and the president were talking about cover stories for their relationship, as two people in such situations frequently do; how to keep it secret," one source said Tuesday.

Two sources, an attorney and another person familiar with Lewinsky's conversations with prosecutors, also say Lewinsky claims she wrote the so-called "talking points" she gave her onetime friend Linda Tripp. The "talking points" suggested that Tripp lie in the Paula Jones sexual harassment case. Lewinsky says she penned the document after conversations with Tripp, sources say.

Tripp flatly denies that a conversation she had with Lewinsky led to the "talking points."

On her way into court on Wednesday Tripp was asked whether she was angry about the reports on the origins of the "talking points." "No, I'm not," she said.

When asked who did author the pivotal document, Tripp responded, "I wonder."

Presidential confidant Bruce Lindsey also made an appearance at the federal courthouse Wednesday afternoon. A three-judge appeals court panel ruled Monday that since Lindsey was a government lawyer and not the president's private attorney, he did not enjoy an attorney-client privilege with Clinton.

During his previous appearances before the Lewinsky grand jury, Lindsey had claimed that an attorney-client privilege prevented him from answering some of Starr's question about conversations with the president.

Several sources close to Clinton's legal team say the president plans to stick to his denial of a sexual relationship, no matter what the former White House intern says.

Starr won Lewinsky's cooperation while trying to enforce a subpoena or negotiate an arrangement for Clinton's own testimony.

A source close to the investigation says Starr is well aware his new star witness has a credibility problem. She has previously denied under oath any sexual relationship with the president.

That, the source says, is why Starr is building a meticulous documentary case of her White House visits and interactions with Clinton, including sending him letters and gifts. Starr hopes to bolster Lewinsky's credibility by proving that the rest of her story checks out, the source says.

White House aides have seized on Lewinsky's account of the "talking points" as good news, suggesting it proved the president and his lieutenants had nothing to do with the most obvious physical evidence of an effort to influence testimony in the Jones case.

But many allies of the president also reacted anxiously to word of Lewinsky's cooperation with prosecutors.

"It means we get asked a lot of the same questions over and over again. At a minimum it is more distraction at a much higher volume," one senior official said.

Two leading members of the Senate Judiciary Committee said Wednesday they hope Starr's investigation will conclude by the end of the summer.

"It's got to be more than just alleged sexual peccadilloes in the White House, and frankly all of us would like to get this over with," said Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah), the committee's chairman. "I'd be surprised if Ken Starr would allow this to go well into September."

"Wrap this sucker up," Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.) said at a joint news conference with Hatch. "After spending 40 million dollars, after requiring a lot of innocent bystanders to spend millions of dollars of their own money on legal fees, either wrap it up and send it to the Congress or go home."

What Lewinsky may say

In Lewinsky's upcoming appearance before Starr's grand jury, the former White House intern is not expected to accuse the president of directly urging her to lie about their relationship under oath.

But sources tell CNN she will provide information that could help Starr build a circumstantial case of obstruction of justice against Clinton. For example, Lewinsky is expected to:

Say she and the president discussed hypothetical questions she might be asked and possible answers designed to conceal their relationship.

Confirm the president told her that if she moved to New York, she might not have to testify in the Jones case.

Say she and the president agreed that one way to explain her frequent visits to the White House Oval Office would be to say she was going to see presidential secretary and friend Betty Currie.

Confirm the president told her to return gifts he gave her by turning them over to Currie. The assumption is that if the gifts were not in Lewinsky's possession, they could not be subpoenaed. The gifts

were returned.

Tripp calls for 'whole truth'

Tripp in the
recorded their
conversations, had earlier received immunity.

holding back
information.

of the truth,"
the truth but
to tell the whole truth."

Lewinsky may
only be a few weeks behind.

Lewinsky's parents 'relieved'

Lewinsky needs immunity from prosecution because she signed an affidavit in the Jones' sexual harassment case saying she did not have sexual relations with Clinton. Giving a different account to Starr would mean she would have committed perjury, a felony, in one account or the other.

Lewinsky's parents "are relieved their daughter is out of harm's way," said the family's spokeswoman, Judy Smith.

Lewinsky's mother, Marcia Lewis, also was granted immunity to protect her from prosecution stemming from mother-daughter conversations.

Lewinsky's first attorney congratulated her and her mother for reaching an immunity agreement.

"I think that's wonderful," Bill Ginsburg told CNN from Los Angeles. "I've always said this is a one-witness case, and Monica is gravely needed by Mr. Starr to make any headway at all in his investigation."

Since only Clinton and Lewinsky know what happened, the case is a "he said, she said" situation," Ginsburg said.

Gingrich tells Republicans not to comment

would be better
complicate efforts
Conference
stick to the
take their
review if Starr sent

House Speaker Newt Gingrich told fellow Republicans Wednesday they off not commenting on the Lewinsky controversy, saying it would only to get the GOP message to voters this fall.

Republican leadership sources tell CNN that Gingrich told a House GOP meeting that if Republicans are asked about the investigation, they should guidance provided by House Judiciary Committee Chairman Henry Hyde.

The Illinois Republican has suggested that members say that Republicans constitutional duties seriously and would conduct a fair and thorough a report to Congress suggesting impeachable offenses.

Gingrich told Republicans it was important to focus on the budget, tax cuts and education issues, the source said.

He also said it was "difficult enough" in this environment to get through to voters and that Republicans would be better off not politicizing the investigation.

Experts See Clinton's Hand Weakened

The Washington Times 7/29/98

President Clinton may be hard pressed to escape at least one accusation of perjury now that Monica Lewinsky is willing to testify that she had a sexual relationship with him.

Clinton supporters have attempted to downplay the significance of whether he perjured himself by saying it's "just about sex." But legal experts point out that perjury, even in regard to adultery, is a felony and felons are not permitted to hold public office.

"There is certainly an effort to portray this investigation as an effort to prove adultery, as opposed to perjury," said Jonathan Turley, law professor at George Washington University. "The president would not be impeached due to any act of adultery. Any adultery committed by the president is strictly a matter between the president and the first lady.

"But any perjury committed by the president is strictly a matter between the president and the public. It is difficult to understand how a principled argument can be made that a perjurer could remain in

office."

The former White House intern's decision to cooperate with independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr not only makes perjury charges against Mr. Clinton more likely, it also strengthens Mr. Starr's hand in his pursuit of charges such as obstruction of justice, suborning perjury and tampering with witnesses, which are more difficult to prove.

The president -- who has been subpoenaed by Mr. Starr and is negotiating for an acceptable forum in which to give his testimony -- has testified under oath that he did not have sex with Miss Lewinsky. If he sticks to his story, Mr. Starr would be forced to break a "he-said-she-said" deadlock by producing evidence -- such as testimony from Lewinsky confidants and gifts that she and the president exchanged -- in an effort to show the president is lying.

The burden of proof, which is normally a well-established threshold in criminal proceedings, would be harder to predict in the House of Representatives, which is expected to receive any Starr report on evidence of wrongdoing by Mr. Clinton. Since some House members are expected to vote along party lines regardless of evidence, the persuasiveness of Mr. Starr's case is particularly important in determining whether a majority of House members would vote to impeach Mr. Clinton.

Furthermore, it is unlikely that Mr. Starr, at the end of his long investigation, would accuse Mr. Clinton of just one count of perjury, according to Mark Levin, director of Landmark Legal Foundation.

"We fall into this trap of simply narrowing the issue to what the White House says it is, which is essentially one possible instance of perjury," Mr. Levin said. "The problem is what's being investigated here is serial perjury. Perjury about Kathleen Willey, about Gennifer Flowers, about Lewinsky, about Lewinsky's gifts being returned, about a job for Lewinsky, and on and on.

"People usually perjure themselves for a reason and that reason is usually to cover up something -- that is, to obstruct an investigation. So typically, in a case like this, if you have one or more perjury counts, you trigger conspiracy and obstruction. On top of that, we have the possibility in this case of witness tampering.

"So we're not talking about one possible instance of perjury," Mr. Levin said. "We're talking about a whole web of criminal issues."

Rep. Bob Barr, Georgia Republican, agreed.

"It's not about sex, it's about several potential felonies," said Mr. Barr, a member of the House Judiciary Committee. "One would certainly hope that our standards of public service would not have fallen so low that it's OK to have a person who commits felonies sitting in the Oval Office. I cannot imagine that would be the standard that would prevail in the Judiciary Committee, if the evidence shows that."

Miss Lewinsky now appears to be willing to discuss not only her sexual relationship with Mr.

Clinton, but efforts to keep her quiet about it. Before yesterday, Miss Lewinsky had been willing to acknowledge an 18-month affair, but was reluctant to tell Mr. Starr about possible obstruction of justice. She apparently changed her mind after Mr. Starr dropped his insistence that she plead guilty to some crime as part of any deal.

Miss Lewinsky's change of heart increases Mr. Clinton's legal and political peril and makes impeachment proceedings more likely. But it is only one of many setbacks to Mr. Clinton in recent days. Others include his failure to prevent White House lawyers and Secret Service officials from testifying before the grand jury.

"These latest developments are not one small step for man -- they're a giant leap for the independent counsel," Mr. Barr said. "This portends very bad things for the president and his troops and increases the likelihood substantially that we will be called on in the Judiciary Committee relatively soon to consider a report from Mr. Starr."

Mr. Turley agreed.

"It's remarkable how bad a week the president is having, and this is only Tuesday," Mr. Turley said yesterday. "The president is fast running out of options. He is increasingly isolated in this matter.

"Thank God for Buddy. It was no accident that the president chose the most loyal breed [of dog] in Buddy."

Lewinsky Gets Full Immunity to Testify

The Washington Times 7/29/98

Whitewater independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr granted full immunity from prosecution yesterday to Monica Lewinsky for her grand jury testimony against President Clinton.

The action signals a move by Mr. Starr to prove perjury and obstruction charges against the president.

"We, as counsel for Monica Lewinsky, have reached an agreement today that for her full and truthful testimony she will receive transactional immunity in this case," said Miss Lewinsky's attorney, Plato Cacheris, in a terse statement to reporters and photographers crowded outside his Northwest Washington office.

He took no questions.

Attorney Billy Martin, who represents Marcia Lewis, Miss Lewinsky's mother, announced full immunity for his client minutes later and again took no questions.

Lawyers close to the probe said Miss Lewinsky will tell the grand jury she had an 18-month affair with Mr. Clinton, beginning when she was a 21-year-old White House intern, and that she lied in a sworn affidavit in the Paula Jones sexual misconduct lawsuit when she denied having sex with the president.

In addition, Miss Lewinsky is expected to testify about late-night visits to the White House after she left for a job at the Pentagon. It was during those visits that conversations are believed to have been held on the Lewinsky scandal, the Jones suit and Miss Lewinsky's response to it.

Although the sources said Miss Lewinsky denied to prosecutors that anyone told her "directly to lie" in the Jones case, she also is expected to say:

- § **Mr. Clinton spoke personally with her about how she could testify in the Jones case and deny the affair.**
- § **The White House sought to retrieve gifts she received from Mr. Clinton, which were under subpoena.**
- § **She spoke with Pentagon colleague Linda R. Tripp about how she could alter her testimony in the Jones case.**

There were news reports today that Miss Lewinsky told authorities she wrote a three-page summary, or "talking points," she gave to Mrs. Tripp about her former friend's pending testimony in the Jones suit. However, sources close to Miss Lewinsky told The Washington Times last night that the former intern typed the document after receiving "guidance and concepts" from another individual, not her mother or someone at the White House.

Lawyers close to the probe warned that Mr. Starr's office planned to talk with Miss Lewinsky more about the document over the next few days, and that the summary "remains a concern" to prosecutors. The former intern is not expected to be called before the grand jury until the debriefing sessions end, which could be next week, the sources said.

Mrs. Lewis, who has testified before the grand jury, talked with her daughter about the suspected affair and advised her on Mrs. Tripp's testimony in the Jones case. She also is believed to have discussed the talking points with her daughter.

Grants of full, or transactional, immunity mean Miss Lewinsky, now 25, and Mrs. Lewis cannot be prosecuted for crimes with regard to the Starr probe. But they can be charged with perjury if they now lie to the grand jury. Full immunity is the most protective type a prosecutor can offer a witness.

Mr. Clinton, under oath in the Jones case, denied having sexual relations with Miss Lewinsky.

The immunity deal was struck yesterday after six months of sometimes-bitter negotiations. Talks intensified after Mr. Starr told one of Miss Lewinsky's attorneys, Jacob Stein, he was not interested in indicting the former intern, the sources said.

The deal was met with grim resignation at the White House, where spokesman Michael McCurry tried to put a happy face on the announcement.

"I think that he's pleased that things are working out for her," Mr. McCurry said of Mr. Clinton's reaction.

"Look, we've been at this for six months ... and there's been a lot more speculation, a lot more -- you

know, a lot more discussion of this than the facts would warrant. I mean, you know, you've got --you've got -- I grant you you've got a factual development that needs to be reported today, and I got a reaction to you from the president," he said.

Others, however, said while the White House always expected Miss Lewinsky to seek a deal, they were still shocked by the announcement.

It was not clear yesterday if Mr. Starr was moving to a possible indictment of Mr. Clinton and others, or if the testimony of Miss Lewinsky and Mrs. Lewis will become part of a report to Congress, which could be used for impeachment hearings. Mr. Starr has not ruled out a possible presidential indictment.

Miss Lewinsky arrived by taxi shortly before the announcement and, with the help of her spokeswoman, Judy Smith, pushed her way through a throng of reporters and photographers. She remained in the office during the announcement. Her parents, in a statement, said they were happy their daughter was "out of harm's way."

The agreements came after a daylong meeting in New York City attended by Miss Lewinsky, her attorneys and three members of Mr. Starr's staff, headed by deputy independent counsel Robert Bittman. The sources said prosecutors, who sought a "face-to-face interview" before any immunity offer, were satisfied she was telling the truth and would make a good grand jury witness.

Prosecutors, who spoke only once before with Miss Lewinsky after she was taped during a luncheon meeting with Mrs. Tripp at a Virginia hotel, believe there is relevant corroborating information to support accusations of perjury and obstruction in the case, the sources said.

Mrs. Tripp, who testified for a seventh day before the grand jury yesterday, said in a statement it appeared "Miss Lewinsky is prepared to tell at least a portion of the truth."

"I encourage her and all other witnesses not only to tell the truth, but to tell the whole truth," said Mrs. Tripp, whose secret taping of Miss Lewinsky sparked the grand jury probe.

Meanwhile, several uniformed Secret Service officials were called to testify before the grand jury and more are expected today and tomorrow. Michael Leibig, attorney for the officers, said 11 Secret Service officials have given grand jury testimony in the Lewinsky probe so far.

Secret Service Agent Larry Cockell, who stepped aside as head of the president's security detail after testifying in the probe, returned to duty last night.

Another expected witness is White House Deputy Counsel Bruce Lindsey, whose claim of executive privilege in refusing to answer the grand jury's questions on conversations he had with Mr. Clinton about Miss Lewinsky was rejected Monday by a federal appeals court panel. The panel said a government lawyer cannot invoke attorney-client privilege in response to grand jury questions about a crime.

Lewinsky Tells Starr Team of Affair with President

The Washington Times July 28, 1998

Monica Lewinsky told independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr's prosecutors yesterday that she had a sexual relationship with President Clinton but would not confirm that anyone had told her to lie about it under oath, according to a lawyer close to the grand jury probe.

Miss Lewinsky's meeting with prosecutors was a major move toward an immunity deal in exchange for testimony from the former White House intern.

The session occurred as a federal appeals court panel rejected Mr. Clinton's claim that White House Deputy Counsel Bruce Lindsey is barred from testifying before the grand jury because of attorney-client privilege, and negotiations continued by the president's attorneys for a compromise deal on Mr. Starr's subpoena of Mr. Clinton.

The court ruling means Mr. Lindsey cannot rely on the privilege claim to refuse to answer questions on conversations he had with the president about Miss Lewinsky.

The prevailing 2-1 opinion by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit was joined by Judges Judith Rogers, who was appointed by President Clinton, and Raymond Randolph, appointed by President Bush. Judge David Tatel, appointed by Mr. Clinton, dissented.

The administration is expected to appeal. The Lewinsky meeting came in response to Mr. Starr's insistence in February that she would get no grant of immunity without a "face-to-face interview" with his staff about whether she had a sexual relationship with Mr. Clinton and whether the president asked her to deny it under oath.

A lawyer close to the grand jury investigation said that during the nearly seven-hour meeting in New York City, Miss Lewinsky said that she would tell a grand jury that she had an 18-month sexual relationship with the president, but she would not say that he or others told her to lie about it in her affidavit in the Paula Jones sexual misconduct lawsuit.

The prosecutors also discussed with Miss Lewinsky details of private conversations she had with the president, the source said.

The source said the prosecutors will meet with Miss Lewinsky again, probably today, to discuss other aspects of the case, including Mr. Starr's continuing concerns that administration officials suborned perjury and obstructed justice.

Mr. Starr's focus now would be that Miss Lewinsky may have been directed to lie -- not vocally, but by means of a three-page summary, or "talking points," that she delivered to Linda R. Tripp, suggesting how Mrs. Tripp could lie in the Jones case.

No decision was made yesterday on whether to grant immunity to Miss Lewinsky. If she proves to be credible, her grand jury appearance could be soon, they said.

The Lewinsky session may signal a conclusion of the sex-and-lies investigation. Only Miss Lewinsky and Mr. Clinton have not been heard by the grand jury.

Miss Lewinsky would face perjury charges if she lied when she denied the affair in her affidavit in the Jones suit. She was tape-recorded as saying the affair occurred and that Mr. Clinton and White House insider Vernon E. Jordan Jr. told her to lie about it in her Jones affidavit.

Yesterday's meeting, according to lawyers and others close to the probe, was scheduled by Miss Lewinsky's attorneys after they learned that Mr. Starr's office had subpoenaed Mr. Clinton to testify in the case. It lasted throughout the day, the sources said, with Miss Lewinsky freely discussing the matter with prosecutors.

"There was some concern on the part of Miss Lewinsky's lawyers that her window of opportunity was quickly closing," said one source close to the probe. "They had no desire to put their client in further jeopardy."

Mr. Starr has said a polygraph test could be ordered for Miss Lewinsky "if appropriate."

The Lewinsky meeting, the sources said, means Mr. Starr wants to find out firsthand if she is telling the truth about a suspected 18-month affair with the president and whether he asked her to lie about it in the Jones case. Those accusations are contained on 20 hours of audio tapes made by Mrs. Tripp, a Pentagon colleague.

Prosecutors have spoken only once with Miss Lewinsky B after she was taped during a luncheon meeting with Mrs. Tripp at a Virginia hotel. That session was cut short when her mother, Marcia Lewis, insisted on coming from New York to be with her daughter.

In the appeals court decision, the judges said a government attorney could not invoke attorney-client privilege in response to grand jury questions about a crime. The court said it would be "contrary to tradition, common understanding and our governmental system" for the privilege to attach to White House counsel in the same manner as private counsel.

"When government attorneys learn through communications with their clients of information related to criminal misconduct, they may not rely on the government attorney-client privilege to shield such information from disclosure to a grand jury," the court said.

Mr. Clinton was informed of the decision after he ended a daylong forum in New Mexico on privatizing Social Security. The ruling rocked the White House, which drafted a statement from chief counsel Charles F.C. Ruff for deputy spokesman Barry Toiv to read to the traveling White House press corps.

Mr. Toiv said the White House was "disappointed" by the decision and said it meant that "the president and all other government officials will be less likely to receive full and frank advice about their official obligations and duties from government attorneys."

Mr. Lindsey, a regular traveler with the president and a constant card game companion on Air Force One, skipped the three-day trip to Virginia, Colorado and New Mexico. Mr. Toiv said he did not know why Mr. Lindsey was absent.

In May, U.S. District Judge Norma Holloway Johnson ordered Mr. Lindsey to answer questions before the grand jury, saying his testimony could be "some of the most relevant and important

evidence" in the sex-and-lies probe. She said Mr. Starr had shown that the testimony was essential to the case.

The White House appealed the decision, forcing the appeals court to rule in the matter.

Also yesterday, Mr. Clinton's attorneys continued to negotiate with Mr. Starr over a compromise on the subpoena in an effort to spare the president the humiliation of having to appear in person before the Lewinsky grand jury. The negotiations continued amid discussions at the White House that Mr. Clinton might challenge the subpoena if an acceptable compromise cannot be reached, the sources said.

The White House had hoped to avoid a constitutional crisis by reaching a deal that would satisfy the grand jury's need for information, but keep Mr. Clinton from having to walk into the federal courthouse before a battery of television cameras.

Administration officials, the sources said, have told Mr. Clinton he faces a loss of public support --and probable defections from within the Democratic Party -- if he takes on a public fight of the Starr subpoena.

Mr. Clinton's personal attorney, David Kendall, said in a statement that he was working with Mr. Starr to "devise a way for the president to provide information ... consistent with his constitutional role and responsibilities." He declined to elaborate.

Mr. Clinton, the sources said, wants a deal allowing him to answer the grand jury's questions on videotape at the White House or a neutral site.

They said he also wants Mr. Kendall to be present during the questioning, as he was in Mr. Clinton's videotaped depositions in two Whitewater trials.

Other options could include giving the grand jury a transcript of questions by Mr. Starr and his staff or a live closed-circuit television feed of the questioning.

Mr. Clinton promised after the Lewinsky scandal broke Jan. 21 to answer questions about his relationship with Miss Lewinsky "sooner rather than later." Since then, he has declined on his attorney's advice to comment on the relationship and has refused at least four requests from Mr.

Starr to testify voluntarily.

Starr Gets Closer to Lewinsky, Lindsey

USA Today 07/27/98

Former White House intern Monica Lewinsky met Monday with prosecutors investigating an alleged presidential affair and cover-up, said sources familiar with the inquiry.

The meeting, including morning and afternoon sessions, took several hours.

No decision has been made on whether to offer her immunity from prosecution in return for grand jury testimony, one source said.

Meanwhile, in a victory for prosecutor Kenneth Starr, a federal appeals court Monday ordered presidential aide Bruce Lindsey to submit to grand jury questioning in the Lewinsky investigation.

"A government attorney may not invoke the attorney-client privilege in response to grand jury questions seeking information relating to the possible commission of a federal crime," the court ruling said.

The decision was made by U.S. Court of Appeals Judges Judith Rogers and David Tatel, both Clinton appointees, and Bush appointee Raymond Randolph.

The court had issued the opinion, then temporarily pulled it back, for reasons that were unclear.

The court upheld the idea that consultations with someone, not as a lawyer but as a friend, adviser or negotiator, are not privileged. "Thus, Lindsey's advice on political, strategic or policy issues, valuable as it may have been, would not be shielded from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege," the judges said.

The decision requiring Lindsey's testimony came as Clinton's attorneys were negotiating with Starr, under pressure of subpoena, over whether the president himself would make an unprecedented appearance before the grand jury.

Whitewater prosecutors had argued that the grand jury in the Lewinsky investigation must have all "relevant" information that deputy White House counsel Lindsey gathered in his discussions with Clinton and others.

The Clinton White House had argued that it is entitled to confidentiality so that it can prepare for possible impeachment proceedings in Congress against the president.

Sham Negotiations

The Washington Times 7/27/98

Political pundit Fred Barnes does not believe President Clinton will testify in the Monica Lewinsky investigation "under any circumstances."

"I think these negotiations are a sham," Mr. Barnes said yesterday on "Fox News Sunday" of reported efforts by the subpoenaed president's attorneys to seek a deal that would allow him to answer the Starr grand jury's questions on videotape.

"The president can't afford to testify. There's so much evidence Starr has" obtained, Mr. Barnes said, adding:

"The president would be in a very difficult situation [responding to grand jury questions], not knowing" what Secret Service agents have said in their testimony.

Four Questions

The Washington Times 7/27/98

Speaking of Monica Lewinsky and the "the big creep," freshman Rep. Joseph R. Pitts, Pennsylvania Republican and veteran of the U.S. Air Force, is confused.

"Please tell us, my liberal defenders of the president's conduct, why was Senator Bob Packwood run out of town for his conduct?" he asks. "Why did liberal Democrat after liberal Democrat, including the current vice president [Al Gore], denounce Senator John Tower as 'unfit for office' because of allegations of womanizing?"

Two last questions.

"Why one standard for Republicans and another for Democrats?" he asks. "Why was Justice Clarence Thomas absolutely vilified by feminist groups and liberals of every stripe for questionable allegations, while the current leader of the free world is given every possible excuse, justification and defense for his conduct for a myriad of abuses, for numerous women providing evidence in a vast cover-up orchestration?"

Reno's Probe

The Washington Times 7/27/98

First, it was the Chevrolet Corvair that Ralph Nader got pulled from the assembly line. Now it's independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr he's going after.

"Has Kenneth Starr gone too far?" wonders Public Citizen, a government-watchdog group founded by Mr. Nader for the sake of accountability. "Who's overseeing the investigator?"

His group writes in a fund-raising letter that Mr. Starr, the independent counsel looking into President Clinton's reported affair with Monica Lewinsky, "has stirred up a hornet's nest of allegations and leaks, secondhand stories and unsubstantiated rumors."

Here's what confuses Mr. Nader:

"But how -- and why -- has Starr's mission mutated from investigating the president's role in a 20-year-old land deal in Arkansas, to wiring up a low-level Pentagon employee to obtain unauthorized secret tapes of an intern's conversations of an alleged affair with Clinton?"

Allow us to answer that one, Ralph.

Attorney General Janet Reno. She's the one who assigned Mr. Starr to the task.

Clinton Pressed to Comply with Subpoena

The Washington Times 7/27/98

Both Republicans and Democrats are wondering how President Clinton will respond to a subpoena to testify in the White House sex-and-lies scandal -- a question the president and his advisers are also pondering.

GOP lawmakers were on the attack yesterday on the Sunday television talk shows while a top Clinton aide, Rahm Emanuel, offered little new insight into the president's thinking on the latest move by independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr.

Mr. Clinton, who was in Aspen, Colo., yesterday to raise more than \$1 million for the Democratic Party, refused to answer reporters' questions about whether he will testify.

"I think it would be a disaster" if Mr. Clinton does not comply with the subpoena, Senate Majority Whip Don Nickles said yesterday on NBC's "Meet the Press."

"I don't think that's an option for him. I don't think that would be sustainable," the Oklahoma Republican said, since the president would "basically be saying he is above the law."

On ABC's "This Week," Mr. Clinton's former chief of staff, Leon Panetta, said, "I would think that the White House is going to do everything possible to see if they can work out an agreement with the special prosecutor here to provide a format for the president to be able to testify" without having to go directly before the grand jury.

"I hope we can avoid a constitutional crisis here that would somehow challenge whether or not you can drag a president before a grand jury," Mr. Panetta said.

Mr. Clinton was subpoenaed last week to answer questions about his relationship with Monica Lewinsky, a former White House intern. The Starr grand jury reportedly wants his testimony as early as tomorrow.

On NBC's "Meet the Press" yesterday, Mr. Emanuel was asked twice if the president intends to testify before the grand jury, but he did not answer the question either time.

"Mr. [David] Kendall, the president's attorney, is working with the office of the independent counsel to get [grand jury members] the information they need," Mr. Emanuel replied.

His statement was a carbon copy of what White House Press Secretary Michael McCurry said late last week when he confirmed that Mr. Clinton's attorneys were talking to Mr. Starr's office.

A report yesterday in The Washington Times indicated Mr. Clinton's attorneys are trying to avoid the embarrassment of Mr. Clinton being the first president ever to testify before a federal grand jury in a criminal probe by seeking a deal that would allow him to answer the grand jury's questions on videotape.

On CBS' "Face the Nation," Sen. Orrin G. Hatch, Utah Republican and chairman of the Judiciary Committee, said the president "owes an obligation to the people of America to tell the truth here and to comply with the subpoena of the courts."

"I think the fact that he would ignore and violate a subpoena would certainly be grounds to file articles of impeachment," he said.

However, Sen. Arlen Specter, Pennsylvania Republican and a member of the Judiciary Committee, disagreed.

"I rechecked the Constitution. I do not believe that ignoring a subpoena would be grounds for impeachment," Mr. Specter said on CNN's "Late Edition." He said the time has come for Mr. Starr to share with Congress the information he has gathered.

According to a report in this week's U.S. News & World Report, which reaches newsstands today, the president's advisers would prefer that he submit a sworn statement or written answers to questions from the grand jury.

But U.S. News says it has learned that Mr. Starr's office "right now will accept nothing less than testimony in which they can directly question the president, either before the grand jury or in a deposition."

The magazine says the two sides could work out an agreement under which Mr. Clinton gives sworn testimony to prosecutors in Mr. Kendall's office or in the White House, and the grand jury gets the transcript.

Mr. Clinton has given videotaped testimony three times before during his presidency: once for his deposition in the Paula Jones sexual harassment case and twice for depositions requested by defendants in Whitewater trials.

Mr. Emanuel alluded to those instances yesterday on "Meet the Press." However, U.S. News says it has been told the White House has reservations about Mr. Clinton going on camera in the sex-and-lies case, fearing that an "embarrassing" videotape of him answering questions about Miss Lewinsky might somehow become public.

Some aides privately told the magazine they don't know if the president and Miss Lewinsky had a sexual relationship. The aides said they are worried Mr. Starr's lawyers would "attempt to catch Clinton in lies or contradictions in an effort to make a perjury case against him," U.S. News said.

To date, the president has declined at least four requests from Mr. Starr to testify voluntarily. The independent counsel forced the issue by issuing the subpoena, sources say.

Lott to Secret Service: Just Tell the Truth

The Washington Times 7/20/98

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott said yesterday that Secret Service agents appear to be hiding something and have helped delay an investigation of President Clinton by fighting grand jury subpoenas.

"They appear to be hiding something. What is it? If there's no problem, just come forward, tell the

truth, and that will be it. We'll move on," the Mississippi Republican said yesterday on "Fox News Sunday."

Mr. Lott said Mr. Clinton should testify before the grand jury probing whether he had sexual relations with former White House intern Monica Lewinsky, lied about it under oath and pressured her to commit perjury.

"I think the president's going to be in a very difficult position if he refuses to testify. ... Look, truth will set you free. If there's no problem there, tell the truth and be done with it," the Republican leader said.

To date, Mr. Clinton has declined at least six invitations to testify before independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr's grand jury.

Don't Make Me Mad

The Washington Times 7/20/98

No more Mr. Nice Guy.

That was the reaction at the White House last week after federal Judge Laurence Silberman ridiculed pleas that Secret Service agents not be forced to testify in the Monica Lewinsky matter.

CNBC's Geraldo Rivera, an unabashed critic of independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr, read a statement from an anonymous White House source Thursday night. Here's an excerpt:

"The White House is stunned by the judge's tone, which does nothing but escalate the harsh rhetoric in this matter. We are mad, we are upset, and we are getting into battle mode. There is going to be a lot more hardball played. **What little cooperation the White House has been giving to Ken Starr will dry up immediately.** He will have to fight for every page of documents, and he will never, ever get the president of the United States to testify without a fight."

Family of Man

The Washington Times 7/8/98

Time magazine's Margaret Carlson not only dislikes Linda Tripp, she says the sex-and-lies witness "lost membership in the family of man when day after day she looked into Monica Lewinsky's eyes as a friend and at night hit the 'on' button on her Radio Shack tape recorder."

Miss Carlson made the remark in the on-line magazine Salon, the Media Research Center reports.

\$40 million

Rich Galen, the executive director of GOPAC, observes that "1,200 people accompanied President Clinton on his vacation to China at a reported cost of upwards of \$40 million. That, as luck would have it, is about the same amount as the White House Spinsters have been complaining Ken Starr has spent on investigating the same President Clinton. The White House wasted as much in eight days as they accuse Starr of having wasted in three years."

A Reporters Hormones

The Washington Times July 7, 1998

The big topic among White House reporters and officials yesterday: the confession by former Time magazine reporter Nina Burleigh that she was (and is) hopelessly attracted to President Clinton.

"I'd be happy to give him [oral sex] just for keeping abortion legal," she told Howard Kurtz, media reporter for The Washington Post. (In this case, Miss Burleigh apparently has Mr. Clinton confused with Supreme Court Justice Anthony M. Kennedy, but that's another story.)

Miss Burleigh, writing in *Mirabella* magazine, fondly recalled an Air Force One trip last year to Jasper, Ark., during which she volunteered to join Mr. Clinton and aide Bruce Lindsey for a game of hearts.

"The president's foot lightly, and presumably accidentally, brushed mine once under the table. His hand touched my wrist while he was dealing the cards. When I got up and shook his hand at the end of the game, his eyes wandered over my bike-wrecked, naked legs. And slowly it dawned on me as I walked away: He found me attractive," Miss Burleigh said.

"It was riveting to know that the president had appreciated my legs, scarred as they were. If he had asked me to continue the game of hearts back in his room at the Jasper Holiday Inn, I would have been happy to go there and see what happened. At the time, that seemed quite possible. It took several hours and a few drinks in the steaming and now somehow romantic Arkansas night to shake the intoxicated state in which I had been quite willing to let myself be ravished by the president, should he have but asked. I probably wore the mesmerized look I have seen again and again in women after they have met him. The same silly hypnotized gleam was displayed on the cover of Time magazine in Monica Lewinsky's eyes."

Word around the White House is that there are other female reporters there who feel the same way as Miss Burleigh. Some male reporters wondered sarcastically who would be the first newsman to publicly declare his lust for the first lady.

I think I am going to be sick from this one. A Hollywood Producer managing presidential scandals.

That Explains It

The Washington Times 7/1/98

President Clinton did not mean to refer to Monica Lewinsky as "that woman" during a famous press conference several months ago. He simply had trouble remembering her name. At least that is what first-pal Harry Thomason tells the *New Yorker*.

"I don't believe he meant to call her 'that woman.' But with all the hullabaloo going on, her name just escaped. I think he just blanked. It wasn't like he was saying something bad about her. From everything I heard, she showed some promise. I think she's probably a good human being, perhaps searching for a father figure. I heard she would come by Betty Currie's desk and say how great he

must be as a dad," said Mr.

Thomason, a Hollywood producer who flew to Washington to stage-manage the president's denial when the scandal broke earlier this year.

Of course, now that Monica Lewinsky's new lawyers are trying to negotiate a plea deal, Mr. Thomason may be trying to repair any hard feelings over the "that woman" remark.

Lindsey Must Talk, Starr Tells Judges

The Washington Times 6/30/98

Independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr said yesterday that "morality, common sense and law" void White House Deputy Counsel Bruce R. Lindsey's claim of attorney-client privilege in refusing to testify before the Monica Lewinsky grand jury, and contended that Attorney General Janet Reno backs him up.

In arguments before a three-judge panel of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, Mr. Starr said government lawyers have a duty to report evidence of criminal wrongdoing, noting that a brief filed by the Justice Department had not identified "a single instance in the history of the republic" in which the department authorized an agency to hold back information "on the sole ground that a government attorney ... possessed the information."

"You don't sit on information, information that's relevant to a federal grand jury," said Mr. Starr, whose office is probing accusations by Miss Lewinsky on 20 hours of secretly recorded audiotapes that she had an affair with Mr. Clinton and that he and others told her to lie about it in the Paula Jones sexual misconduct suit.

Mr. Starr argued that Miss Reno and other "political appointees of the president" filed briefs with the court contrary to the White House's claim of attorney-client privilege for Mr. Lindsey. He has asked the court to give him access to ask Mr. Lindsey 14 categories of questions.

"The attorney general's refutation of the legal argument made by the White House ... speaks volumes about the far-fetched nature of the White House's submission," he said. Arguing for the administration, Washington attorney Neil Eggleston, himself a former White House lawyer, said the attorney-client privilege was absolute and extended to Mr. Lindsey and other government lawyers. Without a claim of confidentiality, he said, Mr. Clinton would be "completely deprived of counsel."

He said a president must be sure White House lawyers cannot be forced to testify about private conversations.

Without that assurance, he said, a president would not confide in his own attorneys.

Justice Department lawyer Douglas Letter argued that the case be returned to District Court, saying potential evidence should be surrendered to the grand jury if it is ruled "essential to ... justice."

Appeals Judge Raymond Randolph, appointed by President Bush, said the Lindsey claim of

attorney-client privilege was "the first time ever" a president has asserted it in response to a grand jury subpoena. Judge Judith Rogers, a Clinton appointee, suggested the privilege claim was "something far beyond" the confidentiality clients of government lawyers enjoy in many states and in civil cases.

Meanwhile, the government's star witness, Linda R. Tripp, begins her testimony today before the Lewinsky grand jury. She recorded the young ex-White House intern's conversations, later giving the tapes to Mr. Starr.

According to sources close to the probe, prosecutors are expected to focus on, among other things, whether Miss Lewinsky told Mrs. Tripp she would face "dire consequences" if she refused to lie under oath about her knowledge of Mr. Clinton's extramarital affairs.

"Make absolutely no mistake about it that the threats were real, repeated and direct -- and passed along from others," said a Tripp confidant. "Threats of dire consequences were clearly transmitted not only from Miss Lewinsky, but from others via Miss Lewinsky."

The sources, citing grand jury confidentiality rules, declined to say who directed Miss Lewinsky to pass along the threats or what specific consequences Mrs. Tripp faced if she refused to lie.

A source close to Miss Lewinsky said it would be incorrect to assert that she passed along threats to Mrs. Tripp. The source declined to elaborate.

Mrs. Tripp's attorney, Anthony Zaccagnini, told CNN's Larry King last month that his client faced "several dangers," including the loss of her job and others he refused to discuss.

He said "certainly Linda felt threatened" and had a logical reason, although he declined to elaborate.

While it has been widely reported that Miss Lewinsky asked Mrs. Tripp to lie about her knowledge of Mr. Clinton's sexual affairs, little is publicly known about threats against Mrs. Tripp. One possible exception is seen in the three-page summary or "talking points" Miss Lewinsky gave Mrs. Tripp, which suggested Mrs. Tripp might lose her job if she refuses to lie about her knowledge of Mr. Clinton's suspected affairs.

"It's important to you that [Clinton administration officials] think you're a team player," the document said. "After all, you are a political appointee."

Although Mrs. Tripp is said to be unaware who, if anyone, helped Miss Lewinsky draft the talking points, Mr. Starr has focused on Mr. Lindsey as a possible source. Mrs. Tripp sought Mr. Lindsey's advice as she was drawn into the Jones suit.

Mr. Lindsey, like the talking points, advised Mrs. Tripp to hire Robert S. Bennett, the president's personal attorney in the Jones suit, sources said.

Mr. Lindsey also gave Mrs. Tripp advice that "appeared to contradict what she had been told" by Kathleen E. Willey about Mrs. Willey's claimed encounter with Mr. Clinton. Mrs. Willey told Mrs. Tripp the president groped her, but the talking points urged Mrs. Tripp to swear Mrs. Willey made up

the incident.

Mrs. Tripp, who has remained mostly silent since the scandal erupted five months ago, is said to be looking forward to unburdening herself before the grand jury.

"She is completely comfortable about the grand jury testimony," said a Tripp friend. "Getting it out there on the table and looking those people in the eye and saying, 'Folks, here's what happened.' And I think there's going to be a lot of people on the other side of that table going, 'Wow!'"

Perjury is Perjury

The Washington Times 6/17/98

Gennifer Flowers says President Clinton clearly perjured himself when he at first denied, under oath, having an affair with her. Later, in the same deposition, he admitted to only a one-night stand.

"The president perjured himself in reference to that statement. .. He obviously denied the relationship or any type of relationship, and then he went on to admit it even partially in his deposition," Miss Flowers said on CNBC's "Hardball With Chris Matthews." The program aired last night.

Mr. Matthews asked Miss Flowers whether, in her opinion, the independent counsel should consider perjury charges against the president.

"Absolutely. Perjury is perjury, whether it's in reference to Monica Lewinsky or myself," Miss Flowers replied.

Ickes Denies he had Role in Tripp Leak

The Washington Times 6/8/98

Former Deputy White House Chief of Staff Harold Ickes has dismissed suggestions that he directed Assistant Defense Secretary Kenneth Bacon to leak information from Linda Tripp's personnel file as a "left-wing conspiracy" theory.

Mr. Ickes said last week that he discussed Mrs. Tripp separately with Mr. Bacon and New Yorker reporter Jane Mayer in the weeks before Mr. Bacon leaked the information from Mrs. Tripp's file to the reporter.

But Mr. Ickes emphasized his conversation with Mr. Bacon, which occurred in mid-February over dinner at the home of Georgetown law professor Stephen Cohen, was innocent. "I think I may have asked Ken when she came over to the Pentagon," Mr. Ickes said last month in a deposition by Judicial Watch, a legal advocacy group. "But other than that, we did not spend any time talking about her."

Possible Intimidation

The Washington Times 6/18/98

Whitewater prosecutor Kenneth Starr is investigating possible intimidation of Kathleen Willey in the months before she testified President Clinton made a sexual advance in the White House.

A tire store owner outside Richmond, Va., said Thursday that FBI agents questioned him earlier this year about Willey bringing in her car in November because three tires had a large number of nails in them. That was about two months before the former White House volunteer's Jan. 11 questioning in the Paula Jones sexual harassment case against Clinton.

"She came in - I didn't know who she was at the time - and we had to replace two tires because she had masses of nails" stuck in them, said Bruce Horlick, owner of Salisbury Tire and Service. "I think we fixed another one, she went on her way, and that was about it. It didn't look like an accident.

Starr to Court: Clinton Probe Very 'Serious'

The Washington Times 6/3/98

Independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr, saying President Clinton is under "serious criminal investigation," asked the Supreme Court yesterday for an expedited hearing on whether Secret Service officers who guard the president can be compelled to testify in the sex-and-lies grand jury probe. Mr. Starr's motion suggested possible indictments and pending impeachment reports, and said there is "reason to believe that the 'privileged' observations that Secret Service is currently withholding from the grand jury would constitute important evidence" in determining whether crimes have been committed in the Monica Lewinsky investigation.

"The president's response treats this as a matter-of-fact investigation. But the unhappy fact is that, at the determination of the attorney general herself, a president is under serious criminal investigation. That unfortunate circumstance is a rare occurrence in our nation's history," Mr. Starr said.

"We will be blunt: The nation has a compelling interest that this criminal investigation of the president of the United States conclude as quickly as possible -- that indictments be brought, possible reports for impeachment proceedings issued, and non-prosecution decisions announced," he said.

In Dallas, where Mr. Clinton was hosting a fund-raiser last night, White House spokesman Jim Kennedy said Mr. Starr "is trying to end-run the rules and leapfrog the legal process. The brief is an act of public relations, not a work of law."

The Secret Service, in a motion filed by the Justice Department, had sought a "protective function" privilege to block the testimony of two uniformed officers and a Secret Service lawyer who interviewed them about their possible grand jury testimony. The agency believes that compelling the officers to testify would put Mr. Clinton in jeopardy by breaking down bonds of trust between the president and those who guard him.

In his motion, Mr. Starr added the request about the Secret Service with his earlier bid to compel the testimony of White House Deputy Counsel Bruce Lindsey. He wants the court to address that matter before its scheduled summer recess, which begins June 29.

Mr. Clinton had sought to block the testimony of Mr. Lindsey, his closest adviser, about conversations they had regarding Miss Lewinsky on a claim of executive privilege. He changed his mind Monday, arguing instead that the testimony was protected by the attorney-client privilege.

Mr. Starr, in his nine-page filing, said that by asserting attorney-client privilege, Mr. Clinton had "directly challenged the ability of the federal grand jury to obtain evidence of possible criminal acts by the president and others."

In a reference to the Watergate scandal of 1974, he said, "That is, save for Nixon, without parallel in the history of the republic."

Mr. Starr is investigating Miss Lewinsky's account, on 20 hours of secretly recorded audio tapes, that she had an affair with Mr. Clinton and that he and White House insider Vernon E. Jordan Jr. told her to lie about it under oath in the Paula Jones sexual misconduct lawsuit. Mr. Clinton and Mr. Jordan have denied the accusations.

Meanwhile, a federal judge yesterday set an Oct. 5 trial date for Webster L. Hubbell, former top Justice Department official and longtime friend of the Clintons', on charges that he, his wife and two advisers failed to pay \$894,000 in taxes, interest and penalties.

U.S. District Judge James Robertson also set a June 26 hearing on several pretrial motions.

Mr. Hubbell, his wife, Suzanna, tax lawyer Charles C. Owen and accountant Michael C. Schaufele were named last month in an indictment handed up in U.S. District Court in the District of Columbia. They are accused of conspiring to violate internal revenue laws, income-tax evasion, impeding the collection of taxes and mail fraud, and Mr. Hubbell and Mr. Schaufele are accused of helping prepare false tax returns.

All four have pleaded not guilty.

The 10-count indictment is the second for Mr. Hubbell, who spent 18 months in prison for stealing \$482,410 from his law firm and failing to pay \$143,747 in taxes. It said the Hubbells spent more than \$750,000 between 1994 and 1997 on personal items, including clothing and accessories, private school tuition, telephone calls and domestic help, and made cash withdrawals of \$60,000.

During the three-year period, they paid less than \$30,000 in taxes, although their income was in excess of \$1 million.

Mr. Starr is investigating whether more than **\$700,000 paid to Mr. Hubbell** by friends and supporters of the president after his 1994 Justice Department resignation was "**hush money**" intended to guarantee his silence in the Whitewater investigation. Mr. Hubbell had promised to cooperate in the probe, but his help never met the expectations of prosecutors. They made no recommendation for leniency at his sentencing.

The indictment said that after a March 1994 meeting at the White House -- when Mr. Hubbell's resignation became known -- "one or more individuals suggested that efforts be taken to assist" him in finding work. Several high-ranking administration officials and others, including Chief of Staff

Erskine Bowles, senior adviser Thomas F. "Mack" McLarty and Mr. Jordan, have acknowledged seeking work for their longtime friend.

Some of the consulting payments Mr. Hubbell collected included a fee of between \$100,000 and \$250,000 from the Lippo Group, an Indonesian firm at the center of the campaign-finance scandal; a contract from SunAmerica Inc., a Los Angeles-based financial-services firm run by Eli Broad, who donated \$165,000 to Mr. Clinton's campaign and the Democratic National Committee; and a \$63,000 retainer from Revlon Corp., where Mr. Jordan is a board member.

Mr. Starr's office has predicted the Hubbell trial will last two weeks. If convicted, the four each face 44 years in prison and fines of \$2.5 million.

False Promises

(taken from an excerpt of the Lindsey, Blumenthal must testify article)

The Washington Times 5/28/98

The Washington Times confirmed last night that Mr. Clinton had declined on at least four occasions to testify before the grand jury, despite repeated promises to cooperate in the Lewinsky investigation. White House spokesman James Kennedy declined to comment on the reports, first made by CBS and NBC, referring questions to Mr. Clinton's personal attorney, David Kendall. He did not return calls.

All In the Family

Parade Magazine 3/98

I hear Roger Clinton, the Presidents younger half-brother, was sued for \$78,000 in child support after blood tests confirmed he was the father of a 6 year old girl. Was the case settled?

Last summer, Roger Clinton and lawyers for the child's mother Martha Spivey of Gainesboro, Tenn. reached a confidential out-of-court settlement that provides for financial support and limited participation by Clinton in the girl's life. He has been paying \$500 a month. The child, Macy Frasier, was conceived during a brief affair in 1990 when Spivey was separated from her husband and Clinton was single. Clinton 40, an aspiring but often unemployed musician, now lives in California with his wife, Molly, 30, and their son Tyler, 4.

Cake and Champagne

The Washington Times 4/9/98

Ironically, it was a New York Times reporter, James Bennet, who revealed that "journalists" covering President Clinton's recent trip to Africa "ordered and paid for" champagne relished by Mr. Clinton's senior advisers on the same night the Paula Jones lawsuit was dismissed.

We write ironically because White House insiders now inform Inside the Beltway that it was none other than New York Times stars R.W. "Johnny" Apple and Maureen Dowd who helped foot the bill for the bubbly.

Mr. Bennet stopped short of identifying which Clinton aides sipped on the complimentary champagne that celebratory night at a French restaurant in Senegal, where in a hotel room not far away the commander-in-briefs similarly welcomed his vindication by banging on a drum and chomping on a cigar.

But we're told that White House political director Doug Sosnick, White House Press Secretary Michael McCurry, and deputy White House spokesman Joe Lockhart were among the mixed group of partyers.

Beauty Queen says Sex with Clinton was Consensual

The Washington Times April 1, 1998

Elizabeth Ward Gracen, the former Miss America who fled the country rather than testify in the Paula Jones sexual misconduct lawsuit, acknowledges she had sex with Bill Clinton in 1983 but denies being a victim of unwanted sexual overtures.

Miss Gracen, who previously denied having sex with Mr. Clinton, came forward to rebut what she said were false accusations that the former Arkansas governor had forced himself on her during an encounter in a limousine.

At the time of the incident, Mr. Clinton was married and his daughter, Chelsea, was 3. Miss Gracen jetted from one continent to another to avoid subpoena servers who have been one city behind her since they missed her at home Christmas Day in Russellville, Ark. She was tracked to Las Vegas and to Princeton, N.J. She also went to St. Martin in the Caribbean and to Paris.

Arkansas state Trooper Larry Patterson testified that his boss, Raymond L. "Buddy" Young, told him he went to Texas to talk with Miss Gracen and came away with the view that "if the money's right, I know she'll keep her mouth shut."

Carville's 'Obituary'

The Washington Times 4/9/98

"James Carville sounds sick of James Carville," writes New York Times columnist Maureen Dowd. "When I called Mr. Carville to ask why he was still hacking away at poor old Gennifer [Flowers], he sounded fatigued," the columnist said.

"I can see my obituary now," Mr. Carville told her. "James Carville, Clinton Sex Defender, Dead."

Miss Dowd also said that the Clinton defenders' standards have fallen, as evidenced by their positive reaction to former Miss America Elizabeth Ward Gracen's confession that she had an adulterous -- but consensual -- affair with the then-governor. "With any other president, at any other time, that news would have been Defcon 4," an anonymous Clintonite told the columnist. "But this White House viewed it as a pretty good story. That just shows how far we've come."

Campaign Blackmail

The Washington Times April 2, 1998

Dick Morris, the former political guru to President Clinton, says federal matching funds were used the 1992 campaign to intimidate various women linked to Bill Clinton.

"Under Betsey Wright's supervision in the 1992 Clinton campaign, there was an entire operation funded with over \$100,000 of campaign money, which included federal matching funds to hire private detectives to go into the personal lives of women who were alleged to have [had] sex with Bill Clinton. To develop compromising material -- blackmailing information, basically -- to coerce them into signing affidavits saying that they did not have sex with Bill Clinton," Mr. Morris said Tuesday on CNBC's "Equal Time."

Mr. Morris added: "I have personal knowledge that this happened. Betsey Wright, who coordinated it, told me it happened."

White House Wildlife

The Washington Times April 2, 1998

"Last year, Hillary Clinton raved about a book she was reading called 'Demonic Males,' about how naughtiness is wired into males of all species," New York Times columnist Maureen Dowd writes from Africa.

"She joked about how, when you read the book, it was surprising that men ever behaved well at all," Miss Dowd writes.

"Perhaps, having read that book and having toured this continent herself last year, she realized that Africa was the perfect place to put the wildlife in Bill Clinton's White House in perspective."

White House Stalls on Lawyers' Role

The Washington Times April 1, 1998

The White House yesterday resisted explaining to the Senate whether its \$2.36 million legal department is conducting improper personal legal work for President Clinton. The General Accounting Office, meanwhile, moved to determine if tax dollars are being misused in the counsel's office.

"We have received more information from the Internal Revenue Service than we have about White House legal work," said a spokeswoman for Sen. Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Colorado Republican and chairman of the Senate subcommittee that oversees the White House budget.

The White House told Mr. Campbell that it won't let him question members of the counsel's office about their role in Mr. Clinton's defense in the sex-and-lies scandal and will only send a White House administrator to an annual budget hearing before his Senate Appropriations subcommittee.

This One is Different, Prominent Women Say

The Washington Times March 17, 1998

Prominent women who have long formed the core of President Clinton's political support broke their silence yesterday to say that Kathleen Willey's accusations that he kissed and groped her are serious

and troubling.

From Democrats on Capitol Hill to leading feminist organizations, female leaders said they found the former White House aide's description of the incident compelling. They cautioned, however, that the charges are unproven.

"All of the allegations against the president are extremely serious and should not be taken lightly. If what Mrs. Willey claims is true, sexual harassment occurred and sexual harassment at any level is inexcusable," said Sen. Mary L. Landrieu, Louisiana Democrat.

"If it were my marriage, I'd kill him," said Amy Isaacs, national director of Americans for Democratic Action, likewise cautioning that the charges are just that.

"If he has broken the law, then I'll stand at the head of the line to get rid of him. But that's a big, big 'if,'" she said.

Rep. Nita Lowey, New York Democrat, said Mrs. Willey's charges were "serious and troubling for those of us who have fought so hard against sexual harassment."

The comments underscore how the charges by Mrs. Willey wield a potential political impact that those by other Clinton accusers -- including Paula Jones and Gennifer Flowers B have not.

Mrs. Willey's interview Sunday night on CBS' "60 Minutes" invited comparison with the televised testimony of Anita Hill, whose 1991 accusations against then-Supreme Court nominee Clarence Thomas raised the debate on sexual harassment to a new height.

Like Miss Hill, Mrs. Willey is a reluctant witness who waited several years to go public with her charges.

Leaders of feminist organizations, who have taken heat for backing Justice Thomas' accuser but failing to come to the aid of Mrs. Jones, reacted quickly and loudly to Mrs. Willey's description of her 1993 encounter with the president.

"Perhaps we need to redefine what a good president is, what a good man is -- because this is beyond the idea of being the likable rogue or the womanizer and really on into sexual assault, sexual abuse," said National Organization for Women President Patricia Ireland, referring to Mr. Clinton's high poll numbers. "It's not verbal harassment. This was an unwanted touching."

It is "a very serious allegation against the president, along with the allegations of covering that up," she said in a morning television appearance.

On Capitol Hill, the mood among Democrats plummeted yesterday as most aides conceded privately that their bosses are wrestling with how to deal with the story that most of them find compelling, disturbing and damaging to Mr. Clinton.

"It was brutal," said one aide to a Senate Democrat. Of Mrs. Willey, the aide said: "This is a woman whom you cannot tie to any kind of organized Bill Clinton hate club."

Analysts elsewhere pointed out that this is the first time Mr. Clinton has been accused of making unwanted sexual overtures while in the White House.

They also said that, while it may be unfair, Mrs. Willey's allegations have more credibility because she came across as better-bred and more mature than previous Clinton accusers.

"There's a class thing at work here," said one administration official watching the spectacle from afar. "She's convincing because she's middle-class and she's articulate and she doesn't have big hair."

Mr. Clinton has long counted on female voters for much of his political support. He wooed them during the 1996 campaign with family-friendly policy proposals and won 54 percent of the women's vote, compared with 37 for GOP nominee Bob Dole.

Some observers questioned whether feminist groups would make anything more than a brief break with a president who has backed their positions on abortion and other key issues.

"Clinton has a lot of chits in with the feminist community," said American University history professor Allan Lichtman. Asked if the remarks would do serious damage to Mr. Clinton, he said, "If it's just an isolated statement, no."

Mr. Clinton has denied he made advances toward Mrs. Willey at their meeting in 1993, a denial he repeated yesterday.

Not all prominent female lawmakers were critical of Mr. Clinton. Both senators from California, Barbara Boxer and Dianne Feinstein, each a close ally of the White House, said they would withhold judgment.

"The president has denied any impropriety with Monica Lewinsky and now Kathleen Willey. I am not in a position to know the facts in either case and am not going to make a judgment until I do," Mrs. Feinstein said.

Mrs. Boxer went further, saying that Mrs. Willey "has made serious charges and they deserve to be thoroughly investigated. It should also be noted that the president has unequivocally denied these charges."

Female Republican lawmakers, who are not natural Clinton supporters but have largely held their fire until now, also spoke up yesterday.

Rep. Constance A. Morella, Maryland Republican, said someone committed perjury. "There are serious allegations and somebody is lying, which means there's perjury involved and I don't know which one it is," she said. "But she comes off as rather credible."

Jones' Lawyers Allege Cover-up of Willey Papers

CNN AllPolitics March 29, 1998

Motion Also Cites Alleged Sexual Assault Accusation

Lawyers for Paula Jones are accusing President Bill Clinton and his legal team of failing to produce subpoenaed documents, and they are asking for sanctions against the president and his attorneys.

Jones' attorneys charged in newly filed court papers that the Clinton legal team did not produce the entire set of letters, notes and telephone messages between Kathleen Willey and the president. Jones' lawyers asked for the documents three months ago, before Willey's deposition.

In their motion, Jones' attorneys contended that the White House had denied any such documents existed, including records about Willey's employment, appointments, duties, conferences, logs and telephone records. Willey was a volunteer worker at the White House.

The White House released some of the letters immediately after Willey's interview on CBS' "60 Minutes," in which she alleged the president made a crude sexual advance toward her.

Dodging Subpoenas

The Washington Times March 17, 1998

Elizabeth Ward Gracen, Miss America 1992, has been dodging a subpoena from Paula Jones' legal team since December, USA Today reports.

The Jones attorneys want to question Miss Gracen, a 37-year-old actress and Arkansas native, about whether then-Gov. Bill Clinton "pressured her to have sex with him, whether he arranged jobs and other benefits for her to keep quiet, and whether any of his associates participated in a 'jobs-for-silence' operation," reporter Tom Squitieri said.

Miss Gracen, in a voice-mail message in January, told USA Today: "I'm out of the country. I don't want to be a pawn in this whole ugly affair."

A friend of the beauty queen has testified that Miss Gracen tearfully told her that she had succumbed to Mr. Clinton's unwelcome advances.

"One reason Gracen is significant is that Jones' lawyers, based on interviews with her friends, are convinced she will not lie under oath. But Gracen is not making their quest easy," the reporter said.

She left Arkansas just ahead of a subpoena server, and has traveled to Las Vegas, Princeton, N.J., and the Caribbean, the newspaper said.

"I do not want to be a party to women being unjustly humiliated in the media and victimized by politicians' agenda," Miss Gracen said in a January call believed to have come from St. Martin. "And when I hang up, I'm on the move to another Caribbean island."

Depositions Portray Clinton as Sex Addict

The Washington Times March 16, 1998

Paula Jones' attorneys filed papers in federal court Friday portraying President Clinton as an

out-of-control sex addict who habitually wielded official powers to prey on young women.

For the first time, an expert on sexual addiction testified that Mrs. Jones still appears traumatized by her encounters with Mr. Clinton, and has symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder like those in shellshocked Vietnam veterans.

White House Press Secretary Michael McCurry conceded Mr. Clinton was disturbed by the release of his own denial-filled deposition along with so much damaging information. One of the depositions even said that Mr. Clinton was once moved to tears when a woman suggested he was a sex addict.

The specifics -- illustrated by stacks of sworn testimony about Mr. Clinton's sexual involvement with numerous women and from three former troopers who testified they routinely pimped for the governor they guarded -- were laid out in an ambitious argument designed as life support for Paula Jones' sexual-misconduct lawsuit against the president.

"There were many times when he had makeup on his collars, on his coats, many times that we had to stop and get a towel or to clean the makeup off of him," former Trooper Larry Patterson testified in a narration that told of perhaps 25 Clinton visits to the apartment of Gennifer Flowers, pickups of strangers on a Floridatrip, and a nighttime sexual rendezvous in the parking lot of Chelsea Clinton's Little Rock elementary school.

"Our president says that the woman is not entitled to sue for sexual harassment. Our president says that a governor who is guilty of such conduct did not do anything 'outrageous,'" Mrs. Jones' lawyers said in a request that U.S. District Judge Susan Webber Wright not throw the case out of court, as the president requested.

Lead counsel Donovan Campbell Jr. accused the president of orchestrating a massive cover-up. He said presidential counsel and close friend Bruce Lindsey threatened "to destroy" Dolly Kyle Browning with vicious lies if she persisted in discussing her relationship with Mr. Clinton.

He said Miss Flowers was directed to deny her claimed 12-year affair with him, in exchange for a state job he got her at the Arkansas Appeal Tribunal, and tried to suppress Kathleen E. Willey's testimony about sexual advances inside the White House.

The filing revealed a great deal of material that was under court seal, including nearly all of the president's own Jan. 17 deposition, in which Mr. Clinton adamantly denied virtually every accusation.

Asked about Mrs. Willey's vivid charge that he made advances toward her in the Oval Office, Mr. Clinton said, "I emphatically deny it. It did not happen."

Disputing her version of the meeting, he said: "I embraced her. I put my arms around her. I may have even kissed her on the forehead. There was nothing sexual about it."

As The Washington Times reported first on Jan. 27, Mrs. Willey said the president startled her with his forwardness, hugging and fondling her and taking her hand to touch his penis

when she went to him Nov. 29, 1993, to request a paid job.

"He put my hands on his genitals," Mrs. Willey testified, saying she quickly overcame her surprise and pulled her hand away.

"Could you tell whether he was aroused?" Mr. Campbell asked her. "Yes," she replied. "And was he?" "Yes," she said.

The president did acknowledge that he uses the phrase "that come-hither look" to describe women he finds attractive.

"It means either in look or dress a sort of suggestive appearance from the look or dress," he said in response to questions during his deposition. "Sexually suggestive?" he was asked. "Yes," he replied.

Mr. Campbell released the first sworn statement from Linda R. Tripp, documenting that Mrs. Willey told of an unsolicited sexual advance by Mr. Clinton in the Oval Office and that Monica Lewinsky detailed a sexual relationship with the president, accompanied by voice tapes and gifts.

"[Miss Lewinsky] said that she was going to deny everything, that President Clinton would deny everything and she repeatedly stated that I must lie and deny that she had ever told me anything about a relationship with President Clinton," Mrs. Tripp declared.

Mr. Campbell recounted the Lewinsky story despite the fact that Judge Wright has ruled out testimony about her to protect independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr's criminal investigation.

The legal filing attacked the president's Feb. 17 legal contention that the lawsuit be dismissed on grounds that even if Mrs. Jones was telling the truth she had no legal basis for a lawsuit.

Mrs. Jones' lawyers seized on that argument, suggesting an American president should have a different moral and legal view of himself, and accusing Mr. Clinton of orchestrating a "a veritable orgy" of legal and factual distortions in his attempt to escape being held liable.

"The president -- our president -- says that a state governor may, with complete impunity, direct a state policeman to summon a female employee of any agency controlled by the governor to leave her workplace in order to meet the governor in a room where, unbeknownst to her, he is alone and waiting to sexually assault her, and there the governor may, with complete impunity, expose and fondle his erect penis in front of the woman, and even command her to perform oral sex," Donovan Campbell Jr. said in responding to the president's request that the case be decided for him without a trial.

"This is a filing to smear the president," Mr. Clinton's attorney, Robert S. Bennett, said at a press conference in Los Angeles, where he denied every single incident related by a dozen witnesses in the Jones filing.

He rejected the Jones team's claim that the papers filed Friday in Little Rock federal court show a pattern of sexual harassment. "There is no pattern," Mr. Bennett insisted while reviving his charge that Mrs. Jones and her backers are politically motivated.

"I think that the president's reputation is pretty darn good in the eyes of the American people. The

American people see through all this," he said, speaking at his West Coast office, where he traveled to give a speech at the University of Southern California.

This thing is nothing but a big piece of cotton candy. When you bite into it, it doesn't exist," Mr. Bennett said, appearing more tired than angry.

The incidents Mr. Bennett brushed off as totally untrue included vivid descriptions of the president's bent for frequent sexual release with many women, attempted seductions, long-term affairs and a momentary fling with a beauty queen in the back seat of a gubernatorial limo.

Mrs. Willey gave a second deposition to change a crucial part of the first, erasing her claim that no one discussed her testimony.

She admitted she was approached by wealthy Maryland developer Nathan Landow who, according to Mrs. Jones' lawyers, asked her to cover up the incident.

Debra Lynn Ballentine, a state co-worker of Mrs. Jones', testified that her friend told her of Mr. Clinton's overtures moments after she left his suite at the Excelsior Hotel on May 8, 1991.

Her testimony confirmed the Oct. 15 report by The Times how Mrs. Jones described the so-called "distinguishing characteristics" of his penis.

"She told me that he had an erection but that it was like bent, real bent, and she asked me if I had ever seen anything like that before and I said no. I didn't know exactly -- I didn't know what she was talking about, but she said something was wrong," Miss Ballentine said.

"He had an erection, a full erection, but it was -- she said it was like bent and she showed me with her hand it was bent sideways," she said.

The troopers' depositions backed up their own stories, first published in December 1993 by the American Spectator and the Los Angeles Times, that related encounters with many women, including some whose names are not known.

Trooper Larry Patterson's testimony was typical. He told about one relationship after the other, with lawyers referring to them by numbers as Jane Doe #1, #2, #3, #4 and so on.

Jane Doe #1, who has been identified as Marilyn Jo Jenkins, an Entergy employee in Little Rock, was the woman escorted into the governor's mansion by Trooper Danny Ferguson on the governor's last day before leaving to become president.

"[She] appeared at the governor's mansion at 5:15 a.m. in a trench coat and a baseball cap, Danny's job was to get her through the Secret Service detail to take her to the basement of the governor's mansion and then stand on the stairs as a lookout while they had their meeting in the basement of the governor's mansion," Mr. Patterson testified.

After Mr. Bennett suggested Mrs. Jones sustained no emotional harm and therefore had no claim for damages on that score, she was examined Feb. 13 by Patrick J. Carnes, clinical director for sexual

disorder services at an Arizona clinic called The Meadows. Mr. Carnes also is editor-in-chief of Sexual Addiction and Compulsivity, a medical journal on sexual disorders.

He found Mrs. Jones' symptoms "consistent with profiles of victims of sexual harassment," like those seen in victims of rape and child abuse.

The question of sexual addiction was broached to Mr. Clinton by Mrs. Browning, who testified she thought she was a sex addict and asked if he considered whether he was as well. She said he seemed to accept her suggestion and cried.

Mrs. Browning, now a Dallas lawyer, has known Mr. Clinton since they were pre-teens in Hot Springs, Ark., and testified to an affair with him that she said began in adolescence and continued until 1992.

Mrs. Jones charged that Mr. Clinton violated her civil rights and sexually assaulted her, that he put his hand on her thigh, reached up the leg of her culottes and touched her vagina, then exposed his penis and fondled himself while asking her to "kiss it." She said she refused and left within about 90 seconds, after he warned her to remain silent.

"You're a smart girl, let's keep this between ourselves," she said Mr. Clinton told her.

A Kind Word for Our Theologian in Chief

The Washington Times 3/9/98

Bill Clinton, who pioneered the use of Christian theology as a tool of seduction, got a little good news and a little bad news Thursday. The Rev. Billy Graham, the nation's chaplain, suggested the nation go easy on our Theologian in Chief, and said he would forgive him even if it's true that he boffed Monica Lewinsky in the Oval Office pantry and told her to lie about it. That's the good news, and we can hear the president now (stroking the lady's hair): "Look, darlin', even Billy Graham thinks it's OK if we do it. This is not really adultery. The Bible says so. You don't think Billy Graham would lie about it, do you? He knows the pressure I'm under, and if the top preacher in the universe thinks I'm entitled, who are you to say no? Besides, I love the way your hair grows out of your head."

But here's the bad news: Mr. Graham, perhaps foolishly forgetting how the president could use his eloquent restating of the fundamental Christian doctrine of forgiveness merely for licentious purpose, reminded his interviewer that he forgives Richard Nixon, too. In fact, the Watergate president seems to rank higher in his esteem than the Whitewater president: "He was a tremendous man," Mr. Graham told Katie Couric on NBC-TV's "Today" show. "I think he had a grasp of foreign policy better than any other president I've known. ... I looked on him as a pal, because we were together so much in different places when he had won, when he had lost, and so forth."

Mr. Graham, the kindly preacher he is, forgives all presidents their trespasses, and, speaking of Mr. Nixon, recalled the story, from the eighth chapter of the Gospel according to St. John, of the scribes and Pharisees putting before Jesus a woman "taken in adultery, in the very act." The Pharisees dared Jesus to ignore the law of Moses, which decreed stoning for an adulteress. "So when they continued asking Him, he lifted up himself, and said unto them: 'He that is without sin among you, let him first

cast a stone at her."

And so, Mr. Graham says of Mr. Nixon, "I forgive him." He extends this to Bill Clinton, but --and here's another spot of bad news for the president -- with an asterisk. "I think that a president should attempt, with God's help, to have a higher moral standard than perhaps the average man in the public has."

Mr. Graham's reluctance to come down hard on the president's view of Christian morality is peculiar to our age. Dwight L. Moody and Billy Sunday, earlier giants of evangelism on whom Mr. Graham modeled himself, never cut public sin any slack. We can take a certain consolation, perhaps, in the knowledge that public men in earlier times, when robes, unlike trousers, did not even come with zippers, were no better and the race survived anyway. Nevertheless, the silence of preachers with the duty to denounce the sin while leaving the sinner untouched is deafening. Hillary's pastor mumbles something incoherent about "facts obscuring truth," which makes almost as much sense as an observation that "it's better to be rich than sick." Or, "a cheerful giver will have peanut butter in abundance." It's the meaningless chatter of holy men with nothing to say to "a faithless and perverse generation."

This leaves the field clear for shameless secular men, like Bill Clinton, to mug facts and maim truth, seducing an ever widening pool of patsies. He perfected his line with the girls in the back seat of his jalopy on the side streets of Hot Springs, and has expanded it now to most of the women of America. If we can believe the polls --and polls are all the politicians in Washington do believe in -- these women are dying to climb into that back seat to see what the president offers. All the pols want is to stay out of his way.

But maybe not all. Several hundred women rallied Thursday at the U.S. Court House in Washington, where a grand jury is listening as the Clinton administration files in one by one to insist "there ain't nobody in the hen house but us chickens." The demonstrators made the point that some American women are fed up with the miserable lack of dignity, decency and decorum on Pennsylvania Avenue.

They're fed up that the president gets by without having to account for white-trash behavior, that until now no one has been willing to take him on because sucking up to celebrity and power is the new national pastime.

The president's deposition, as reported by The Washington Post (and a good piece of work it was) reflects the sordid culture that is the new American way of life. The lawyers who took his deposition, determined not to give the president wiggle room, identified five categories of sexual dalliance. Like someone ordering off the menu at a Chinese restaurant, the president could admit to No. 1, deny No. 3, and get a pass on No. 4. Not every man is a gelding in the Gelded Age.

Clinton=s Involvement with Flight Attendants

ABC News Report February 18, 1998

Following the first ad break, Peter Jennings told February 18 World News Tonight viewers: "In Washington the grand jury that's hearing evidence about alleged sex and cover-ups involving the

President, allegedly anyway, and Monica Lewinsky, heard today from the deputy White House counsel Bruce Lindsey. Outside he would not talk about his testimony, as ABC's John Cochran tells us Mr. Lindsey is a man who knows how to keep a secret."

John Cochran openedCochran continued his glowing profile by illustrating it with some interesting footage: "He usually tries to head off trouble before it starts," Cochran asserted. As viewers saw video of a flight attendant dancing with Lindsey, Cochran explained: "On election day in 1992 he celebrated Clinton's expected victory, but he had worried during the campaign that stories might erupt about Clinton and flight attendants."

While video rolled showing **Clinton and a flight attendant sharing a single jump seat as Clinton first put his hand on her knee and then she wrapped her arm around his**, Cochran reported: "**This attendant later got a job at the White House.** After the election Lindsey told another flight attendant she did not have to talk to reporters."

Willey Tells of Clinton Advance

The Washington Post March 16, 1998

Kathleen E. Willey, a former White House aide who once considered herself "good friends" with President Clinton, broke her long public silence in an interview broadcast last night and accused the president of lying under oath when he denied making a sexual advance to her near the Oval Office four years ago.

In a soft and halting voice, Willey recounted to a national television audience that she met with Clinton to seek a paid job in November 1993 only to have him kiss and grope her against her will. The president, she said, had "taken advantage of" her emotional distress at a time when her family faced financial ruin and her husband was missing.

In some ways, Willey could be a more troublesome witness for the president than the other women claiming sexual encounters. What she alleged was not a consensual relationship, as have Gennifer Flowers and Dolly Kyle Browning. A longtime Democrat, she cannot be dismissed as part of the "vast right-wing conspiracy," as was Paula Jones, who has aligned herself with conservatives in her sexual harassment lawsuit against Clinton. And because Willey was so unwilling to come forward for so long, she has not given the impression of someone eager to capitalize on her accusation.

"This is not just sexual harassment. If it's true, it's sexual assault," Patricia Ireland, president of the National Organization for Women, said on CNN's "Late Edition." **"He put his hand on her breast, he put her hand on his erection.** That is a pretty serious charge if true and it is a very big problem."

On the same show, Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Orrin G. Hatch (R-Utah) said that if Willey is telling the truth, "then I have to tell you, I think this presidency would be over."

Clinton Denied Exposing Himself

USA Today 1/20/98

One source familiar with the testimony said Clinton denied exposing himself to Mrs. Jones and asking her for oral sex in a Little Rock hotel room in 1991, as she has alleged. Clinton did not rule out having been introduced to Mrs. Jones, then an Arkansas state employee, but said he did not remember ever meeting her, the source said.

Another of the submitted questions asked Clinton if he had slept with a woman he appointed to an Arkansas judgeship.

Clinton Denies Having Affair with Intern

USA Today 1/21/98

Whitewater prosecutors have expanded their investigation to determine whether President Clinton had an affair with a White House intern and tried to cover it up. Presidential aides said Wednesday Clinton adamantly denies the charges and is "outraged by them."

Meanwhile, Republicans seized on the latest controversy to strike the Clinton White House. House Judiciary Chairman Henry Hyde said he would wait to see what turns up, but suggested impeachment proceedings would be an option if the allegations are proven true.

Clinton "never had any improper relationship with this woman," White House press secretary Mike McCurry said. "He's made it clear from the beginning that he wants people to tell the truth in all matters."

Is it appropriate for Starr to expand his probe to examine this alleged Clinton affair?

* 9122 responses

Yes.
67%

No.
33%

Immunity

The Washington Post 3/5/98

"We would love immunity, we would love her to tell the truth," Ginsburg said on CNN's "Larry King Live." "[If not] we are prepared to try this case . . . we don't think the American public will convict her."

Clinton Aides Admit Effort to Nail Starr

The Washington Times 1/25/98

The White House yesterday admitted to mounting a campaign to discredit Whitewater prosecutor Kenneth W. Starr but said its effort did not include unearthing personal foibles. Newspapers and TV networks, however, have received information about the personal lives of Mr.

Starr and his team, although Clinton officials note that the information did not come from the White House, but from Clinton associates.

With each scandal, the White House has designated a team to handle questions about the affairs. That approach was clearly revealed in a November 1994 memo prepared by former White House lawyer Jane Sherburne. Her so-called "task list" detailed 39 ethical and legal areas and who was assigned to handle each.

In a highly unusual complaint about White House lying published in *The Washington Post* in 1994, for example, former White House correspondent Ruth Marcus warned that Clinton aides can't always be believed.

"To borrow a phrase from the law of libel, the Clinton White House often seems to be following a pattern of knowing or reckless disregard for the truth. Apparently putting its short-term political interests ahead of accuracy, it regularly fails to provide trustworthy information -- whether out of inability, unwillingness or both," she wrote in August 1994.

Clinton Quotes and Lies

Gore admits boom began with Bush

By Bill Sammon
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

Vice President Al Gore, who in 1992 said America was in "the worst economy since the Great Depression," is now quietly acknowledging the current economic boom began midway through the Bush administration.

The Clinton-Gore team, eager to claim bragging rights for presiding over what will soon become the longest economic expansion on record, finds itself in the awkward position of crediting President Bush, the father of one of Mr. Gore's presidential rivals, for initiating the expansion.

"The economic expansion that began in April 1991 is now the second longest on record," said a recent report by the White House Office of Management and Budget. "If the expansion continues through February 2000 -- as virtually all private- and public-sector forecasters expect -- it will become the longest running expansion ever."

But in October 1992, 18 months after the boom began, Mr. Gore insisted the economy "is in trouble." During a debate with Vice President Dan Quayle, then-Senator Gore denounced Bush-Quayle economic policies.

"The experience that George Bush and Dan Quayle have been talking about includes the worst economic performance since the Great Depression," said Mr. Gore, hammering home a campaign theme he first articulated months earlier. "Unemployment is up, personal income is down, bankruptcies are up, housing starts are down."

"How long can we continue with trickle-down economics when the record of failure is so abundantly clear?"

Last week, Gore spokesman Chris Lehane said that rhetoric is not at odds with the vice president's tacit acknowledgment that the recovery began halfway through the Bush administration.

"If you ask people who were working men and women in the late '80s and early '90s whether they thought that time was tougher than this time, I think it's a pretty clear answer," said Mr. Lehane, who emphasized that 18 million new jobs have been created during the Clinton-Gore years.

"The economic plan that they put out in the summer of 1993 on which Gore cast the tie-breaking vote -- balanced the budget, significantly cut the deficit and allowed the bond market to respond strongly, which then helped promote the strongest stock market in history," he added. "I mean, you went from a time period in which the [debt] was almost quadrupled to a period where the stock market has now quadrupled."

But the nonpartisan National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) says the Clinton-Gore team did not create the current economic expansion. Rather, Mr. Clinton and Mr. Gore merely presided over a boom that was nearly two years old by the time they took office in January 1993.

"The beginning of the uptick was under Bush," said NBER spokeswoman Donna Zerwitz. "The economic truth is that seeds for the recovery were sown during the Bush era."

Still, the Clinton-Gore team "had an awful long time to screw up and turn the economy bad," she added. "We'll nominate Al Greenspan for sainthood if he single-handedly saved us from that, but I kind of doubt it."

Miss Zerwitz said the Clinton-Gore team deserves credit for keeping the economy going "even if it's by not interfering.

Even if it's by omission, rather than commission."

Some Republicans have argued that the current economic expansion is actually a continuation of the boom begun by the Reagan-Bush team in 1982.

Taking a longer view of economic cycles, they claim America is in the midst of a 17-year expansion that was temporarily interrupted by an eight-month downturn that Mr. Bush managed to reverse while Mr. Clinton was still governor of Arkansas.

In the years since losing to Mr. Clinton, Mr. Bush has complained that the press never gave him credit for turning around the economy, even when signs of recovery became abundant in mid-1992. At that time, some economists pointed out that the gross domestic product had risen three quarters in a row, proving that the recession had technically ended.

But the Clinton-Gore campaign, led by James Carville and George Stephanopoulos, emphasized that many Americans were still suffering economically. Ironically, that is the same point Mr. Clinton made last week during a four-day tour of America's most impoverished places.

As to Mr. Gore's claim in October 1992 that Bush policies "have created the worst economy since the Great Depression," Miss Zerwitz said Mr. Gore "probably should have said we are coming out of . . . the worst economy."

"We may have still been early enough in the recovery that things still looked bad if you didn't have your crystal ball," she said. "There was no official word that things had turned around."

The official word from NBER came in December 1992, the month after Mr. Bush had been defeated. Miss Zerwitz said that although the NBER was accused of playing politics with the timing, the real reason for the delay was an unusually complex set of financial indicators that obscured the full dimensions of the recovery until after the election.

Since then, Clinton administration officials have often lauded the economic boom while remaining vague about the precise date of its birth. But now that the expansion is about to enter record territory, the Clinton-Gore team find themselves unable to claim credit for the feat without affixing an exact date to the start of the turnaround.

According to the NBER, which has chronicled business cycles dating back to 1854, the longest expansion on record began in 1961 and ended in 1969, lasting 106 months.

The Reagan-Bush expansion lasted 92 months -- from 1982 to 1990. The Bush recession lasted eight months in 1990 and 1991.

The expansion that began under Mr. Bush and continues under Mr. Clinton is now in its 100th month and will become the longest on record at the end of February, when it will be 107 months old.

FBI Asked to Probe Clinton Advisers

By Ron Fournier
AP Political Writer
Thursday, September 17, 1998; 5:05 p.m. EDT

WASHINGTON (AP) -- The White House says there is no "scorched earth strategy," but Republicans see a trend. They say it's been open season on Bill Clinton's critics.

Since the president admitted he had sex with Monica Lewinsky, three Republican lawmakers were forced to acknowledge adulterous affairs, and questions were raised about the military honors of a Democrat who asked publicly for Clinton to resign.

Suspecting White House handiwork, Republican leaders asked FBI director Louis Freeh on Thursday to investigate whether Clinton advisers

or allies peddled stories of adulterous relations to the media.

“Clearly there is credible evidence that an organized campaign of slander and intimidation may exist,” the letter says.

It singled out White House aide Sidney Blumenthal for suspicion. Blumenthal was not available for comment, although he has told superiors he did not distribute information about Rep. Henry Hyde, the focus of the latest revelation.

While Republicans vented their anger, Democrats feared the suspicions will poison efforts to strike a deal to avoid Clinton's impeachment. And lawmakers from both parties fretted that they will be the next focus of prying eyes.

Hyde, Judiciary Committee chairman, admitted Wednesday to “indiscretions” with a woman in the 1960s at a time both were married. The Illinois Republican would oversee impeachment proceedings.

Rep. Helen Chenoweth disclosed last week that she had a long-term affair with a married man in the 1980s. The Idaho Republican had run ads accusing Clinton of damaging the presidency with the Lewinsky affair.

Rep. Dan Burton said a week earlier he fathered a child from an extramarital relationship in the early 1980s. The Indiana Republican is one of Clinton's staunchest critics.

All three lawmakers came forward after reporters questioned them about the relationship. There is no proof the White House or Clinton backers planted or spread the stories, but even some colleagues wonder if Blumenthal was involved.

White House chief of staff Erskine Bowles promised Thursday to fire staff members caught collecting or distributing information on lawmakers' private lives. “We will not tolerate such conduct,” Bowles said in a letter to Hyde.

Staff members who deal with the media have denied spreading the reports, Bowles said.

But even the president's top aides say privately they understand why Republicans are so suspicious.

--From the day the Lewinsky investigation became public, presidential confidants outside the White House told reporters about informal efforts to gather information about Ms. Lewinsky and lawmakers, particularly Judiciary Committee members.

--Some White House advisers have helped spread rumors and news stories about wrongdoing by the president's political enemies. ``There are not five pure guys" in Congress, one senior aide has said repeatedly.

--In August, a Clinton loyalist was blamed for leaking an incorrect report that Rep. Paul McHale took credit for military honors he didn't receive. McHale was the first Democrat to demand Clinton's resignation.

--Bob Mulholland, a Democratic National Committee member from California, threatened in April to expose adulterous activity of GOP lawmakers if impeachment proceedings begin. He later said he was not serious, and Democratic leaders disavowed his threats.

Mulholland chuckled Thursday when asked about the Hyde, Chenoweth and Burton revelations. ``They can't say they weren't warned," Mulholland said.

He denied involvement in distributing negative information about congressmen, but Mulholland predicted ``angry spouses and ex-spouses" will continue to reveal private details about GOP lawmakers.

``In a few months, there won't be a quorum left on House Judiciary," he said.

One longtime Clinton supporter, speaking on condition of anonymity, predicted the private lives of well-known reporters will soon be revealed, not necessarily by presidential backers but ``just because of the inertia of this whole thing."

Hyde said the news article disclosing his relationship was ``an obvious attempt to intimidate me." He had warned Judiciary Committee members in a memo that Clinton supporters and White House staff may attempt to distribute derogatory information about them and said such acts could be an illegal attempt to intimidate the Congress.

``We are witnessing more signs of the White House scorched earth strategy," declared House GOP Whip Tom DeLay of Texas.

These are chilling times in a town traditionally known for a high-octane mix of sex and power.

Some lawmakers dismissed the notion that they can be intimidated.

``You think I'm worried?" quipped Rep. Barney Frank, a Massachusetts Democrat once reprimanded in his own sex controversy. ``I already gave at the office."

Report on 'anti-Clinton movement' leaked to journalists
Electronic Telegraph 9/18/98 By Ambrose Evans-Pritchard

Starr evidence to be censored for Lewinsky's sake

AS far back as December 1996, the White House was discovered disseminating material from a 330-page report called the Communication Stream of Conspiracy Commerce, a collection of remarkable profiles and annotated press cuttings prepared at taxpayers' expense by the President's legal team.

The report was not intended for publication. It was shown to a few selected journalists thought to be sympathetic to President Clinton. They were encouraged to use it as a crib sheet for articles on the so-called anti-Clinton movement, some of which appeared in print. The document was forced out into the open when the Wall Street Journal reported its existence, setting off a clamour of protest.

Philip Weiss, a feature writer for the Left-leaning New York Observer, said: "It was shown to me after I did a pro-administration story on the death of Vince Foster [the White House aide]. The White House was pleased by that piece, so they sent me a copy of the report. I told them, 'No thanks, I'm not interested'."

It contained a mix of facts, spin, and outright disinformation. The Sunday Telegraph, for example, was singled out for attack and called a "tabloid", even though the authors clearly knew that this was not true. The report claimed that anti-Clinton stories were instigated by Richard Mellon Scaife, a Right-wing banking billionaire. It said that Scaife uses his network of think-tanks, foundations, and media outlets to launch conspiracy tales in cyberspace. Once on the Internet "the story will be picked up by the British tabloids," which launder and return them to the United States as quasi-legitimate news.

The material closely resembled a "flow chart" designed by James Carville, Mr Clinton's former campaign manager and his fiercest defender on television. Mr Carville runs a privately-funded, arms-length operation on behalf of the White House from a basement on Capitol Hill. However, taxpayers' money may have been used to pay for a private investigator, Terry Lenzner. According to Time magazine, Mr Lenzner received a \$100,000 no-bid contract from the White House in 1994. This is likely to be of interest to the House Judiciary Committee, if it votes to go ahead with an impeachment inquiry. Mr Lenzner's firm, Investigative Group International, has been involved in "opposition research" on Paula Jones, Kenneth Starr's team and others who posed a threat to the

White House.

It is assumed that private money was used to fund this work. It would be a serious matter if government contracts paid for political investigations.

Mr Lenzner was assistant chief counsel for the Watergate Committee in 1973, when he played a role in the downfall of President Nixon.

Clinton to Governors: You=re Irrelevant

Policywire.com July 28, 1998

Federal Power-Grab Threatens Liberty, States' Sovereignty

On May 14, 1998, while in Birmingham, England, **President Clinton secretly issued a new Executive Order on federalism** that revokes President Reagan's strong Executive Order 12612 on the same subject. President Clinton's Executive Order 13083 establishes ambiguous and unconstitutional tests to justify intervention by the federal government in matters typically left to states and local communities.

New federal regulations, additional bureaucracies and new spending could be easily justified under the new Clintonian framework. In a recent Executive Memorandum, Heritage Foundation expert Adam Thierer explains the dangers of E.O. 13083.

The National Conference of State Legislatures says that the measure "calls into question fundamental principles of federalism." In a letter to President Clinton, America's governors, state and city legislators stated "we feel that E.O. 13083 so seriously erodes federalism that we must request its withdrawal."

Opposes the Founders

Executive Order 13083 is unconstitutional. The 10th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution clearly states that those powers not specifically designated to the federal government "are reserved to the states or to the people." E.O. 13083 creates ambiguous and open-ended criteria for federal intervention including:

"When decentralization increases the costs of government thus imposing additional burdens on the taxpayer."

"When States would be reluctant to impose necessary regulations because of fears that regulated business activity will relocate to other states."

"When placing regulatory authority at the State or local level would undermine regulatory goals because high costs or demands for specialized expertise will effectively place the regulatory matter

beyond the resources of State authorities."

"When the matter relates to Federally owned or managed property or natural resources, trust obligations, or international obligations."

Reverses Reagan

Executive Order 13083 also violates the federalism principles in the Constitution as recognized in the Reagan Administration . E.O. 13083 follows a precedent established by President Clinton when he gutted President Reagan's Executive Order 12606 protecting the family (revoked by E.O. 13045) and E.O. 12291 mandating cost-benefit analysis of federal rules (revoked by E.O. 12866). The new executive order reverses much of President Reagan's sound policy on federalism.

Congress Must Act to Restore Constitutional Federalism

Congress should reject the treading on the Constitution that President Clinton's new executive order embodies. Congress should make clear that such guidelines are inappropriate, and should codify stricter guidelines, such as those in President Reagan's E.O. 12612.

Private irony

The Washington Times 5/18/98

Several readers caught some unintended irony in Friday's Inside Politics, which reported that Vice President Al Gore had called for an "electronic bill of rights" to allow Americans to protect their privacy.

Jim Azevedo of San Diego writes: "Where was he when 900 files containing highly private information were illegally collected by the White House staff? Where was he when Linda Tripp's privacy was violated by the release of her security clearance application and arrest record by members of the administration?"

Will Mr. Gore appoint Craig Livingstone to be in charge of a "privacy initiative?"

'Egregious' Veto

The Washington Times 5/28/98

President Clinton "sent his own daughter to the exclusive, private Sidwell Friends school," writes New York Post columnist Irwin M. Stelzer. "Yet he vetoed a bill that would have given poor kids the same opportunity to escape the egregious D.C. school system because 'we must not abandon' our public schools, and because it would be 'a disservice to those children.' ...

"It's more important to pander to the teachers' unions than to give a few thousand children an opportunity to escape Washington's poverty trap," Mr. Stelzer adds of the president's reasoning. "In short, sauce for the Chelsea goose is not sauce for the poor citizen's gander, say our nation's leader and his supporters."

Report: Clinton Deposition Admits Affair with Flowers

USA Today 1/22/98

Amid reports that President Clinton has acknowledged for the first time an affair with Gennifer Flowers during the 1970s, a White House official said Thursday that Clinton's latest account is "not at odds" with his earlier denials.

Flowers said "it's hard to believe" Clinton now reportedly admits what he had long denied.

The Washington Post said Thursday that the president's reversal came during Clinton's six-hour closed-door deposition Saturday in the Paula Jones sexual harassment lawsuit. The Post quoted unidentified sources familiar with his testimony.

White House press secretary Mike McCurry confirmed Thursday that Jones' lawyers questioned Clinton under oath about his relationship with Flowers. During the 1992 presidential campaign, Clinton denied Ms. Flowers' statements that they had a 12-year affair, but he admitted having caused pain in his marriage.

"The president knows that he told the truth in 1992 when he was asked about that relationship and he knows that he testified truthfully on Saturday and he knows his answers are not at odds," McCurry told reporters Thursday.

What? Excuse me but this is beyond comprehension.

Willey affidavit describes a crude Lothario

The Washington Times

President Clinton's unsolicited advances to Kathleen Willey in the Oval Office went beyond a hug, a stolen kiss and anxious groping, according to a sealed affidavit. **AHe grabbed her breast and put her hand on his genitals,"** a source familiar with information sealed by the federal court in Richmond, Va., told The Washington Times.

"We shouldn't be doing this," Mrs. Willey said of the contact, the source said. **AI always wanted to,"** Mr. Clinton is said to have replied during the encounter in the Oval Office and adjacent presidential study. The Willeys and Clintons were acquaintances.

The incident occurred Nov. 29, 1993, when Mrs. Willey met alone with Mr. Clinton to request a full-time job because of a family financial crisis. **Her husband, Edward Willey Jr., committed suicide that same day because of the money problems.**

The details about the president's unsolicited Oval Office advances to Mrs. Willey reveal possible links to disclosures by Monica Lewinsky and Paula Jones. A second source confirmed the substance of the Willey incident with The Times but refused to discuss specific details.

Koop got Arlington Burial Waiver

The Washington Times 2/2/98

President Clinton overrode Army opposition and granted a unique burial waiver at Arlington National Cemetery to C. Everett Koop at a time when first lady Hillary Rodham had enlisted the former surgeon general to support her national health care plan, internal documents show. Dr. Koop, the nation's top health official for seven years under Presidents Reagan and Bush, never served in the armed forces. Ex-military status is nearly always a factor in the handful of nonspousal waivers issued yearly. Military experts said they knew of no other instance in which a president awarded burial rights at Arlington to a living non-veteran.

Basic Opposition

Unbelievable Walsh

The Washington Times 2/25/98

Lawrence Walsh, the former Iran-Contra prosecutor, criticizes Kenneth W. Starr for bringing Monica Lewinsky's mother before a grand jury. But Mr. Walsh showed no restraint in his own subpoenas, the New York Post says. "Consider: During the Iran-Contra investigation, Walsh subpoenaed Betsy North, the wife of Lt. Col. Oliver North; North lawyer Brendan Sullivan -- even North's pastor. In one go, Walsh flung down and danced upon spousal, attorney-client and even pastoral privilege," the newspaper said in an editorial. "To the best of our knowledge, none of those who currently profess shock -- shock! -- at Starr's efforts even said boo about Walsh's far more serious attacks on privacy and privilege. "Also, as the Landmark Legal Foundation's Mark Levin has pointed out, Walsh publicly cited supposedly secret grand-jury testimony more than 600 times in his final report. Starr, by contrast, has merely been accused of leaking such testimony, without a shred of evidence. "Unlike Starr, Walsh abused his office and made a mockery out of fairness and justice. To denounce this self-righteous Savonarola as a hypocrite would do an injustice to hypocrites everywhere."

Why Did Willey Wait?

ABC's World News Tonight March 17, 1998

Sam Donaldson began the show anchored by Forrest Sawyer: "The President's defenders here sense real danger in Willey's story, particularly because of the way she told it on television. Here was a woman who appeared vulnerable...and sympathetic to many of those who watched..."

After showing Clinton's denial, Donaldson noted that letters to Clinton showed she "spoke admiring of him." Like the other networks Donaldson reported that "White House Communications Director Ann Lewis says she's convinced the President is telling the truth because what she saw on television." Lewis completed Donaldson's sentence: "Simply is contradicted by the person I met with who in 1996 was so positive about the President."

But, Donaldson highlighted a contradiction missed by the other network reporters: "The letters released today appear to support Lewis's view. But, when Anita Hill was questioned sharply about why'd she not charged Clarence Thomas with sexual harassment until years later, during his Supreme Court confirmation hearing, it was none other than Ann Lewis who said women would understand the delay."

Ann Lewis, October 1991: "We know what it's like to work for a boss who insults you, who degrades you and yet you feel you have to go on working, you have to go on working, you have to go on being friendly."

Mrs. Lewis Not the Only Mother Called to Testify

The Washington Times February 28, 1998

"Mrs. Lewis might be comforted to know that she isn't the first mother forced to answer difficult questions dealing with a daughter's relationship with Bill Clinton. Albeit with little fanfare, Delmer Lee Corbin, the mother of Paula Corbin Jones, was ordered by President Clinton's attorneys to give a similar deposition under oath, which also lasted several hours. "She was summoned several months ago to the Little Rock law firm of Wright, Lindsey and Jennings, where Mr. Clinton's legal team pressed her about everything her daughter might have told her concerning that infamous night in 1991, when Mrs. Jones said she had a close encounter with then-Gov. Clinton in a Little Rock hotel room. "The grilling by the attorneys wasn't easy for Mrs. Corbin, either. During one break in her testimony, she hid her face from cameras and declined to answer questions. "Come to think of it, Miss Lewinsky is lucky she doesn't have a sister. Mrs. Jones does, her name is Lydia Cathey, and she too was ordered by the president's attorneys to testify under oath. Where is William Ginsburg when you need him?"

Associates Dead or in Jail

The Clinton body count

Joseph Farah of WorldNetDaily 9/24/98

Congress may still be wondering whether President Clinton should be impeached for his sexual improprieties, but a growing number of Internet denizens and talk-radio listeners are all but convinced he's much worse than a lying Gigolo.

In recent months, a list of more than 80 deaths associated directly or indirectly with Clinton has been the buzz of the new media. In the last week alone, I estimate I have received two dozen copies of some version of the document.

While such lists have been around for a long time, the most amazing thing about them is not only how fast they are growing -- which they are -- but how incomplete every single one of them is.

For instance, not one version of the "body count" lists that I have seen included the name of Eric L. Henderson. Yet, everything about his remarkable

death cries out for examination.

On Feb. 25, 1997, he was shot to death while riding his bicycle in Northeast Washington, D.C. Because he didn't have identification on him, he initially was listed as a John Doe. And because the area where he died was known as an open air drug market, those who lived near it assumed that the victim was just another loser in a random dope deal gone bad.

A few weeks later, a suspect in the shooting was arrested. He was 15 years old, a chubby kid who stood 5 feet 5 and weighed 200 pounds. Because he was a juvenile, his trial, which ended in a conviction, was a confidential matter.

Eric L. Henderson was 33 when he was killed. He was a highly regarded lawyer and investment banker, a graduate of Haverford College in Pennsylvania and Columbia University School of Law in New York.

His family had searched for three days before finding his body at the D.C. morgue. Then, officials say, they pleaded for privacy in the case.

Who was this guy? He was a young man of extraordinary achievements, which included serving as -- are you ready for this? -- a financial adviser not only to the South African government under Nelson Mandela but also to the late Commerce Secretary Ron Brown.

Henderson's family members have been extremely reticent to discuss his death. His closest friends were mortified by the murder -- officially dismissed as a nickel-and-dime street killing.

They remember him as a certified financial genius. He'd helped put together the debt restructuring plan that saved Parks Sausage, a black-owned company in Baltimore. He had distinguished himself as a financial adviser to the United States Agency for International Development and the notorious U.S. Commerce Department. He also had worked as an investment banking associate at Smith Barney and PaineWebber. In 1995, he started the Onyx Group, an investment banking firm in Washington. He told friends that his goal in life was to create employment opportunities for

struggling young black males.

"Eric was in a position to be the next Reginald Lewis," the late black billionaire, said Larry Parks, a graduate of Gonzaga High in Washington and currently senior vice president of the Federal Home Loan Bank in San Francisco. "He was a visionary, on the vanguard of the next phase of the civil rights movement, which is wealth creation in the black community. The thugs have no idea who they killed."

Maybe. Maybe not. Perhaps Henderson was killed in a random drug deal on the seedy streets of Washington. Perhaps he was leading a double life, as police investigators suggest. Or maybe, just maybe, he knew too much.

It should not go unnoticed that Henderson was a financial adviser to Ron Brown, the Commerce secretary who, until his still mysterious death in a plane crash in Croatia, was under investigation and about to be indicted for some of his financial creativity. It's also worth noting that a close confidante to Brown, Nolanda Hill, has reported that Brown had confronted Clinton just before his trip -- telling him, "I won't go down alone."

Well, he certainly did not go down alone. He went down with a whole planeload of others, including government officials and businessmen involved in the trade mission. But did Brown actually die in the plane crash? Military forensics investigators discovered a perfectly cylindrical hole, the size of a .45-caliber round, in the top of his head. They could find no explanation for the hole, yet his remains were never autopsied.

That little discovery should raise questions about not only Brown's death, but those of others around him -- most notably, I would think, his young and gifted financial adviser, Eric L. Henderson.

Is it time to add one more name to the growing and staggering Clinton body count? I don't know, but the fact that such questions are not even raised in polite media company is not a good sign in a supposedly free society.

THE CLINTON BODY COUNT: A partial list of those who have died around president
WorldNetDaily.com 9/24/98

The following is a partial list of people with connections to the Clintons who have died under suspicious circumstances.

THE MOST RECENT

James McDougal
Banker
Died March 8, 1998

Jim McDougal was serving his three-year sentence for bank fraud at the Fort Worth Federal Medical Center in Texas, a facility operated by the federal Bureau of Prisons for inmates who need medical attention.

Just prior to another round of testimony before Kenneth Starr's grand jury, McDougal, while in solitary confinement, suffered a heart attack that may have been brought on by diuretics forced on him. When Jim McDougal was finally taken out of solitary, instead of attempting to defibrillate his heart with equipment on hand at the facility, he was driven over to John Peter Smith Hospital. Not the closest hospital to the Fort Worth Federal Medical Center, John Peter Smith hospital is a public hospital, where (in the words of one local) ,"They let interns practice on deadbeats."

The single most damning fact to come out of the McDougal death was his injection with Lasix, a diuretic, to force his giving of a urine sample for drug testing, even though McDougal was not a known drug user. Lasix is contra-indicated in cases of heart disease and can cause excessive diuresis, blood volume reduction, circulatory collapse and vascular thrombosis or blood clots. If a matching potassium supplement is not administered at the same time, Lasix can kill.

McDougal may have been taking the heart medication Digitalin, which cannot be combined with Lasix.

Several inmates had gone public with the claim that McDougal

was given a heavy injection of Lasix right after he ate lunch, but the prison system has refused to allow those prisoners to be interviewed or to release McDougal's medical records.

The Fort Worth Star-Telegram recently acquired the official report of the McDougal death via a Freedom Of Information Act request, and found that doctors ignored McDougal's signs of imminent death.

Ron Miller
Witness
Died Oct. 12, 1997

Ron Miller, investigated by authorities over the sale of his company, Gage Corp. to Dynamic Energy Resources, Inc. was the man who tape-recorded Gene and Nora Lum and turned those tapes (and other records) over to congressional oversight investigators. The Lums were sentenced to prison for campaign finance violations, using "straw donors" to conceal the size of their contributions to various candidates. Indeed, Dynamic Energy Resources, Inc. had hired Ron Brown's son Michael solely for the purpose of funneling \$60,000 through him to the Commerce secretary, according to Nolanda Hill's testimony.

Reportedly a healthy man, Miller suddenly took ill on Oct. 3, and steadily worsened until his death nine days later. (This pattern fits Ricin poisoning.) Owing to the strangeness of the illness, doctors at the Integris Baptist Medical Center referred the matter to the Oklahoma State Medical Examiner's Office.

The Oklahoma State Medical Examiner's Office promptly ran tests on samples of Ron Miller's blood, but has refused to release the results or even to confirm that the tests were ever completed.

Mary Mahoney
White House intern
Died July 1997

An attractive 25-year-old woman, Mahoney was a former White House intern for Bill Clinton working as the assistant manager at a Starbuck's Coffee shop in Georgetown.

Gunmen entered the Starbuck's while the crew was cleaning up after closing. Mahoney's two associates, Aaron Goodrich, 18

and Emory Evans, 25, were taken to a room and shot. Mary herself had five bullets in her, from at least two different guns, most likely with silencers. A total of 10 shots were fired; none of them heard by neighbors in the densely populated Georgetown section. Mahoney was shot in the chest, her face, and in the back of the head. Even though more than \$4,000 remained in the store, the police have categorized the triple murder as a robbery, even as they acknowledged the "execution style" killings.

There was no sign of forced entry. One report said the cafe was still locked when the bodies were found the next morning.

George Stephanopoulos, Monica Lewinsky and Chelsea Clinton were all regulars at the Starbuck's.

THE MOST FAMOUS

Vincent Foster
White House Counsel
Died July 21, 1993

Found dead in Fort Marcy Park in Virginia of a supposed suicide by gunshot. A suicide note was supposedly found a few days later, torn into 28 pieces, in his briefcase, after his office had been entered by White House staff and materials removed.

The gun which he supposedly used to kill himself was reported to be still in his hand, but the person who first found the body reports that there was no gun at that time. Many irregularities surround the death and the investigation of it.

Like Clinton, Foster was from Hope, Ark. He worked for the Rose Law firm with Hillary Clinton. London Telegraph reporter Ambrose Evans-Pritchard reports a member of the Foster family has confirmed to him that Foster and Mrs. Clinton were lovers. Foster had intimate knowledge of the Clintons' personal finances. Foster was involved in an investigation of their finances, and reportedly made a phone call to Hillary Clinton, in Los Angeles, just hours before his death.

Recently, the signed report of medical examiner Dr. Donald Haut was uncovered at the National Archives. It stated that Foster had a previously unreported gunshot wound to his neck.

Finally, an FBI memo has surfaced dated the day after the date of the official autopsy, in which the autopsist informs the FBI that there was no exit wound.

William Colby
Director of Central Intelligence (ret)
Died April 27, 1996

William Colby had been the DCI from 1973 to 1976 under Nixon and Ford.

At age 76, Colby had found a new career and had just started writing for Strategic Investment at the time of his death. This had worried many insiders in the intelligence community who felt that Colby had already divulged too many of the CIA's secrets in the preceding years. Indeed, his dismissal by Ford because of his over-cooperation with congressional investigations into CIA wrongdoing. It was Colby who had revealed to Congress the plans to kill Fidel Castro, the spying on American citizens (in direct violation of the CIA charter) and the conducting of biological tests by the CIA on unsuspecting citizens. He was replaced by George Bush.

According to the original CNN report, Colby was reported missing by neighbors who "recovered" his canoe, by one story from under the dock at Colby's house, by another report, a quarter mile downstream.

Colby was, by all reports, a methodical, tidy man, yet police found his home unlocked, his computer on, and a partly eaten dinner on the table. The official story is that Colby just put down his fork and decided to drop everything and go canoeing.

Colby at 76 was still a world-traveler and consultant to many corporations. He recently became an editor of an important financial newsletter, "Strategic Investment," which covered the Vince Foster "suicide" in detail. Its editors hired three renowned handwriting experts to investigate Foster's suicide note, which hadn't been found when his briefcase was first searched, but later materialized, torn into pieces, with no fingerprints on any of the pieces. Upon comparing this document with others of Foster's writings, these experts declared it was a forgery, and a not very good one at that.

Colby had old enemies as well as new, with plenty of motives for his extermination. He was in charge of the infamous Operation

Phoenix during the Vietnam War, in which more than 20,000 South Vietnamese citizens -- supposedly Viet Cong sympathizers -- were rounded up, tortured and executed. In the 1970s he opened some of the secrets of the CIA to Congress: "Colby insisted on going public about the agency's role in tapping the telephones and opening the mail of Americans; plotting the assassination of Fidel Castro, and using human guinea pigs for mind-control experiments involving LSD," the Times reports.

On Monday, May 6, Colby's body was found just 20 yards from where his canoe had been recovered, in an area that had been thoroughly searched several times by helicopters and search teams.

Most notable about the body was the absence of a life jacket, which according to his wife, Colby always wore on the water.

DEAD BODYGUARDS

Maj. Gen. William Robertson
Deputy Commanding General, V Corps, Europe
Died Feb. 23, 1993

Col William Densberger
V Corps Chief of Operations and Plans
Died Feb. 23, 1993

Col. Robert Kelly
V Corps Chief of Intelligence
Died Feb. 23, 1993

Spec. Gary Rhodes
Crew Chief
Died Feb. 23, 1993

All were killed when their Army UH-60 Blackhawk helicopter crashed in Weisbaden, Germany. No cause was ever determined. V Corps figured prominently in the US Bosnia-Serbia peacekeeping operations, along with the carrier Roosevelt. These men, and eight others associated with Clinton's visit to the Roosevelt all died within four months of each other.

Steve Willis
Clinton bodyguard

Died Feb. 28, 1993

Robert Williams
Clinton bodyguard
Died Feb. 28, 1993

Conway LeBleu
Clinton bodyguard
Died Feb. 28, 1993

Todd McKeehan
Clinton bodyguard
Died Feb. 28, 1993

Killed by gunfire in the Waco, Texas, assault on the Branch Davidians. All four were examined by a "private doctor" and died from nearly identical wounds to the left temple, so-called execution style. In his address to employees of the Treasury Department in the Cash Room on March 18, 1993, Clinton said: "My prayers and I'm sure yours are still with the families of all four of the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms agents who were killed in Waco -- Todd McKeehan and Conway Le Bleu of New Orleans; Steve Willis of Houston, and Robert Williams from my hometown of Little Rock. Three of those four were assigned to my security during the course of the primary or general election." However, the Little Rock, Arkansas, office of the ATF confirmed that all four had at one point been bodyguards for Bill Clinton, three while he was campaigning for president, and one while he had been governor of Arkansas. In the autopsies of these agents, three had virtually identical wounds to the left temple that exited through the rear of the head, execution-style. All four were treated by a "private physician."

Alan G. Whicher
Died April 19, 1995

Oversaw Clinton's Secret Service detail. In October 1994, Whicher was transferred to the Secret Service field office in the Murrah Building in Oklahoma City. Whicher was the only agent killed in the bomb blast of April 19, 1995.

Five Navy aviators
Clinton bodyguards/escorts
(names not determined)
Died March 26, 1993

All died in the crash of an E-2C Hawkeye in Italy. The crash occurred shortly after the plane was "waved off" from a landing attempt on the Carrier Roosevelt, due to a "foul deck." All five men had been Clinton's escorts during Clinton's visit to the Roosevelt two weeks prior. Three other men, who had flown Clinton to the Roosevelt for that visit also died later in a helicopter crash.

Staff Sgt. Brian Haney
Clinton bodyguard
Died May 19, 1993

Marine Sgt. Tim Sabel
Clinton bodyguard
Died May 19, 1993
Maj. William Barkley
Clinton bodyguard
Died May 19, 1993

Capt. Scott Reynolds
Clinton bodyguard
Died May 19, 1993

All four men died when their helicopter crashed in the woods near Quantico, Va. Reporters were barred from the site, and the head of the fire department responding to the crash described it by saying, "Security was tight," with "lots of Marines with guns." A videotape made by a firefighter was seized by the Marines. All four men had escorted Clinton on his flight to the carrier Roosevelt shortly before their deaths.

Unknown SS agent

Killed when the C-130 carrying the presidential limos crashed near Jackson Hole, Wyoming.

DEAD FUNDRAISERS

C. Victor Raiser II
National Finance Co-Chairman, Clinton for President Campaign

Died July 30, 1992

Montgomery Raiser
Son of C. Victor Raiser II
Died July 30, 1992

Both men died in a private plane crash in Alaska, en route to a fishing expedition. No cause was ever determined. Five others not connected to Clinton died with them. DeeDee Meyers described Raiser as a "major player" in the Clinton organization. Victor raiser was also chairman of Mobile Telecomm Technologies Corp., whose subsidiary, SkyTel Corp. is an international paging company used by federal police agencies such as the FBI.

Victor Raiser was a Washington lawyer and he was counsel to the Washington law firm of Jones Day Reavis & Pogue until 1991. At his death, he was the national finance co-chairman of the Clinton for President campaign. He and his wife had been friends of the Clintons for ten years. He was the past national finance chairman of the Democratic National Committee. He served on the boards of the Democratic Business Council and the Center for National Policy and the board of advisers of the Democratic Leadership Council.

On May 29, 1993, President Clinton announced that he had selected Raiser's widow, Molly Raiser, 50, former Democratic co-chair of the Women's Campaign Fund, to be his protocol chief and stated that he planned to nominate her for confirmation as an ambassador.

Paul Tully
Democratic National Committee Political Director
Died Sept. 24, 1992

Found dead in a hotel room in Little Rock Arkansas of "unknown causes." No autopsy allowed. Described by Clinton as a "dear friend and trusted advisor. Tully authored several key strategies for Clinton and the party. Paul Tully, 48, Democratic National Committee political director and architect of a strategy to make the party competitive again in presidential elections, was found dead in his hotel room on September 24, 1992, in Little Rock, Arkansas of unknown causes. Authorities speculated his death was from a heart attack or stroke.

Tully devised a strategy of targeting states based on their value in

the Electoral College, and coordinating the presidential campaign with state and congressional races.

Ed Willey
Real Estate Attorney, Clinton Fund Raiser
Died Nov. 30, 1993

Died of a shotgun blast to the head. Body found in deep woods in Virginia. Ruled a suicide, no note was found. Died on the same day his wife was allegedly sexually accosted in the White House by Bill Clinton. Intimately involved in several Clinton fund raising events.

Hershell Friday
Attorney and Clinton fund raiser.
Died March 1, 1994

Killed when his plane exploded. Cause unknown.

Larry Lawrence
Ambassador to Switzerland nominee.

Larry Lawrence was a fundraiser, made famous by his burial at Arlington which revealed not only the special treatment given him but the depths of his legal troubles prior to his being nominated as ambassador to Switzerland. Less well known is that at the time of his death, allegedly from a heart attack, Larry Lawrence had just come under criminal investigation by the State Department and had (as had Ron Brown) indicated a willingness to cooperate.

DEAD WITNESSES

Luther Parks
Head of Clinton's security team in Little Rock.
Died Sept. 26, 1993

Gunned down in his car at the intersection of Chanaul Parkway and Cantrell Road, near Jacksonville, Arkansas, (near Little Rock). Parks was shot through the rear window of his car. The assailant then pulled around to the driver's side of Park's car and

shot him three more times with a 9mm pistol.

His family reported that shortly before his death, they were being followed by unknown persons, and their home had been broken into (despite a top quality alarm system). Parks had been compiling a dossier on Clinton's illicit activities. The dossier was stolen.

When news of the discovery of Vincent Foster's body was reported, Parks is reported to have said, "Bill Clinton is cleaning house."

Bill Shelton

Arkansas state trooper and fiancée of Kathy Ferguson
Died June 1994

He allegedly committed suicide by shooting himself in the back of the head at the grave site of his fiancée. Officer Shelton was the fiancée of Kathy Ferguson, who was the ex-wife of Trooper Danny Ferguson. Kathy Ferguson also committed "suicide" a month earlier by allegedly shooting herself in the back of the head. Oddly, next to the body were her packed bags, as if she was expecting to be going somewhere. Danny Ferguson is a co-defendant along with Bill Clinton in Paula Corbin Jones' sexual harassment suit. His ex-wife was reported as a corroborating witness for Ms. Jones.

Kathy Ferguson

Ex-wife of Trooper Danny Ferguson
Died May 1994

Died of a supposed gunshot suicide in her living room. There was a suicide note found by the body. However, friends were surprised at having noticed nothing wrong previously. And even more curious, found nearby were several packed suitcases, as if she expected she was going somewhere. She was the former wife of Trooper Danny Ferguson, who is the Arkansas state trooper alleged to have escorted Paula Corbin Jones to the hotel room for her alleged episode of sexual harassment by then-Governor Clinton. Ferguson's wife was reported as a possible corroborating witness for Jones.

Gandy Baugh

Died Jan. 8, 1994

Attorney representing Dan Lasater in a case concerning alleged financial misconduct. Died in an alleged suicide by jumping out of a window of a multi-story building. Lasater was a close associate of Gov. Clinton, and was convicted of cocaine distribution. Baugh's law partner was also "committed suicide" one month later on Feb. 9, 1994.

Dr. Ronald Rogers
Dentist from Arkansas

Killed in plane crash as he was on his way to an interview with a London Sunday Telegraph reporter to reveal information about Clinton scandals.

Stanley Huggins
Partner in Memphis law firm

Investigating Madison Guaranty Savings & Loan, he was reported to have succumbed to viral pneumonia. His 300-page report has never been released.

Calvin Walraven

A key witness in Joycelyn Elder's son's drug case. Ten days after Elder's son was convicted of trafficking in cocaine, Walraven was found dead in his apartment with a gunshot blast to the head. Tim Hover, a Little Rock police spokesman, said no foul play is suspected.

Neil Moody
Died Aug. 25, 1996

Following Vincent Foster's murder, Lisa Foster married James Moody, a judge in Arkansas, on Jan 1, 1996. Near the time Susan McDougal first went to jail for contempt, Judge Moody's son, Neil, died in a car crash. There were other reports that Neil Moody had discovered something very unsettling among his stepmother's private papers and was threatening to go public with it just prior to the beginning of the Democratic National Convention. Witnesses said they saw Neil Moody sitting in his car arguing with another person. Then his car sped off and hit a brick wall.

Johnny Franklin Lawhon
Died March 29, 1998

In the spring of 1997, a tornado ripped through some junked cars at Johnny's Transmission shop and opened up the trunk of a car that proved to have a box of Whitewater records in it, including a copy of a \$27,000 cashier's check drawn on Madison and payable to Bill Clinton. Lawhon realized what he was looking at and turned the box of documents over to the FBI.

According to police, Lawhon and a friend hit a telephone pole at a high rate of speed after their car had become airborne and left the road. They had driven less than a quarter mile at the time of the impact.

Eric Butera

An informant who came forward offering information regarding the murder of White House intern Mary Mahoney. He was then sent into a known crack house to make an undercover buy for the police and was beaten to death.

DEAD WOMEN

Suzanne Coleman

Had affair with Clinton when he was attorney general. Died of "suicide" with gunshot wound to the back of her head. No autopsy allowed. Was seven months pregnant at time of her death. She had told friends it was Bill Clinton's child.

Paula Grober
Clinton's speech interpreter for the deaf.
Died Dec. 9, 1992

Died in a one-car accident with no known witnesses. Her body was thrown 33 feet from the car, indicating a very high speed. A very attractive woman, Paula traveled extensively with Clinton from 1978 until her death. Clinton, through a spokesman, called Grober's death "a great personal loss." He also said, "Hillary and

I extend our sincere sympathy to Paula's family. I had the privilege of working with her over many years."

Judy Gibbs
Penthouse model and call girl

Judy Gibbs, who appeared in the December 1979 issue of Penthouse, and her sister Sharon were part of a house of prostitution in Fordyce, Arkansas, that also engaged in blackmail of its more powerful clients. Linked to Bill Clinton by both her own family and by one of Bill's bodyguards, Judy had just decided to cooperate with police in an investigation of Arkansas cocaine trafficking when she burned to death inside her home from a fire of undetermined origin.

DEAD INVESTIGATORS

Paul Wilcher
Washington attorney investigating gun running out of Mena, Arkansas.
Died June 22, 1993

Found dead on a toilet in his Washington apartment. No cause of death was ever reported by the coroner.

At the time of his death, he was investigating connections between the "October Surprise" during the 1980 federal election campaign and drug and gun-running out of Mena, Arkansas, as well as the assault on the Waco, Texas, Branch Davidians. Was planning on producing a television documentary on his findings. He had delivered a 105-page affidavit to Janet Reno detailing the evidence he had collected regarding the drug operation at Mena, just three weeks before his death.

Jon Parnell Walker
Resolution Trust Commission investigator
Mysteriously fell to his death from an apartment balcony.

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT DEATHS

Ron Brown
Former Chairman, DNC; Commerce Secretary
Died May 3, 1996.

Ron Brown died along with 39 other people when the T-43 (a converted 737 used by the Air Force) carrying the group on a trip to Bosnia crashed while approaching the Dubrovnik airport. On the verge of being indicted and having stated his willingness to make a deal with prosecutors, Ron Brown's death brought to an end his ability to testify.

Military investigators concealed from the public the fact that a perfectly cylindrical hole, the size of a .45-caliber round, was found in the top of his head. No autopsy was performed.

Barbara Wise
Commerce Department staffer
Died Nov. 29, 1996

As the scandals continued to swirl around the Commerce Department, and most of all about John Huang, one of Huang's associates, Barbara Wise, was found dead in her locked office at the Department of Commerce, partially nude and covered with bruises. No cause of death has ever been announced.

Charles Meissner
Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Economic Policy.

Following Ron Brown's death, John Huang was placed on a Commerce Department contract that allowed him to retain his security clearance by Charles Meissner. Shortly thereafter, Charles Meissner died in the crash of a small plane.

THE HENRY - IVES DEATHS
A.K.A. THE "TRAIN DEATHS"

Kevin Ives & Don Henry

Initial cause of death was reported to be the result of falling asleep on railroad tracks in Arkansas on Aug. 23, 1987. This

ruling was reported by the state medical examiner Fahmy Malak, appointed at the pleasure of Gov. Bill Clinton. Later it was determined that Kevin died from a crushed skull prior to being placed on the tracks. Don had been stabbed in the back. Rumors indicate that they might have stumbled upon part of the Mena drug operation.

Keith Coney

Keith had information on the Ives/Henry deaths. Died in a motorcycle accident in July 1988 while being chased by a car. Ruled a traffic accident.

Keith McKaskle

McKaskle had information on the Ives/Henry deaths. He was stabbed to death in November 1988. He had told his family someone was out to kill him and told them "goodbye."

Gregory Collins

Greg had information on the Ives/Henry deaths. He died from a gunshot blast to the face in January 1989. Declared a suicide.

Paul Olson

A federal witness in investigations to drug money corruption in Chicago politics, Paul had just finished two days of FBI interviews when his plane ride home crashed, killing Paul and 130 others on Sept 8, 1994. The Sept. 15, 1994, Tempe Tribune newspaper reported that the FBI suspected that a bomb had brought down the airplane.

Jeff Rhodes

He had information on the deaths of Ives, Henry & McKaskle. His burned body was found in a trash dump in April 1989. He died of a gunshot wound to the head and there was some body mutilation, specifically that his hands and feet had been partially sawed off, leading to the speculation that he was tortured prior to being killed. The body was then burned.

James Milan

Milam had information on the Ives & Henry deaths. He was decapitated. The state Medical examiner, Fahmy Malak, initially ruled death due to natural causes, claiming that the victim's small dog had eaten the head, which was later recovered from a trash bin several blocks away.

Richard Winters

Winters was a suspect in the deaths of Ives & Henry, and had offered to cooperate. He was killed by a shotgun blast to the face during a "robbery" in July 1989.

Dan Harmon, the prosecutor to whom Winters reportedly made the offer, has been accused of involvement in the Kevin/Ives deaths and is now in jail for running his office as a racket.

Jordan Kettleison

Kettleison had information on the Ives & Henry deaths. He was found shot to death in the front seat of his pickup in June 1990.

The Clinton 'body count' New alarm over growing list of dead close to president

By Michael Rivero

Copyright 1998, WorldNetDaily.com

"Dear Sir," began Monica Lewinsky's somewhat peevisish letter of July 3rd, 1997. In it, according to the recently released report by Kenneth Starr, the former intern chided the president for failing to secure for her a new White House job, and hinted that continued stalling would result in word of their affair leaking out.

The next day, Monica confronted Bill Clinton in an Oval Office meeting she described as "very emotional"; a meeting which ended when the president warned her, "It's illegal to threaten the president of the United States."

Three days later, another former White House intern, Mary Mahoney, was shot five times in the back of the Georgetown Starbuck's she managed. Two of her co-workers were also killed. Even though cash

remained in the register, the triple murder was quickly dismissed as a botched robbery. No suspects have ever been arrested.

Coincidence? Maybe.

Former Democratic National Committee fundraiser and Commerce Secretary Ron Brown was under criminal investigation. Indictments seemed imminent. Ron Brown had reportedly told a confidante that he would, "not go down alone." Days later, his plane crashed on approach to Dubrovnik airport during a trade mission excursion to Croatia. Military forensics investigators were alarmed by what appeared to be a .45-caliber bullet hole in the top of Brown's head.

Coincidence? Maybe.

Yet another fundraiser was Larry Lawrence, famed for his short residence at Arlington National Cemetery. Less well known is that he had been under criminal investigation by the State Department for three weeks when he died.

Coincidence? Maybe.

But for a growing number of Americans, the sheer numbers of strange deaths surrounding the career of Bill Clinton has begun to raise serious questions. In a meeting with Vernon Jordan, Monica Lewinsky reportedly expressed fears that she might, "end up like Mary Mahoney," and began to make sure that others knew of her affair with Bill Clinton.

Of all the strange deaths surrounding the Clintons, none has come under more renewed scrutiny than the fate of White House Deputy Counsel Vincent Foster, who was found dead in Fort Marcy Park on July 20, 1993. The official investigation concluded that Foster inserted a gun into his mouth and pulled the trigger. Yet according to the lab results neither Foster's fingerprints nor blood was on the gun, nor were powder granules or bullet fragments traceable to that gun in his wounds. The purported "suicide note" was found to be a forgery by three independent experts. The record of a second wound on Foster's neck, and an FBI memo that contradicts the official autopsy, strongly suggests

that Foster's wounds were misrepresented in the official report. The FBI's own records revealed that deliberate deception was used to link Foster with the gun found with his body. Partly on the basis of that evidence, the FBI is now in federal court on charges of witness harassment and evidence tampering in the case.

In normal police procedure, homicide is assumed right from the start. Suicide must be proven, because homicides are often concealed behind phony suicides. Yet in the case of Foster, serious doubts persist regarding the credibility of the evidence offered up in support of the claim of suicide, and a recent Zogby Poll revealed that more than two-thirds of all Americans no longer think the official conclusion of suicide is believable

The official conclusion regarding Commerce Secretary Ron Brown's death was that his plane was brought down by, "the worst storm in a decade." However, the Dubrovnik airport weather office, just two miles from the crash site, could not confirm the existence of any such storm, nor did any other pilots in the area. According to the April 8, 1996, Aviation Week & Space Technology, three separate radio links to the aircraft all quit while the aircraft was still seven miles from the crash, evidence that the plane suffered a total electrical failure in flight which was never investigated. The perfectly cylindrical hole in Ron Brown's skull never triggered an autopsy. After Ron Brown's death, his co-worker, Barbara Wise, was found locked in her office at the Department of Commerce, dead, bruised, and partially nude. Following Brown's death, John Huang's new boss at Commerce was Charles Meissner, who shortly thereafter died in yet another plane crash.

These and other questionable deaths have been collected together in a document known as the "Dead Bodies List," which can now be found in many locations on the World Wide Web. Some of the cases are poorly documented and have been dismissed until now as "conspiracy theory." However, analysis of the "Dead Bodies List" by experts on the Internet revealed that in many cases, deaths whose circumstances demanded an investigation had been ignored.

Some events officially declared to be accidents seem to stretch the bounds of credulity. In one case, Stanley Heard, member of a Clinton advisory committee and chiropractor to Clinton family members, and his lawyer Steve Dickson were flying to a meeting with a reporter. Heard's private plane caught fire, but he was able to make it back to his airport and rent another plane to continue his journey. The rented plane then caught fire. This time, Heard did not make it back to the airport. Gandy Baugh, attorney for Clinton friend and convicted cocaine distributor Dan Lasater, fell out of a building. Baugh's law partner was dead just one month later. Jon Parnell Walker, an RTC investigator looking into Whitewater, interrupted his inspection of his new apartment to throw himself off of the balcony.

Nor does the pattern of suspicious deaths discriminate by gender. Susan Coleman was reportedly a mistress to Clinton while he was Arkansas attorney general; she was seven months pregnant with what she claimed was Clinton's child when she died. Judy Gibbs, a former Penthouse Pet and call girl, reportedly counted Bill Clinton among her clients. Shortly after agreeing to help police in an investigation into Arkansas cocaine trafficking, Judy burned to death. Kathy Ferguson, a witness in the Paula Jones case, was killed with a gunshot behind the ear and was declared a suicide, even though her suitcases had all been packed for an immediate trip. One month later, Bill Shelton, Kathy's boyfriend and a police officer who had vowed to get to the bottom of Kathy's murder, was also dead of a gunshot, his body dumped on Kathy's grave.

Another alarming trend observed in these deaths is how society's safeguards against murder appear to have been compromised. Many of the questionable deaths involved either negligence or the complicity of medical examiners.

Dr. Fahmy Malek was the Arkansas medical examiner under then-Gov. Bill Clinton. His most famous case involved his ruling in the "Train Deaths" case of Don Henry and Kevin Ives in which Dr. Malek ruled that the two boys had fallen asleep on the railroad tracks and been run over by a train. A subsequent autopsy by another examiner found signs of foul play on both the

boys' bodies and concluded that they had been murdered. According to Jean Duffey, the prosecutor in the Saline County Drug Task Force, the two boys accidentally stumbled onto a "protected" drug drop and were killed for it. Dan Harmon, the Arkansas investigator who concluded there was no murder, is now in prison on drug charges. Despite the evidence for murder and national exposure, the Henry/Ives case has never officially been re-opened, and Jean Duffy has since left Arkansas out of fear for her life. Several witnesses in the Henry/Ives case later died and were ruled as either suicides or natural causes by Dr. Malek, whose willingness to provide an innocuous explanation for these deaths is illustrated in one case where he claimed that a headless victim had died of natural causes. Malek claimed that the victim's small dog had eaten the head, which was later recovered from a trash bin. When pressed to fire Dr. Malek, Gov. Clinton excused the medical examiner's performance as the result of overwork and gave him a raise.

Dr. Malek's Washington D.C. counterpart was Fairfax, Virginia, Medical Examiner James C. Beyer. Long before his autopsy on Vincent Foster, Beyer's work was disputed. In the case of Tim Easley, Beyer ignored obvious defensive wounds, and eyewitness reports of an argument between Easley and his girlfriend, to conclude that Easley had committed suicide by stabbing himself in the chest. When an outside expert called attention to the fact that Easley had been stabbed clear through one of his palms, the girlfriend confessed to the murder. In the case of Tommy Burkett, Beyer ignored signs of violence done to Burkett to rule it was a simple suicide. A subsequent autopsy showed that Beyer had not even done the work he claimed in his original autopsy. Even though Beyer showed X-rays to Burkett's father, Beyer later claimed they did not exist. When Beyer performed the Foster autopsy, he wrote in his report that X-rays had been taken, then again claimed they never existed when asked to produce them.

In some cases, the deaths simply have no innocuous explanation, One witness, Jeff Rhodes (who had information on the Henry/Ives murders) was found with his hands and feet partly sawn off, shot in the head, then burned and thrown in a trash bin. Another

obvious murder was Jerry Parks, Clinton's head of security in Little Rock. Immediately following news of Foster's death, Parks reportedly told his family, "Bill Clinton is cleaning house." Just weeks after the Parks' home had been broken into and his files on Clinton stolen, Parks was shot four times in his car.

Ron Miller, on whose evidence Nora and Gene Lum were convicted of laundering Clinton campaign donations, went from perfect health to death in just one week in a manner so strange that his doctors ordered special postmortem tests. The results of those tests have never been released, but toxicologists familiar with the case suggest that Miller's symptoms are consistent with Ricin, a cold war assassin's poison.

For a fortunate few the murder attempts have failed. In the case of Arkansas drug investigator Russell Welch, his doctors were able to identify that he had been infected with military anthrax in time to save his life. Gary Johnson, Gennifer Flowers' neighbor whose video surveillance camera had accidentally caught Bill Clinton entering Flowers' apartment, was left for dead by the men who took the video tape. Gary survived, although he is crippled for life. L.J. Davis, a reporter looking into the Clinton scandals, was attacked in his hotel room but survived (his notes on Clinton were stolen). Dennis Patrick, whose bond trading account at Dan Lasater's company was used to launder millions of dollars of drug money, has had four attempts on his life.

But the real importance of the "Dead Bodies List" isn't what it tells us of modern political intrigues, but what it tells us of ourselves, in how we respond to it. The list has been around for quite some time, largely ignored by the general public, completely ignored by the mainstream media. The common reaction has been that such a list is unbelievable, not for its contents, but for its implications. For that reason, most Americans have, until recently, accepted at face value the official assurances that all these deaths are isolated incidents with no real meaning; that all the indications of foul play and cover-up are just an accumulation of clerical error and "overwork"; that it's all just "coincidence."

On Aug. 17, as Bill Clinton admitted his "inappropriate

relationship" with Monica Lewinsky on nationwide television, Americans began to confront the unavoidable fact that this president and his administration had lied to the public about a rather trivial matter. Americans came to realize that this president and his administration could no longer safely be assumed to have told the truth on more serious matters.

In this new climate of doubt, the "Dead Bodies List" has enjoyed a new vogue, albeit a dark one. Talk radio discusses it. Total strangers e-mail it to each other. What was unthinkable a few months ago has become all too plausible. Political murder has come to America. Those cases on the "Dead Bodies List" where hard evidence directly contradicts the official conclusion have come under renewed scrutiny.

It takes courage for the average citizen to accept that the government has lied to them, for by doing so, the citizen also accepts the obligation to do something about it. Americans know beyond a doubt that they have been lied to. Americans are discovering that they cannot ignore the fact of being lied to without sacrificing that part of the American self-image that holds honor and justice as ideals. But as the above poll would suggest, such a sacrifice is no longer acceptable.

Clinton=s Dead Associates

I don't know if this is accurate as stated, but it is interesting if you're into conspiracies. It supposedly comes from the Wall Street Underground paper...

The following is a list of 28 dead people connected with Bill Clinton:

James McDougal - Clinton's convicted Whitewater partner died of an apparent heart attack, while in solitary confinement. He was a key witness in Ken Starr's investigation.

Mary Mahoney - A former White House intern was murdered July 1997 at a Starbucks Coffee Shop in Georgetown. The murder happened just after she was to go public with her story of sexual harassment in the White House.

Vince Foster - Former White House councilor, and colleague of Hillary Clinton at Little Rock's Rose law firm. Died of a gunshot wound to the head, ruled a suicide.

Ron Brown - Secretary of Commerce and former DNC Chairman. Reported to have died by impact

in a plane crash. A pathologist close to the investigation reported that there was a hole in the top of Brown's skull resembling a gunshot wound. At the time of his death Brown was being investigated, and spoke publicly of his willingness to cut a deal with prosecutors.

C. Victor Raiser II - & - Montgomery Raiser - Major players in the Clinton fund raising organization died in a private plane crash in July 1992.

Paul Tulley - Democratic National Committee Political Director found dead in a hotel room in Little Rock, September 1992. Described by Clinton as a "Dear friend and trusted advisor".

Ed Willey - Clinton fund raiser, found dead November 1993 deep in the woods in Virginia of a gunshot wound to the head. Ruled a suicide. Ed Willey died on the same day his wife Kathleen Willey claimed Bill Clinton groped her in the oval office in the White House. Ed Willey was involved in several Clinton fund raising events.

Jerry Parks - Head of Clinton's gubernatorial security team in Little Rock. Gunned down in his car at a deserted intersection outside Little Rock. Park's son said his father was building a dossier on Clinton. He allegedly threatened to reveal this information. After he died the files were mysteriously removed from his house.

James Bunch - Died from a gunshot suicide. It was reported that he had a "Black Book" of people containing names of influential people who visited prostitutes in Texas and Arkansas.

James Wilson - Was found dead in May 1993 from an apparent hanging suicide. He was reported to have ties to Whitewater.

Kathy Ferguson - Ex-wife of Arkansas Trooper Danny Ferguson died in May 1994 was found dead in her living room with a gunshot to her head. It was ruled a suicide even though there were several packed suitcases, as if she was going somewhere.

Danny Ferguson was a codefendant along with Bill Clinton in the Paula Jones lawsuit. Kathy Ferguson was a possible corroborating witness for Paula Jones.

Bill Shelton - Arkansas State Trooper and fiancée of Kathy Ferguson. Critical of the suicide ruling of his fiancée, he was found dead in June 1994 of a gunshot wound also ruled a suicide at the gravesite of his fiancée.

Gandy Baugh - Attorney for Clinton friend Dan Lassater died by jumping out a window of a tall building January 1994. His client was a convicted drug distributor.

Florence Martin - Accountant subcontractor for the CIA related to the Barry Seal Mena Airport drug smuggling case. Died of three gunshot wounds.

Suzanne Coleman - Reportedly had an affair with Clinton when he was Arkansas Attorney General. Died of a gunshot wound to the back of the head, ruled a suicide. Was pregnant at the time of her death.

Paula Grober - Clinton's speech interpreter for the deaf from 1978 until her death December 9, 1992. She died in a one car accident.

Danny Casolaro - Investigative reporter. Investigating Mena Airport and Arkansas Development Finance Authority. He slit his wrists, apparent suicide in the middle of his investigation.

Paul Wilcher - Attorney investigating corruption at Mena Airport with Casolaro and the 1980 "October Surprise" was found dead on a toilet June 22, 1993 in his Washington, DC apartment. Had delivered a report to Janet Reno 3 weeks before his death.

Jon Parnell Walker - Whitewater investigator for Resolution Trust Corp. Jumped to his death from his Arlington, Virginia apartment balcony August 15, 1993, Was investigating Morgan Guarantee scandal.

Barbara Wise - Commerce Department staffer. Worked closely with Ron Brown and John Huang. Cause of death unknown. Died November 29, 1996. Her bruised nude body was found locked in her office at the Department of Commerce.

Charles Meissner - Assistant Secretary of Commerce who gave John Huang special security clearance, died shortly thereafter in a small plane crash.

Dr. Stanley Heard - Chairman of the National Chiropractic Health Care Advisory Committee died with his attorney Steve Dickson in a small plane crash. Dr. Heard, in addition to serving on Clinton's advisory council personally treated Clinton's mother, stepfather and brother.

Barry Seal - Drug running pilot out of Mena Arkansas, Death was no accident.

Johnny Lawhorn Jr. - Mechanic, found a check made out to Clinton in the trunk of a car left in his repair shop. Died when his car hit a utility pole.

Stanley Huggins - Suicide. Investigated Madison Guarantee. His report was never released.

Hershell Friday - Attorney and Clinton fundraiser died March 1, 1994, when his plane exploded.

Kevin Ives & Don Henry - Known as "The boys on the track" case. Reports say the boys may have stumbled upon the Mena Arkansas airport drug operation. Controversial case where initial report of death was due to falling asleep on railroad track. Later reports claim the 2 boys had been slain before being placed on the tracks. Many linked to the case died before their testimony could come before a Grand Jury.

THE FOLLOWING SIX PERSONS HAD INFORMATION ON THE IVES/HENRY CASE:

Keith Coney - Died when his motorcycle slammed into the back of a truck July 1988.

Keith McMaskle - Died stabbed 113 times, Nov, 1988

Gregory Collins - Died from a gunshot wound January 1989.

Jeff Rhodes - He was shot, mutilated and found burned in a trash dump in April 1989.

James Milan - Found decapitated. Coroner ruled death due to natural causes.

Jordan Kettleon - Was found shot to death in the front seat of his pickup truck in June 1990.

Richard Winters - Was a suspect in the Ives/Henry deaths. Was killed in a setup robbery July 1989

THE FOLLOWING CLINTON BODYGUARDS ARE DEAD:

Major William S.

Barkley, Jr.

Captain Scott J. Reynolds

Sgt. Brian Hanley

Sgt. Tim Sabel

Major General William Robertson

Col. William Densberger

Col. Robert Kelly

Spec. Gary Rhodes

Steve Willis

Robert Williams

Conway LeBleu

Todd McKeegan

McDougal, Still Silent, Indicted Again

The Washington Times 5/5/98

Susan McDougal was indicted yesterday by a federal grand jury for her refusal to testify about an illegal \$300,000 loan she received and about a check from a failed Arkansas thrift that contained the words "Payoff Clinton."

The 12-page indictment named McDougal on two counts of criminal contempt and one count of obstruction of justice.

The former business partner of President Clinton and Hillary Rodham Clinton was accused of failing to answer questions before the grand jury on two occasions on whether Mr. Clinton knew about the loan, if he lied about it in the first Whitewater trial and what the "payoff" check represented.

McDougal, 43, served 18 months in jail on a civil contempt citation after her initial 1996 refusal to testify before the grand jury. She was named on two counts of criminal contempt of court and one count of obstruction of justice. If convicted of all charges, she faces up to 20 years in prison.

In a second appearance on April 23, 1998, the indictment said, she again refused to answer the questions and also declined comment on the Aug. 1, 1983, check for \$5,081 drawn on James McDougal's trustee account, made payable to Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan Association and signed by Susan McDougal. The words "Payoff Clinton" were written in the notation section of the check.

When asked about the check, she said: "I won't answer your questions you ask me because I believe your whole office is conflicted and that you should not be investigating this."

Pressed by associate independent counsel Julie Myers for an answer, McDougal -- after consulting

her attorney, who was outside the grand jury room -- said: **"I would love to tell you. I would love to tell you everything I know about it, but not with these people running the investigation."**

Miss Myers then said, according to the indictment, "We have more checks we could show you if you would like to see those." McDougal responded: "I'll see anything you got. I won't answer your questions."

The grand jury wants to know if Mr. Clinton lied when he said under oath in the first Whitewater trial that he knew nothing of the Small Business Administration loan McDougal received in 1986. Proceeds from the loan were used to buy property for Whitewater Development Corp., the Arkansas real estate venture jointly owned by McDougal; her late husband, James; and the Clintons.

The McDougals, along with former Arkansas Gov. Jim Guy Tucker, were convicted on 24 of 30 fraud and conspiracy charges in the first Whitewater trial in 1996. James McDougal later became a cooperating witness and told prosecutors Mr. Clinton was aware of the loan.

Susan McDougal Indicted Again

USA Today 5/05/98

Former Whitewater partner Susan McDougal was charged Monday with three felonies for refusing to tell a grand jury what she knows about the first family's business dealings, including a previously undisclosed check she marked with the words "Payoff Clinton."

The indictment was handed down by a grand jury here that this week finishes two years of Whitewater-related investigation, and prosecutors signaled they may be ending the Arkansas phase of their probe by announcing they won't seek to impanel a new grand jury.

Whatever decisions remain will "now be moved up to Washington," where prosecutors are probing the Monica Lewinsky matter and allegations of obstruction of justice, according to Charles Bakaly, a spokesman for Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr.

"One option certainly is that certain evidence gathered by this grand jury could be made available to another grand jury that would also have venue over potential crimes," Bakaly explained.

Whitewater prosecutors are not expected to take any action against first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton before the grand jury expires Thursday, leaving such decisions to later in the investigation, sources familiar with the investigation said.

Monday's indictment threatens to punish Ms. McDougal with years more of prison time for her feisty and high-profile campaign to refuse answering prosecutors' questions.

Ms. McDougal, 43, was charged with two counts of criminal contempt for refusing to answer grand jury questions, in September 1996 and again last month, and one count of obstruction of justice.

Her lawyer promised to take the case to trial and to use such a trial to examine recent allegations that one of the prosecution witnesses in an earlier case against his client had been paid by conservative

critics of President and Mrs. Clinton.

"She is not going to be bullied by them," attorney Mark Geragos said, insisting he would subpoena Starr and his top deputy as witnesses.

Bakaly said Ms. McDougal had been granted immunity from prosecution in exchange for her testimony and had no legal grounds for refusing a judge's order to cooperate.

"There is not a constitutional right not to answer questions," he said, also accusing the president of "injecting" himself into the highly public feud between prosecutors and Ms. McDougal with comments he made in interviews.

That allegation drew a sharp retort from Clinton's private attorney.

Starr "through his public relations officer, has seen fit to assert that the president somehow improperly injected himself into the investigation," David Kendall said. "This claim is wholly false."

"The president's statements have been both accurate and appropriate," the lawyer added. "It is for the public to judge what the independent counsel's motivations may be."

Starr issued a statement saying the indictment did not accuse the president of wrongdoing, but court documents attached to the indictment revealed previously undisclosed evidence affecting Clinton.

In videotaped testimony submitted in 1996 during Ms. McDougal's first trial, Clinton testified under oath in 1996 he never had any loans or financial dealings with the failed Madison Guaranty Savings & Loan owned by McDougal and her late ex-husband, James.

The indictment includes a partial transcript of Ms. McDougal's last grand jury appearance in which she was confronted by prosecutors with a \$5,081.82 check she signed over to Madison Guaranty that was marked "payoff Clinton."

The check from August 1983 was drawn on a McDougal account and paid to the S&L that eventually failed, the court record said.

"Since your last appearance before the grand jury in September 1996 we have been able to obtain a copy of this check and confirm it's your handwriting on the check. You signed this check, correct?" a Starr prosecutor asked.

"May I go out and see my attorney?" Ms. McDougal asked.

Prosecutors do not say in the indictment what they believe the check was for, but indicated the reason they were interested in it was because it related to Clinton's videotaped testimony in 1996.

"We have more checks that we could show you if you would like to see those," the Starr prosecutor is quoted as saying in the transcript.

Displaying the feistiness she has shown in her public attacks on Whitewater prosecutors, Ms.

McDougal answered back: "I'll see anything you got. I won't answer your questions."

Kendall, the Clintons' lawyer, said he believed the check involved the McDougals' effort to pay off a Whitewater related business loan at another of their banks, and that the notation simply was an accounting reminder that it went for the real estate venture involving the Clintons.

"This accounting notation simply refers to the retirement of a Whitewater Development company corporate loan. Gov. Clinton himself never received a cent of this," he said.

Outside the courthouse where the indictment was handed down, Bakaly also asserted that the president, through the White House counsel, turned down repeated requests from prosecutors that he personally urge Ms. McDougal to cooperate.

"The Office of Independent Counsel requested that the president urge his former business partner, Ms. McDougal, to testify truthfully before the grand jury. That request was rejected," Bakaly said.

White House Counsel Charles F.C. Ruff said Monday it was "reckless and irresponsible" to suggest it was Clinton's job to urge Ms. McDougal to do anything. "The president has always urged everyone to tell the truth. At the same time, he understands that it is not appropriate for him to intervene personally in this matter," Ruff said.

The charges come 20 months after Ms. McDougal first refused to testify before a federal grand jury after being convicted by a jury on fraud charges related to the failed savings and loan at the center of the original Whitewater investigation.

She has already served 18 months for civil contempt for refusing to answer questions before the grand jury, the maximum time a federal judge can order.

She was freed in March on that charge and is currently serving a two-year prison sentence for the fraud charges stemming from her 1996 trial.

Hubbell Got \$700,000 for Little or No Work, House Probe Shows

The Washington Post April 24, 1998

Webster L. Hubbell received more than \$700,000, most of it from friends of President Clinton and Democratic Party supporters, at a time when he was under pressure from independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr to provide information about Clinton in the Whitewater investigation, congressional investigators have determined.

That amount is at least \$200,000 greater than what has previously been known about Hubbell's income after leaving his post as associate attorney general amid accusations that he had defrauded his former clients and partners at the Little Rock law firm where he worked with Hillary Rodham Clinton. Hubbell served an 18-month federal sentence after pleading guilty in late 1994 to tax evasion and mail fraud.

In addition to turning up more payments to Hubbell, the House Government Reform and Oversight

Committee found new details about them, including evidence that Hubbell received money for his daughter's college tuition from the head of the Lippo Group, an Indonesian conglomerate, and offered to secure a government appointment for another client even after his conviction.

Even as the House panel has investigated him, Hubbell faces the possibility that Starr will bring new tax and fraud charges against him relating to the funds. Grand juries in Little Rock and Washington have for months heard testimony from a steady parade of witnesses about his consulting fees, including the question of whether the funds were intended to buy Hubbell's silence with prosecutors investigating the Clintons.

Starr's office has been investigating the role of Clinton advisers in helping Hubbell sign up clients. Among those who came to Hubbell's aid were then-U.S. Trade Representative Mickey Kantor, who is now a key member of Clinton's legal defense team in the Monica S. Lewinsky matter, and Vernon E. Jordan Jr., who helped Lewinsky line up a job at Revlon and Hubbell obtain a consulting contract with its parent company, MacAndrews & Forbes Holdings Inc.

Hubbell, a former law partner of Hillary Clinton and the late Vincent W. Foster at the Rose Law Firm in Little Rock, might have information relevant to several areas of Starr's wide-ranging Whitewater inquiry. For example, Hubbell and Hillary Clinton were both involved in legal work connected to the Castle Grande project, a large-scale land fraud scheme put together in the 1980s by the late James B. McDougal, the Clintons' former Whitewater business partner.

Starr has investigated whether Hillary Clinton testified truthfully about her work on the project.

The new information about Hubbell's consulting payments was subpoenaed from his clients by investigators for the House committee. The records show he did little or no work for most of the \$593,442 he received from 18 companies and individuals, including \$61,667 from HarperCollins for a book that was never completed. Three trust accounts established to pay his family's living expenses, education costs and his legal bills took in \$110,710.

The House panel found Hubbell's consulting contracts would have paid him more than \$850,000 had most clients not ended their arrangements with him when he entered his guilty plea in December 1994. His income after he left his \$123,000-a-year Justice post totaled \$704,152. All the payments came in 1994 and early 1995, except for the HarperCollins funds, which were in 1995 and early 1996.

Hubbell's lawyer, John Niels, declined to comment yesterday on Hubbell's income or the prospect of new charges being brought against his client. In a memoir published last year, "Friends in High Places," Hubbell discussed his consulting income and said "it wasn't hush money."

The House panel, chaired by Rep. Dan Burton (R-Ind.), has been looking into Hubbell's consulting fees as part of its investigation into campaign finance irregularities. The Indonesia-based Lippo Group and its former employee, ex-Democratic National Committee fund-raiser John Huang, have been important figures in the campaign finance inquiry, and they were among those who came to Hubbell's aid in June 1994.

A Lippo subsidiary paid Hubbell \$100,000 on June 27, 1994, shortly after receiving a request from

Little Rock lawyer Douglas Buford, a former law partner of both President Clinton and White House aide Bruce R. Lindsey. Lippo owner James Riady also helped pay Hubbell's daughter's college tuition while he was in jail, records gathered by the House committee show. A company jointly owned by Riady and C. Joseph Giroir, a former Rose partner of Hubbell's, contributed \$12,000 to an education trust set up by Hubbell's Little Rock accountant, Michael Schaufele.

On Dec. 7, 1995, Hubbell tried to tap Riady again. "Webb asked me to contact you to see if James will help with Caroline's second semester tuition payment. The trust has only received a small donation since your last contribution," Schaufele wrote to Giroir in a letter obtained by the committee. Giroir confirmed that he and Riady contributed \$12,000 to the trust but said they refused the second request.

In another new payment found by the House panel, Nicholas Stonnington, a Merrill Lynch vice president in Los Angeles and Democratic Party contributor, paid Hubbell \$18,000 in August 1994. In a Feb. 10, 1995, letter from Hubbell to Stonnington B sent two months after Hubbell had entered his guilty plea B Hubbell promised to help Stonnington line up a federal appointment.

Hubbell told Stonnington that Bob Nash, newly named head of White House personnel, was an old friend from Arkansas. He urged Stonnington to consider a short-term appointment, perhaps on a commission on the Internet. "This would give you exposure with several people while we worked on the other possibilities. I am putting that in motion as a possibility," he told Stonnington.

Two companies that had competing interests in the telephone business, Sprint Corp. and Pacific Telesis Group Inc., both hired Hubbell in the fall of 1994 to consult on a dispute between the Justice Department and the Federal Communications Commission.

A source close to Pac-Tel said the company did not know Hubbell was working for its competitor too. Records show he took in \$112,000 from the two companies.

Indictment Claims Hubbells Lived Lavishly

The Washington Post May 1, 1998

Independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr yesterday brought a new set of federal tax evasion and fraud charges against Webster L. Hubbell, a former top Justice Department official and close friend of the Clintons who has already been sent to prison once by Starr on unrelated embezzlement charges.

Hubbell's wife, Suzanna, his Little Rock lawyer and his accountant also were charged in the 10-count indictment, which includes alleged tax violations stemming from some of the more than \$700,000 in payments made to Hubbell by Clinton supporters.

Hubbell, a former law partner of first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton at Little Rock's Rose Law Firm, admitted in 1994 -- in a plea bargain arrangement with the independent counsel -- that he stole nearly \$500,000 from his old law firm and its clients. But the indictment, handed up by a Washington grand jury yesterday, alleges that even as he was negotiating his guilty plea with Starr, Hubbell was committing new acts of fraud and tax evasion.

Yesterday's indictment alleges that Hubbell and his wife, a Clinton administration political appointee in the Interior Department, have earned more than \$1 million since 1994 but owe the government \$894,000 in back taxes and penalties. The Hubbells spent most of their money on a lavish lifestyle, the indictment claims, while putting less than \$30,000 of those earnings toward their tax liability.

But yesterday's indictment was also significant for what it did not include: any charges related to obstruction. While Starr's office said its investigation is continuing, prosecutors have considered such charges for more than two years as they tried to learn whether Clinton backers were trying to buy Hubbell's silence by arranging more than \$700,000 in consulting fees for him at the same time he was under pressure to cooperate with Starr's Whitewater probe.

Hubbell has said the payments were not meant to influence his testimony in the Whitewater investigation. And yesterday, choking up as he and his wife talked to reporters outside their Washington home, Hubbell said the new indictment was intended only to pressure him to lie about the president.

"I will not do so, and my wife would not want me to do so. I want you to know the office of independent counsel can indict my dog, they can indict my cat, but I'm not going to lie about the president, I'm not going to lie about the first lady or anyone else. My wife and I are innocent of the charges brought today."

Starr has been trying in recent weeks to wind up his long-running Whitewater investigation, and legal sources said he may be attempting to put pressure once again on Hubbell to cooperate. Hubbell could provide information related to several areas of Starr's investigation, including the Clintons' Arkansas real estate dealings and legal work Hillary Clinton did at the Rose Law Firm for a savings and loan owned by the Clintons' business partners.

The indictment charges the Hubbells, Little Rock accountant Michael C. Schaufele and Little Rock tax lawyer Charles C. Owen with conspiracy, tax evasion, impeding and impairing the Internal Revenue Service and mail fraud. All four defendants, prosecutors charged, tried to "evade and defeat the payment of" back taxes already owed by the Hubbells for the period from 1989 to 1992, as well as taxes owed on the nearly \$1 million the Hubbells collected in 1994 and 1995.

A White House spokesman said yesterday, "the president and first lady are very saddened by the developments in this matter and feel bad for Webb and Suzy Hubbell, Mike Schaufele, Charlie Owen and all of their families."

The Hubbells' lawyer, John W. Nields, said Starr was improperly singling out Hubbell for prosecution. The indictment, he said in a statement, constitutes "a rare type of tax charge . . . that would never have been brought against an ordinary taxpayer by the Department of Justice."

Added Nields, "The crime of evasion of payment occurs only when a taxpayer commits some sort of fraud of concealment intended to prevent the IRS from collecting a tax -- like putting assets in another person's name or putting money in a numbered Swiss account. And that did not happen here."

The 42-page indictment details lavish spending by the Hubbells since they came to Washington after Clinton's 1992 election -- even maintaining a deluxe lifestyle during the period that Hubbell was under investigation and during his 18 months in prison. In that way the indictment is similar to information contained in Hubbell's December 1994 plea bargain, in which he admitted embezzling \$482,000 from Rose and its clients and spending it on luxuries like vacations, a fur coat and lingerie.

According to the new indictment, the Hubbells used about 20 credit cards and spent \$85,000 on clothes, \$95,000 on private school tuition, \$20,000 for telephone bills, \$10,000 for laundry and dry cleaning, \$11,500 for beverages in addition to groceries, \$5,000 for beauty salon visits and \$9,900 for domestic help.

Hubbell also withdrew \$223,000 from his individual retirement account over time, repeatedly electing not to pay the usual 20 percent tax withholding. On one occasion, the indictment alleges, he engaged in an elaborate scheme to "swap checks" so that he could pay off a \$29,000 debt at the Rose Law Firm using money from his pension account funneled through his IRA to avoid the pension fund's automatic tax-withholding requirement.

The indictment also charges that the Hubbells set up a company called Bridgeport Group in March 1997 to hide money from the Internal Revenue Service. Webster Hubbell entered into a book contract with the William Morrow & Co. publisher through Bridgeport, which received a check for \$49,500 in June 1997 as the first installment.

The Hubbells paid no estimated tax on the money and "were able to spend the book advance before the IRS could discover the location of the funds," the indictment said.

The indictment said that Hubbell was hired by about 15 clients in 1994 after allegations of billing fraud surfaced and he resigned his post as associate attorney general. Prosecutors contended that Hubbell did "little or no work" for the consulting fees, which ranged from \$5,000 to \$100,000. The largest single payment came from the Lippo Group conglomerate of Indonesia.

Senior White House aides and Clinton advisers helped Hubbell line up the consulting jobs, nearly all of them for companies or individuals that were strong political backers of Clinton and the Democratic Party. Those who helped included top Clinton aides Thomas F. "Mack" McLarty, current Chief of Staff Erskine B. Bowles, then-U.S. Trade Representative Mickey Kantor and Washington superlawyer Vernon E. Jordan Jr.

Accountant Schaufele, a longtime friend of the Hubbells from Little Rock, prepared and filed false tax returns for the couple for 1994, 1995 and 1996, the indictment alleged. He and attorney Owen, another Hubbell friend, set up bank accounts and the Bridgeport corporation that the Hubbells allegedly used to conceal income from the IRS, the Rose firm and other creditors.

"Mr. Schaufele is innocent," said his attorney, Chris Todd. "Without pay and out of true friendship, Mike Schaufele helped Webb and Suzy Hubbell with their taxes during the most difficult time of the Hubbells' lives."

Jail Tapes Portray Hubbell As Clinton Loyalist

The Washington Post May 1, 1998

He may have been in jail, but Webster L. Hubbell still saw himself as a Clinton loyalist.

Talking to his wife in 1996 while in a federal prison serving out his sentence for embezzling from his former clients and partners at Little Rock's Rose Law Firm, Hubbell repeatedly expressed concern for one of those former partners: Hillary Rodham Clinton.

"I will not raise those allegations that might open it up to Hillary," Hubbell told his wife Suzanna in one phone call, responding to a White House friend's fear that his dispute with the law firm could create problems for the first lady. "So I need to roll over one more time."

That loyalty is one of the most striking themes to emerge in a series of recorded, behind-bars conversations Hubbell had in 1996 with his closest confidants B selectively edited portions of which were made available yesterday by the Republican majority of the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee.

Hubbell's insistence that he would stand by the president and first lady who brought him from Arkansas to Washington as the third-ranking official in the Justice Department came at a time when his prospects appeared bleak. He was already serving an 18-month federal sentence on fraud and tax evasion charges, and knew that more problems lay ahead.

Hubbell told his lawyer as much on Oct. 26, 1996. "The hard part is the realization that you have all your friends come up to you and say that this will be over in a week, and you know it's not true," Hubbell told his attorney John M. Niels.

At the time, prosecutors for independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr were already examining hundreds of thousands of dollars in consulting fees that Hubbell took in while he was under investigation. Starr has still not completed his probe into whether the payments were intended by people close to the Clintons to buy Hubbell's silence about Whitewater matters, but yesterday Hubbell was charged in a new indictment with tax evasion related to some of the payments.

Government Reform and Oversight Republicans, who have been investigating the payments to Hubbell as part of their campaign finance inquiry, obtained the tapes from the Justice Department and released the excerpts yesterday B over the strenuous objections of Democrats, who insist that even the edited versions violate Hubbell's privacy and the conditions under which the tapes were obtained from Justice.

In many of the conversations, the Republicans produced their own paraphrasing of the discussion.

Rep. Henry A. Waxman (D-Calif.), the ranking Democrat on the committee, complained last night that Chairman Dan Burton (R-Ind.) did not allow the minority to review the transcripts before releasing them. The GOP, he added, is "trying to smear Webb Hubbell" by producing selective portions that could be open to interpretation.

The calls from the federal prison in Cumberland, Md., present an unusual glimpse into the prison anxieties and strategies of Hubbell as he discussed a whole range of matters now under investigation

both by Starr and the committee B from the Clintons' Whitewater land deal to the Rose Law Firm and payments from the Lippo Group in Indonesia.

The tapes show that Hubbell and his wife hoped some of the same influential White House officials and Democratic fund-raisers who had helped him financially in 1994 by lining up consulting fees for which he did little or no work would assist him again when he got out of prison.

Hubbell was aware that his calls were being monitored, and he occasionally reminded those he talked to of that fact B at one point, he warned his wife, "We're on a recorded phone, Suzy." Sometimes his comments seem guarded; other times, they appear to be remarkably candid.

The prison tape recorders captured Hubbell in discussions with his closest confidants. Among them: his wife; his lawyer, Niels; his accountant, Michael Schaufele; and his friend Marsha Scott, a White House aide who is also longtime friend of President Clinton. Suzy Hubbell and Schaufele were indicted along with Hubbell yesterday on charges related to alleged tax evasion.

Through their talks, a picture emerges of a man who had been publicly humbled but privately remained confident that his powerful friends would continue to come to his financial aid. A recurring theme throughout was Hubbell's stated desire to remain loyal to his friends B in particular, to Bill and Hillary Clinton, referred to on the tapes only as "our friends." And he promised to keep secrets out of a book he had contracted to write B eventually, and appropriately, called "Friends in High Places."

On Loyalty

Hubbell's concern for Hillary Clinton was evident in several conversations on the tapes from the spring of 1996. At the time, Hubbell was feuding with former Rose partners over repaying money he had embezzled in an overbilling scheme. Rose had threatened to sue him, and Hubbell was considering filing a countersuit that he said could embarrass his former partners.

But Scott had conveyed a message to Hubbell through his wife: He is "not going to get any public support if you open up Hillary to all this." Said Suzy Hubbell, "Well, by public support I know exactly what she means. I'm not stupid."

Hubbell responded: "I told you I will not do that. I will not raise those allegations that might open it up to Hillary."

Scott also warned, according to Suzy Hubbell, that his wife B a political appointee at the Interior Department B would lose support at the White House if he sued Rose. "I'm hearing the squeeze play," said Suzy Hubbell.

Hubbell said: "So I need to roll over one more time."

Then, his wife asked if exploring overbillings would create problems for Hillary Clinton.

He didn't answer, saying, "We're on a recorded phone, Suzy."

His wife's concern was her Interior post: "I've got to have, keep this job. I have to have the support of the people, of my friends at the White House to keep, not necessarily, but if anything happened, I need that to keep this job. When the election is over and things are better, I need to have done a good job and have friends there who will let me get a better job."

Loyalty also figured into a call that same day B March 25, 1996 B between Hubbell and Scott.

Said Hubbell: "Have I ever been disloyal?"

"Oh, God, no," Scott replied.

"And I am not going to be here," he added.

Tapping Friends

Suzy Hubbell worried about Hubbell's job prospects after his release. Despite the consulting fees that Hubbell received in the months before he went to jail, the family needed money, she told him in September 1996.

Worried about where her husband would find work, his wife said she would call several friends B many of them Washington heavy-hitters. Among those she named: Democratic lobbyist Michael Berman, head of the Duberstein Group; lawyer Michael Cardozo, who headed President Clinton's first legal defense fund; Clinton friend Vernon E. Jordan Jr.; lobbyist and former White House congressional liaison Howard Paster; Tyson Foods lobbyist Jack Williams; and Democratic fund-raiser Nathan Landow.

Hubbell worried such a concerted effort to secure him financial aid could look bad and should be kept low-key, telling his wife, "We have to be very careful about this . . . editorials are all talking about how all this is designed to keep me . . . quiet. We have to make sure that it's our personal friends that are helping."

Even so, in a conversation in October 1996, Scott offered her assistance and mentioned that top Justice Department official Frank Hunger, a relative of Vice President Al Gore, had offered help as well. "Your friends are all talking about what you are going to do next and how they can help," she said.

Still, Hubbell worried: "I'm a little leery of making phone calls right now because the wolves are at the door."

The Lippo Link

Reports began to appear in the news media in October B in the waning days of the presidential campaign B suggesting that Hubbell had received hush money from the Lippo Group, the Indonesian conglomerate owned by the Riady family. "I'm not telling anybody what I did or what they paid me," Hubbell told his wife.

Later, Hubbell discussed the Riady matter with one of his attorneys, Laura Shores: "I had to say to

Suzy there is a reason why we aren't going to say anything . . . Our friends are wanting to know certain answers, and that needs to come through John [Niels] or you."

But Niels had bad news for Hubbell soon after: The independent counsel's office had notified Niels that it planned to investigate the sources of Hubbell's income from the time he left Justice to the time he started serving his sentence. It was that examination, of course, which eventually led to yesterday's indictment.

White House Uses the Media to Sully Its Foes

The Washington Times March 30, 1998

The White House has assembled and distributed to friendly reporters files with negative information about political opponents to offset stories produced by media seen as hostile to the president, The Washington Times has learned. Located in the Old Executive Office Building, an "opposition research" team sifts through public documents to collect the information, while other Clinton aides use computer media search services for quick research projects.

While top aides to the president vow they don't distribute unsubstantiated rumors about critics, they have relied on news sources that publish unproven tips about White House opponents.

And like any research operation, the White House and its allies also scan through news outlets such as The Washington Times and Internet sites operated by critics such as the "Drudge Report" to chart developments in opposition camps.

Clinton aides and allies gave a detailed description of the broad opposition research effort in depositions taken over the past month by Judicial Watch Inc., a legal watchdog group that has sued the government to determine whether the White House used secret FBI background files to discredit political opponents.

Among the opponents with special White House files:

Rep. Bob Barr, Georgia Republican, who has pushed for impeachment proceedings against Mr. Clinton. Sen. Fred Thompson, Tennessee Republican, who chaired the recent Senate campaign-finance scandal hearings.

House and Senate committees that have investigated the president's scandals.

The depositions, provided to The Washington Times, so far have revealed no effort by the White House to use the files against critics, although senior White House adviser Paul Begala has not supplied two related documents sought by Judicial Watch.

The interviews of Mr. Begala; his assistant, Eleanor Stacy Parker; and Clinton advisers James Carville and George Stephanopoulos, portray a White House deeply fearful of conservative attacks and diligent in seeking out negative information on foes.

Mr. Begala, one of the chief architects of the research campaign, denied in his March 3 deposition

that any presidential aides were engaged in opposition research.

"There is no one whose job it is to gather information on perceived adversaries. Not that I know," he said.

Suggesting that aides simply gather the information from the press, he said: "Everybody hears, reads papers, hears news broadcasts and receives information. There is not, to my knowledge, someone whose job it is to do that."

But two weeks later, on March 18, Miss Parker described in detail the opposition research effort she taps on behalf of Mr. Begala, adding that the White House even installed the Lexis-Nexis news research service in her office.

Miss Parker said the opposition research center is a two-man operation in the Old Executive Office Building near Mr. Begala's office.

"Sometimes when we need things I can turn to them for help, so if I need a particular clipping or if I'm looking for something in the public record, they can help me," she said.

"Usually it's news clippings or votes or trying to find if someone said something in an interview, you know, anything that we can find in the paper or find in the Congressional Record," she said.

Mr. Begala said in his deposition that he collects "votes and quotes" for use against opponents, but never relies on rumor or innuendo to attack opponents.

"I believe in research and the public records. ... In no campaign that I am aware of have I ever used any kinds of digging up dirt," he said.

But Miss Parker said the White House uses articles from Salon Magazine, a kind of liberal Internet alternative to the conservative Drudge Report.

In one article on the magazine's Web page, for example, Salon displays a picture of Whitewater independent prosecutor Kenneth W. Starr, the Rev. Jerry Falwell and Paula Jones, who has filed a sexual misconduct suit against Mr. Clinton, naked in bed together.

Mr. Starr recently expanded his probe to investigate efforts by the White House to spread rumors about him and his aides.

Miss Parker said Sidney Blumenthal, a Clinton communications aide, had distributed copies of articles from Salon to other aides via interoffice mail.

She and others deposed by Judicial Watch counsel Larry Klayman said the White House also taps into media outlets viewed as critical of the White House, including Judicial Watch's own Web page.

For example, Miss Parker said the White House often taps into the Drudge Report on the Internet, which has published many rumors about the Monica Lewinsky affair and other scandals.

"I read it every day," said Mr. Begala's assistant. "I would say I like the Drudge Report."

Much of the information about Clinton critics collected by the president's aides is distributed to friendly reporters, according to the depositions.

Among the reporters cited: CNN's Wolf Blitzer and John King, ABC producer Mark Halperin, and reporters from The Washington Post and Time magazine.

Mr. Stephanopoulos and Mr. Carville, meanwhile, said that a goal of helping friendly reporters is to offset stories written by members of the media considered hostile to the White House. In that group, Mr. Stephanopoulos included free-lance journalist Christopher Ruddy and Wall Street Journal editorial board member John Fund. Of Mr. Ruddy, he said: "Another deeply dishonest journalist. Crazy guy, I think;" and of Mr. Fund, the former Clinton aide said, "I just think he's a dishonest journalist."

Mr. Carville named, among others, radio talk-show host Rush Limbaugh, Mr. Fund, Mr. Ruddy and columnist Pat Buchanan.

Clinton Asked Hale about SBA Loan Three Times

The Washington Times March 30, 1998

President Clinton, who swore under oath he knew nothing about an illegal \$300,000 government loan to Susan McDougal, was so concerned in 1986 that she had misused the cash he asked David L. Hale -- who approved the loan C if he knew what had happened to the money.

According to lawyers and others familiar with the conversation, Mr. Clinton confronted Mr. Hale about the Small Business Administration loan at a west side Little Rock, Ark., shopping mall shortly after it was approved in March 1986.

It was the third time Mr. Clinton had spoken to Mr. Hale about the loan, the sources said, and he was angry it had not been used exclusively on financial problems he and his Whitewater Development Corp. partner, James McDougal, had at Whitewater and Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan Association. The sources said Mr. Clinton believed Susan McDougal had diverted much of the cash to her own use.

The extent and nature of the contact, which exceed what previously was believed about Mr. Clinton's efforts regarding the loan, are under investigation by Whitewater prosecutors.

At the mall, the sources said, Mr. Clinton asked Mr. Hale if he had heard what Mr. McDougal, who died last month while in prison in Texas, had done with the cash. The query took place outside the Fu Lin Restaurant owned Charles Yah Lin Trie and was preceded by a call from Mr. Clinton to Mr. Trie to see if Mr. Hale was there.

Mr. Trie, who pleaded not guilty in February to federal charges of diverting campaign cash to the Democratic National Committee, is expected to be asked about the Clinton call to corroborate information given to Whitewater prosecutors by Mr. Hale on the date of the mall conversation. Mr.

Trie, who faces trial in October, is believed to have made a deal with prosecutors to cooperate in the Justice Department's campaign finance investigation.

While the Clinton-Hale meetings, if they occurred, took place 12 years ago, Mr. Clinton's sworn denials concerning the loan during his April 1996 videotaped testimony in the first Whitewater trial -- if shown to be false -- could result in perjury charges.

Mr. Hale, who spent 19 months in prison on a guilty plea to unrelated SBA fraud, has confirmed in interviews that he spoke with Mr. Clinton on three occasions about the loan -- including the mall meeting -- but declined last week to elaborate. He said he is still cooperating with independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr.

In previous interviews, Mr. Hale -- who owned an SBA-backed lending agency known as Capital-Management Services Inc. -- said he spoke to Mr. Clinton about the loan at the state Capitol, where the governor asked if he was going to be able to "help me and Jim out;" at James McDougal's office, where the governor told him his name "could not appear" anywhere on the loan documents; and later at a mall, where the two talked briefly. He also said there was "never any doubt" that Mr. Clinton was aware of the loan, which was never repaid.

Mr. Hale told Whitewater prosecutors he was pressured by Mr. Clinton for the loan to "clean up" financial difficulties at Madison and Whitewater. James McDougal has corroborated Mr. Hale's accusations, the sources said.

In sworn videotaped testimony in the first trial, the president denied asking Mr. Hale to make the loan. But prosecutors argued that Capital-Management was used as a source of several illegal loans and 24 felony convictions suggested that the jurors believed Mr. Hale and not the president.

Mr. Clinton has maintained throughout the Whitewater probe that he did nothing wrong and that the investigation is politically motivated.

During the first Whitewater trial, an FBI agent testified that \$50,000 of the loan had been used to cover Whitewater expenses; \$25,000 went for a down payment on 800 acres southwest of Little Rock known as Lorance Height from International Paper Realty Corp.; and \$24,455 was deposited in the Whitewater account at Madison. It is not clear where the remaining \$200,545 went.

The Lorance project eventually defaulted on its \$150,000 mortgage.

Additional testimony on the loan is expected to come from former Arkansas Gov. Jim Guy Tucker, who underwent a liver transplant last year and has continuing health problems. He agreed to cooperate in the Whitewater probe in exchange for probation on his guilty plea in a bankruptcy scheme.

Tucker had intimate knowledge of Madison and Capital-Management as an attorney for and a borrower from both firms.

His ties to Madison were first mentioned in 1992 in criminal referrals by the Resolution Trust Corp., which identified Tucker as a "target" in a fraud scheme involving the failed thrift. The referrals also

listed the Clintons as "possible witnesses" and Mr. Clinton's gubernatorial campaign as a "target." A target is someone who is likely to be indicted.

The RTC had concerns that the Clintons and Tucker, as principals in "shell corporations" created by James McDougal, stood to benefit from a check-kiting scheme and account overdrafts.

Susan McDougal refused to tell a grand jury if Mr. Clinton's testimony was truthful when he said he had no knowledge of the loan. She was released March 8 after 18 months on a contempt citation in her refusal to testify to the grand jury. She has since begun a two-year term in her conviction in the first trial and awaits trial on embezzlement charges involving conductor Zubin Mehta. Her Whitewater convictions related directly to her receipt of the SBA loan.

Clinton's Courtiers

There is "a band of journalists who defend the president at practically every turn, who disparage virtually his every accuser, and who treat almost any criticism of his administration as a threat to enlightened government," writes Jay Nordlinger, associate editor of the Weekly Standard.

"We might say that these journalists are indistinguishable from official White House spokesmen -- except that the officials seldom go so far. Margaret Carlson of Time, Eleanor Clift of Newsweek, Al Hunt of the Wall Street Journal, Lars-Erik Nelson of the Daily News, Joe Conason of the New York Observer -- these are the ones who will stand by Clinton until (as the president himself likes to say) 'the last dog dies.' They are, indeed, the courtier press," Mr. Nordlinger said.

He added: "Prominent in Clinton's court is Carlson's employer, Time magazine. Its editors have apparently decided that, whereas their chief rival, Newsweek, will lead the journalistic investigation of Clinton, they will lead the counter-investigation."

Foster Notes case Advanced to June

The Washington Times 4/7/98

The Supreme Court agreed yesterday to speed up its decision on whether a grand jury can hear what the late White House Deputy Counsel Vincent W. Foster Jr. knew of first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton's role in the Travelgate scandal.

The case is an appeal of the first-ever federal ruling about whether the traditional secrecy of a client's conversations with his attorney applies in a criminal case after the client's death. The new order, moving the Supreme Court hearing from this autumn to June, virtually assures a decision in the case by the scheduled summer adjournment date of June 28.

Although the case was sealed, Whitewater independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr told the high court he is investigating President and Mrs. Clinton's involvement in the May 19, 1993, firing of seven workers in the White House travel office.

He noted that Mr. Foster, who was found dead in a Northern Virginia park in July 1993 in what investigators have ruled a suicide, was a former law partner of Mrs. Clinton's from Little Rock, was

involved in the process leading to the firings, and would have been an important witness on whether witnesses lied or obstructed justice in the Travelgate probe.

Mr. Starr is seeking to force James Hamilton, who was Mr. Foster's private lawyer at the time of his death, to surrender three pages of notes taken at his initial conversation with Mr. Foster on Sunday, July 11, 1993, nine days before he died.

Mr. Hamilton said forcing him to surrender notes of that interview would chill relationships of lawyers with prospective clients, a view supported in briefs by the American Bar Association, the American College of Trial Lawyers, the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers and the American Corporate Counsel Association.

Mrs. Clinton has publicly denied involvement in the Travelgate affair, but documents released at 1996 hearings by the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee contradict her account. Memos by several White House aides indicated she was a key player in the episode.

One memo said Mr. Foster was instrumental in carrying out her instructions for "immediate action" on the matter.

Mr. Foster's diaries and a note found after his death indicated he was concerned about failing Mrs. Clinton on the Travelgate issue.

The high court agreed on March 30 to hear the case and routinely placed it on the October docket, but it reconsidered yesterday after Mr. Starr argued that a long delay would hamper his criminal investigation.

Had it stayed on the court's fall calendar, a ruling in the case might not have come until mid-1999.

Mr. Starr, who originally opposed the high court even considering the case, asked the justices to hear arguments May 26 on a subpoena issued in 1996.

"We are pleased with the court's decision to expedite the consideration and resolution of this matter," Mr. Starr said yesterday.

Mr. Hamilton said in court papers he had no objection to the extraordinary early hearing but asked more time to prepare.

The justices chose a date 13 days later than Mr. Starr requested, allowing each side more time to deliver written briefs.

Mr. Hamilton had no comment yesterday about the somewhat leisurely briefing schedule ordered by the court, although it only gave him two extra days to prepare.

Mr. Hamilton, with the law firm of Swidler and Berlin, has argued strongly against being forced to surrender the Foster notes.

"The position [Mr. Starr] supports wars with the experience of seasoned, practicing lawyers," Mr.

Hamilton argued to the court. The independent counsel "in effect contends that the privilege is meaningless."

Mr. Hamilton also represented the Foster family after Mr. Foster's death and contended in court papers that a person's estate can be decimated by criminal proceedings after his death.

It is the second Whitewater case on attorney-client privilege claims to reach the high court. The independent counsel previously overcame claims of privilege involving notes by two White House lawyers from a conversation with Mrs. Clinton about her grand jury testimony.

The American Bar Association brief backing Mr. Hamilton's claim argued that ABA members have an obligation to secrecy even after the client goes to his grave.

ABA President Jerome J. Shestack said that at any given time hundreds of thousands of Americans, aware that their death may be imminent from disease, old age, work hazards "or, like the client in this case, by their own hands," would fear to reveal secrets that could embarrass those who survive them.

White House Takes on Holy Cardinal

The Washington Times 4/7/98

President Clinton's unusual taking of Holy Communion in a South Africa Catholic church last week has set off a theological war of words between the White House, the Roman Catholic Church and one clergyman of his Baptist denomination.

The White House told a cardinal he was mistaken about church doctrine.

The holy war opened Sunday when the New York archbishop, Cardinal John O'Connor, decried the acceptance of Communion by Mr. Clinton and the first lady during a March 29 visit to Cape Town's Regina Mundi Catholic Church in the Soweto neighborhood.

"Since this is a person who is not Catholic, he cannot be admitted to Eucharistic Communion," the cardinal said in his Palm Sunday homily, the topic of which was adultery.

"The action taken by the priest in South Africa, however well-intentioned, was legally and doctrinally wrong in the eyes of the church."

Under fire for doing something Mr. Clinton avoids in the United States when visiting Catholic churches, the White House retorted that African Catholics enjoy more relaxed rules, in what was taken by the cardinal's office as a lecture on Catholic theology.

"The conference of bishops in South Africa had a more ecumenical view of the Holy Eucharist and had advised members of the traveling party it was appropriate for baptized Christians to share in Communion. And the President acted on that guidance," said White House spokesman Michael McCurry.

He disputed Cardinal O'Connor's view that Vatican rules barring Protestants from taking Communion are universal.

"Cardinal O'Connor may not be familiar with the doctrinal attitude towards the Holy Eucharist that the conference of bishops in South Africa brings to that question," he said.

To that, Cardinal O'Connor's spokesman Joe Zwillling replied, icily: "With all due respect to everyone involved, I think the cardinal knows what the [Catholic] church teaches."

He said that as a former student at Georgetown University, a Catholic institution, "One would have expected [Mr. Clinton] would have at least been exposed to this kind of thing. ... Church teaching is church teaching on the matter of Communion, and no local bishops group can change that rule."

Enter the Baptists, of whom Mr. Clinton is one, though lately he has regularly attended Methodist services with Mrs. Clinton, a Methodist.

The Rev. Brent Walker, general counsel to the Baptist Joint Committee, said the president was well within his rights, and he suggested that the Catholics calm down. However, he propounded a view of Communion -- or the Lord's supper, as Baptists generally call it -- that is unusual for Baptists.

"I think it's a bunch of to do about nothing, not that the Catholics don't have the right to say who takes Communion and who doesn't, but in the face of that invitation [to attend Mass] I don't see how he would not be invited to take it," Mr. Walker said.

"I think he would have been conspicuous in his refusal if he hadn't done that. The irony of this is that Communion is supposed to be for communion -- to bring people together, to unify and to signify the body of Christ coming together. For it to be a point of division is quite ironic."

But for Baptists, the ritual is not a sacrament but an ordinance, a memorial service patterned after the Jewish Passover seder. Catholics believe the wine and bread become the actual body and blood of Christ; Baptists do not. The invitation to participate is usually extended in Baptist churches to "those of like faith and practice," often meant to subtly discourage participation by those of other denominations. Indeed, some pastors limit the invitation to members of the local church.

The dispute started long before Mr. Clinton arrived in South Africa during his 11-day journey through Africa.

Deputy White House spokesman Barry Toiv explained that the South African priest, Remigius Makobane, met with the White House advance team and extended the invitation for the president to attend Mass and take Communion.

They were told that the South African Catholic bishop's conference had a more open view of who could accept Communion and that it wasn't limited to Catholics.

Father Makobane gave the advance team a fact sheet that said, "Due to recent rulings from the South African Conference of Bishops, non-Catholics may take Catholic Communion."

An advance team briefing paper given to Mr. Clinton before the Mass said the priest had "invited all

non-Catholics present that wish to receive Communion may do so."

When the time came, Mr. Clinton rose and walked to take Communion with his wife, Hillary Rodham Clinton.

Within days, Catholics were offended by a photograph of Father Makobane placing the Communion host, which in Catholic belief is the living body of Christ, on Mr. Clinton's tongue.

Cardinal Anthony Bevilacqua of Philadelphia said Mr. Clinton should not have taken Communion. "I don't think there was any malice on anyone's part," he said.

The Catholic News Service then reported the incident and suggested that the African view of who can accept Communion was wrong.

"Canon law permits non-Catholics to receive Communion in a Catholic Church in cases of 'grave necessity' if they cannot approach a minister of their own community on their own and ask for it," said the news service.

On Sunday, Cardinal O'Connor opened his sermon by noting he had received several letters from Catholics "perplexed" by Mr. Clinton's action.

"To receive Holy Communion in the Catholic Church means that one believes one is receiving, not only a symbol of Christ, but Christ Jesus himself. One is not engaging simply in a memorial gesture toward the Last Supper and Crucifixion, however reverent and well intentioned," he said on the first Sunday of Easter Week.

He also noted that Catholics are not to receive Communion unless "we are in a state of grace."

Mr. Zwilling said that the cardinal was not suggesting that Mr. Clinton, plagued by admissions of and numerous other allegations of adultery, was not in a "state of grace."

"It is not for me to judge the conscience of the motivation of a priest, or of the president and first lady," Cardinal O'Connor said.

He concluded, "Let this be a teaching moment for all of us."

Spinning the Battle at the White House

The Washington Times 4/7/98

The White House Spin Patrol, having flummoxed Kenneth Starr and conned America into thinking there's nothing wrong with a president dropping his drawers for his drop-in guests, is at work now trying to intimidate the press.

The spinners -- the likes of James Carville, Paul Begala, Ann Lewis, Lanny Davis, Eleanor Rodham Clift, Margaret Carlson -- are trying to shame a few reporters for doing their jobs.

If the polls prove that Americans think it's OK for a president to molest the interns, so this line of argument goes, the press ought to leave the man alone and let him get on with getting it on with whoever walks in.

The spin is not working yet on some of the editors and reporters, but the professors who yearn to tutor editors or maybe even be one when they grow up are getting the White House message. The nation's editors, assembled last week in Washington for the annual convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, raised various methane readings to alarming levels with endless blather and bloviation about "credibility," and why they don't have any.

One way they can get some, argue those who haven't covered the Clinton sex, lies and audiotape scandals, is to swear off doing what they haven't been doing. Marvin Kalb, who professes ethics and other high-toned stuff at Harvard, chided the newspapers for anonymous "improper sourcing." (Since the sources are anonymous it's difficult to see how anyone, even a Harvard professor, knows whether they're "improper.") As usual, the people with the solutions don't know very much about the problems, and the people who deal with the problems are wary of academic solutions.

Down the street at the White House, the spinners were trying to effect some rage at Stuart Taylor, a columnist for the National Journal, because Kenneth Starr talked to him about quitting his job as a columnist to go to work for the independent counsel's office to help write the Starr report on the president's deeds, mis- and otherwise.

"I just think it's such a massive outrage," said spinmeister Paul Begala, who is himself a professor at the University of Texas. "He conveyed a sense of independence and objectivity that I now think is fraudulent. I just think it's an outrage."

It's difficult to see how a reasonable man could be outraged. Mr. Starr is perfectly within his rights to offer Mr. Taylor a job, or even to offer Mr. Begala a job if he could think of something Mr. Begala could do. Mr. Taylor, as a columnist, has never pretended to be unbiased or impartial; columnists who are unable to put objectivity aside have no business writing columns. When he writes that Kenneth Starr is everything that Bill Clinton is not -- "honest, principled and utterly inept at spin" -- he is stating the obvious, and leaves no doubt about his bias and prejudices.

Where's the offense? How would Stuart Taylor's going to work for Kenneth Starr be different from David Gergen leaving U.S. News & World Report, or Sidney Blumenthal leaving the New Yorker, to go to work for Bill Clinton? No outrage there, either. Bad taste, but no outrage.

The spinmeisters, who are not dumb, actually know better. They're fatigued. The deranged James Carville, always good for a laugh or two, was reduced on the weekend to debating with Jesuitical precision the finer points of groping vs. going the whole nine yards.

Tim Russert, the long-suffering host of NBC-TV's "Meet the Press," **pressed James about the president's admission that he had had an affair with Gennifer Flowers after denying it for years.**

"Well, that's not exactly true, Tim," said Mr. Carville, "because what they said, is, 'Did you have sex?' And they defined sex in the most broadest terms. And you know that, also. ... He

said, 'What I was told was that it was groping in a bar.' Well, if I groped with somebody in a bar, I don't regard that as sex. I mean ... if I groped with somebody in a bar in 1977, I don't call that having sex. I don't know what else to tell you." (We certainly can't think of anything to add.)

Paul Begala is a little shellshocked, too. When Cokie Roberts, on ABC-TV, asked him about **Leon Panetta's description of how the White House staff tried to keep the president's "dark side" under control by not letting him be alone with women at the office, he professed not to know what Mr. Panetta was talking about.**

"I've seen the president meet with the attorney general or the secretary of state, or the head of the EPA, or the head of Health and Human Services," he says, "and no signs of any 'dark side.'"

Imagine that. President Clinton actually sat through meetings with Janet Reno, Madeleine Albright, Carol Browner and Donna Shalala, and kept his pants on the whole time. (Groping, fondling and flashing don't count.)

Dick Arme y Rips 'Shameless' Clinton

USAToday 4/7/98

House Majority Leader Dick Arme y on Tuesday defending his public bashing of President Clinton a day earlier, saying it was a matter of personal responsibility.

"I stand by my remarks, which reinforced the importance of personal responsibility. I could not let these children think this president is a good role model," he said in a statement. "Parents expect this standard from teachers, football coaches and CEOs. We should be able to expect the same from the president."

On Monday, Arme y told a group of about 50 government students at Coppell High School that if he were facing the same sexual misconduct allegations as President Clinton, he would resign.

"I believe he's a shameless person," Arme y said. "If it were me that had documented personal conduct along the lines of the president's, I would be so filled with shame that I would resign. This president won't do that. His basic credo in life is, 'I will do whatever I can get away with.'"

Arme y's remarks were some of the harshest yet by a top Republican since a federal judge dismissed Paula Corbin Jones' sexual misconduct lawsuit against the president last week.

"His ideology begins and ends with himself," said Arme y, a Texas lawmaker first elected to Congress in 1984. "And, frankly, my own guess is the man spends very little time and effort in his life pursuing anything other than his own physical comforts."

Liberal Press Helping Clinton

Press Help Clinton

Media Research Center

Today found a priest to take Clinton's side over Cardinal O'Connor in the dispute over Clinton taking communion at a Catholic church in South Africa on March 29. The April 8 CyberAlert reported that the controversy had generated only about 30 seconds on the CBS Evening News, 22 seconds on Good Morning America and part of a story on FNC. (It has yet to get a second on CNN's The World Today, ABC's World News Tonight or the NBC Nightly News.) Hours after the CyberAlert was sent Today's Katie Couric interviewed liberal Father Andrew Greeley about the matter.

At the top of the April 8 interview Today showed a clip of O'Connor calling Clinton's action "legally and doctrinally wrong." Greeley disagreed with the implication that Clinton and the South African priest did something improper, arguing that "a lot of priests in this country and in other countries too push the envelope. They say at weddings and funerals they invite people to receive communion so that those in mixed marriages, the families of the non-Catholic spouse won't be offended or feel excluded. This happens in the archdiocese of New York, the archdiocese of Chicago. It happens everywhere. I don't see why we select out the African priest for criticism."

Couric: "Well, he's not the only one who's been criticized as you well know President Clinton has been really severely criticized in this whole thing. Do you think some of that criticism is fair or what do you think is motivating Cardinal O'Connor?"

Greeley: "Well I wouldn't try to guess the Cardinal's motivations. I do know that when Ronald Reagan who was technically a fallen away Catholic in a marriage the church wouldn't recognize, when he received communion back in the early 1980s nobody protested. So maybe there's special rules for Republicans."

Couric: "Ouch."

Amazing. Clinton offends millions of people of religious faith, yet NBC manages to turn that into an opportunity to denounce Ronald Reagan.

Impeachment

DNC Tells Mulholland to Stop Probe of GOP

The Washington Times April 14, 1998

The Democratic National Committee ordered a DNC official yesterday to stop digging up dirt about the personal lives of Republican members of Congress who may conduct impeachment hearings against President Clinton.

Under mounting fire from Republicans who called for the resignation of DNC member Bob Mulholland of California C who said he was investigating divorced GOP House Judiciary Committee members --DNC Chairman Steve Grossman said yesterday that Mr. Mulholland's tactics

were not condoned by national party officials.

"I do not believe efforts of this kind advance the goals of our party," Mr. Grossman said in a letter to Mr. Mulholland late yesterday. "Consequently, I respectfully request that you refrain from the activities described in recent news accounts. The Democratic National Committee neither condones nor supports this type of activity."

Mr. Mulholland, who is also the chief spokesman for his state's Democratic Party, immediately backed away from his investigation. "I've accomplished my goal. I've gotten the press to focus on the Republicans. I'm moving on to other things," he said yesterday.

Mr. Grossman's move came after the White House yesterday again disavowed Mr. Mulholland's activities and said that it did not support such actions, and after three days of complaints from GOP lawmakers who accused the Democrats of engaging in a smear campaign that some said was "obstruction of Congress."

In a letter to DNC General Chairman Roy Romer, Republican National Committee Chairman Jim Nicholson called on him yesterday to "repudiate the outrageous politics of intimidation now being practiced by" Mr. Mulholland.

Mr. Mulholland told The Washington Times on Friday that he was gathering damaging information on the personal lives of GOP leaders and some Judiciary members that he threatened to disseminate if impeachment hearings are begun against President Clinton. One of the Judiciary members he targeted was Rep. Bob Barr, Georgia Republican, who "has been married three times," he noted.

He told The Times that records of divorce proceedings of some of the panel's GOP members "contain some very interesting information," including charges of adultery.

Mr. Nicholson accused Mr. Mulholland of engaging in "gutter politics" and said that his activities were "nothing short of a deliberate attempt to intimidate and impede the Congress in the performance of its official functions."

He called on Mr. Romer "to ask for his resignation," saying that Mr. Mulholland "needs to be told, in no uncertain terms, that blackmail is not a legitimate tactic of a great national party."

As the Republicans stepped up their attacks on Mr. Mulholland yesterday, a White House spokesman said that it and the DNC had sent word to him to end his investigative activities.

"I don't know what the White House can do," said Joe Lockhart, an assistant press secretary. "But we've said very clearly that we don't see looking into people's lives as appropriate and [it] certainly is not relevant to what this president is here to do in Washington."

Earlier yesterday, before Mr. Grossman's letter, Mr. Mulholland stood by his plans to spread personal information about GOP lawmakers who may have to vote on whether to begin impeachment proceedings against Mr. Clinton if Kenneth W. Starr, the special prosecutor, submits a report to the House in the Monica Lewinsky affair.

"I get a little tired of the Republicans continuing to attack the most successful president in decades. And when I see these Republicans go on television talking about Democrats and President Clinton, about family problems, family values, I just get a little outraged," he said on the NBC "Today" program yesterday.

"I mean, after all, it's the Republicans, led by [Speaker] Newt Gingrich, [former Senate Majority Leader] Bob Dole, or California Governor Pete Wilson, who all dumped their first wives for younger women. They they go on TV and attack Democrats and the president," Mr. Mulholland said.

"And I think if Bob Barr and some of these other Republicans have had two, three or four families, then let the American people know it. That's all public record," he said.

Mr. Barr, who also appeared on the "Today" show yesterday, said that Mr. Mulholland's activities were the political equivalent of "going through people's garbage."

"If he thinks that Henry Hyde, who is the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, is going to base his decision whether or not to move forward on impeachment hearings on what Mr. Mulholland comes up with, I mean, he's just sadly mistaken," he said.

The lawmaker also said that the White House was "engaged in a systematic effort to smear anybody who does criticize them."

Despite the DNC's letter of disavowal, Mr. Mulholland still appeared to have the support of his fellow Democrats, who maintained yesterday that he was free to dig up any information he had on the Republicans.

"We're all held to a standard of scrutiny in our personal lives and we must stand ready to answer for it," said Democratic Assemblywoman Carole Migden of San Francisco.

"Some people might find this morally objectionable, but we're engaged in a war and those are the rules of war," she said.

Clinton Editorials

That Illinoisiest Lady in the White House

The Washington Times 8/14/98

There's a true story we all learned down home in the fifth grade, reading Arkansas history:

Once upon a time several families from Illinois moved into a settlement up on Cadron Creek, in Faulkner County, and joined the little Methodist church. The Arkansas families resented the invasion of the Yankees, Christian or not, and pretty soon the preacher's hands were full of squabbling women. The men seemed to get along with each other pretty well, this being some years before the outbreak of the War of Northern Aggression.

The Illinois women and the Arkansas women began sitting on opposite sides of the meeting house, barely speaking to one another, and pretty soon the preacher had enough. He called a congregational meeting and told everyone to take their say, and then shut up. He said it more tactfully than that. Methodist preachers are unsurpassed purveyors of tact.

One of the Illinois women stood up. "Well," she said, "I have seen some sassy women in my day, but I have to say that these Arkansas women are the Arkansasiest women I have ever seen."

She sat down and one of the natives stood up. "You know," she said, "we've had some noisy women come through this community, but I have to say that these Illinois women are the Illinoisiest women I ever did see."

Hillary Rodham, as she insisted on being called when she arrived to scatter sunshine and civilization in the primitive land of the razorback hog, has friends in Arkansas but she is nevertheless regarded by nearly everyone as the Illinoisiest woman Arkansas ever did see.

Arkansas folk reckon they owe her a debt, sort of, because if she hadn't married Bill he might have married one of the girls from home. Lady Bountiful, you might say, saved one of our own from years of considerable neglect and abuse. Arkansas women are not generally as tolerant of a husband's bordello behavior with saloon singers and wayward girls as Miss Hillary's example suggests. Above all, you don't do it with the help.

John Robert Starr, the flinty columnist for the Arkansas Democrat Gazette and the earliest surviving student of Miss Hillary dating from his days and nights as the managing editor who won the great Little Rock newspaper war, has been vacationing.

"I emerged from four days in the wilderness to learn that Hillary Clinton had wiggged out again," he writes. "'Wiggged out' was my grandmother's way of saying 'flipped one's lid,' 'went bonkers' or 'took leave of one's senses.'"

"In an exclusive interview with the Democrat Gazette, Dame Hillary blamed her husband's problems on an anti-Arkansas bias within the Beltway.

"Shades of Jimmy Carter, who still believes he would have been a successful president were it not for an anti-Georgia bias in Washington. However calm the White House may appear on the surface, you may rest assured paranoia rules supreme within.

"I wonder if Hillary talked about an anti-Arkansas bias with as straight a face as she talked six months ago about 'a vast right-wing conspiracy' against the president"

"Does the word cuckold apply to women as well as men? Even hard-core Clinton backers were having trouble giving a logical explanation for Hillary's latest absurdity. One [Arkansas] Democratic strategist said he thought that Hillary might 'express that differently' if she is given another chance."

Well, perhaps she might. Miss Hillary, like her husband, is a conniver of convenience. Bill Clinton has done more to ruin the reputation of Arkansas, to fix it in the public mind as a redoubt of shiftless rednecks and lawless lowlifes than any music-hall comic or second-banana vaudevillian of a century ago who made "Arkansas" the synonym for "barefoot hillbilly." The

Clintons' early defense against accusations of stealing, cheating, lying and whoring was, "well, Arkansas is a small state, and everybody does it." (Bill Clinton has not behaved as a hillbilly, to keep things straight, but as the wastrel son of an indulgent Delta planter, abusing women, stealing from the family and looting the homes of the field hands to take his nocturnal pleasures.)

If Miss Hillary really wants to help her man, she would furl the flag of Arkansas, to which by birth and breeding she is not entitled, and do something constructive. That stained dress B the little navy-blue number -- is what has got the White House wigged out. Miss Hillary could come forward with the explanation that would put the matter to rest. "Yes, of course it has his stain on it," she could say. "It's his dress. I bought it for him myself for our Thursday-night dress-ups. Doesn't every man need a little something in basic navy for those special occasions?"

Such a story sounds a little fishy, but every bit as believable as any of the other yarns the Clintons have spun, in, out or about Arkansas.

The Sometimes Risky Hot Springs Rubdown

The Washington Times 8/7/98

Nobody understands the Arkansas rubdown like a boy from Hot Springs, where soft soap is an art and massage is a science. You'll feel good for a little while, but the aches and pains are back within the hour.

The Democratic pols clamoring for Bill Clinton to tell all, to

say he's sorry and promise to be good from now on probably understand that, too, but they only want to feel good for a little while, i.e., until after the November elections.

Mr. Bill has to worry about what follows after, and if he confesses that he lied about Monica Lewinsky, he knows that's just the beginning. He'll put himself in the position of the lady in the schoolyard japery about the price of virtue. (Q: "Would you sleep with me for a million dollars?" A: "Well, yes." Q: "What about a hundred dollars?" Q: "What do you think I am, a common hooker?" A: "We've already established that, now we're haggling over the price.")

His tormentors would unravel him lie by lie, evasion by evasion, deception by deception. To err is certainly human, forgiveness can be liberating, but deception is never divine, and it's certainly not good politics. He would no doubt get past the Republicans in Congress, mostly men too timid to put up their dukes for a fixed fight in a convent, but he could never be taken seriously again by anyone else anywhere this side of Hollywood. Not the stuff of a respectable legacy, and Bill Clinton -- no giggling, please -- still frets about the legacy he'll leave behind when he takes off for his new life in Southern California.

If he admits lying about Monica -- following his earlier admission that he lied about Gennifer Flowers in his famous "60 Minutes" interview -- questions about other great moments in Mr. Clinton's history naturally arise.

Would he extend his mea culpa to include lies he told about the Whitewater loans, which started this whole tawdry business? Would he apologize for lying about the travel office fiasco? Filegate? What about the lies that other women in the long line stretching from Little Rock to the Oval Office say he told about them? And didn't he inhale, just a little bit? And how about an apology at last to Col. Eugene Holmes at the University of Arkansas and to his draft board in Hot Springs, to whom he boasted that he was too educated to fight, and most of all an apology to whoever, or to the ghost of whoever, took his place in Vietnam?

Then, getting to the really important current stuff, would he join Charlie Trie and Al Gore in a mea culpa about the Chinese connection to the 1996 presidential election, with simultaneous translations into Mandarin and Indonesian (as a courtesy to the Lippo Group), explaining what, exactly, Beijing got for its hundreds of thousands of dollars in illegal campaign contributions?

Mr. Bill is famous for his long, mind-numbing speeches, but working all these apologies, explanations, refinements and corrections into one mea culpa would extend his remarks to a length barely manageable even for the man from Hot Springs.

This, of course, is not a consideration for those who are expected to fall on their swords for him, but who suddenly don't want to. A top Democratic aide tells the New York Times that there's nothing on the members' minds but the adventures of the presidential member.

"They don't believe Clinton, but they can't say that," the aide declares glumly. "They are desperate for him to do a mea culpa. That would get them off the hook."

They're leaving town this week, going to where nobody's interested in all the Monica stuff, if you believe the public-opinion polls. Nobody does, of course, least of all the pollsters, who understand that the culture has been so saturated with the idea -- the work of the most brutally efficient spin machine in the history of mankind -- that it's neither nice nor respectable to say you're interested. So almost nobody does. This is a lie, too, as a casual surfing through the cable channels demonstrates.

The airwaves are saturated (polluted, as the White House might say) with expert panelists decrying themselves as purveyors of scandal, and with interviews of all manner of folks saying how they've given up following the story, and prove it by

citing the most excruciating details of the latest disclosures.

Congressmen, who lie with the practiced ease of all politicians, can't wait to get home to talk about education, the environment, the millennium bug, trade, the Asian financial crisis, worthwhile Canadian initiatives, Bosnia -- in sum, the stuff they're so interested in they can't quite remember Monica's bra size.

Rep. James Traficant Jr. of Ohio, a Democrat who, like every other Democrat trying to get out of town before the president testifies to the grand jury, sings a little ditty about the president's amoral dilemma: "If the dress doesn't fit, we must acquit/ If it's on the dress, he must confess."

If it is a diversion, it's really working
The Washington Times 8/6/98

Maybe Abraham Lincoln had someone like Bill Clinton in mind with his famous aphorism about the man about to be ridden out of town on a rail.

"If it weren't for the honor of the thing," the man in Mr. Lincoln's story said, "I think I had just as soon walk."

Only a very foolish man would bet that the Arkansas

mercury -- now you think you've got him, now you don't -- is about to ride out of town on a rail. But the feeling grows that the president is about to reach the end of the line. When the president arrived at the Hamptons on Saturday for a holiday with the Hollywood pals he hopes to join when his days in Washington are over, the greetings were more restrained than he expected.

A perceptive man, willing to elevate his perspective a little, could imagine, however, that Monica Lewinsky and her search for love in all the wrong places and the grief that this is about to bring down on the president is not necessarily the worst thing than could happen to him.

If the public-opinion polls are correct, most Americans profess to believe that getting a little illicit sex on the side is OK, as long as both perpetrator and perpetratee are strangers and preferably strangers who live a long way away, and if the president has to lie about it, well, that's no more than a good American wife expects a husband to do, so long as it's Hillary's husband, and not hers. A good American husband knows better than to try this trick at home.

But the White House spinners have been telling us for days that everybody lies about sex, so maybe we can discount these public-opinion polls as baloney because everybody lies about sex.

Nevertheless, the issue here, as the president and his spinners know better than anyone else, is not sex at all, but lying and perjury and suborning perjury and persuading others to lie and take the hit for him, if necessary. (Sort of like dodging the draft, and expecting someone else to take the hit for him.) Contempt for the law and the courts has traditionally been serious business in America, where the Constitution and the law have been held in high regard, though there are signs that maybe nobody any longer cares about this, either.

Casting himself as the great white whale and Ken Starr as Captain Ahab, the president has succeeded in portraying the relentless pursuit as a long-running soap opera, not to be taken seriously by serious people. This is no doubt occasionally painful, and might even be humiliating, but for his genetic immunity to personal humiliation. (Flem Snopes had a similarly robust immune system.)

The beauty part, for the president, is that the national obsession with the president's precious bodily fluids and Monica Lewinsky's navy-blue dress, like the nation's famous obsession with who shot J.R. (remember him?), diverts attention from far more serious high crimes and misdemeanors. This could explain the long suffering of Hillary, whose patience and forgiveness have surely been an example for all the wives of America. Some of those high crimes and misdemeanors may have been abetted by her, and even if they were her very own high crimes and misdemeanors, she knows she's safe from prosecution as long as her husband goes unscathed (if not exactly untouched) by the sordid behavior at the White House.

Diverting public attention from the really bad stuff protects Al Gore, too, since the worst stuff of all is the selling of American foreign policy to the Chinese for a few hundred thousand dollars in campaign contributions. Who can pay due attention to Charlie Trie's take-out artistry when we're waiting to hear from the FBI about Monica's dress, and whether Mr. Clinton will contribute a vial of presidential whatever to the DNA lab?

The president is taking comfort in the probability that his lawyers can make a good argument that he can't be indicted by a special prosecutor, that this argument can be litigated a long time even if he eventually loses, and most of all that the Republicans in Congress won't have the stomach for a serious impeachment inquiry -- indeed, they may not have the stomach for an impeachment inquiry at all.

The president's defense, portrayed by the White House tag team of Carville, Emanuel and Davis, has shifted once more. It's no longer that he didn't do it -- not even a nut case like James Carville can keep saying that without occasionally

breaking into an embarrassing giggle -- but that well, even if he did, everybody else does it, too, and what's the big deal?

Selling out the nation's safety and security is definitely a big deal, widely recognized as a big deal, and worth considerably more than a giggle. Keeping everyone focused on Monica's pliability and the president's drawers, or lack of any, has to be reassuring to a man determined to survive intact, at whatever cost to the country and to the people who put him where he is.

A Sorry Result Only Al Gore Could Love

The Washington Times 7/31/98

Al Gore's the only man in America with a logical reason to

root for the impeachment of Bill Clinton. Everybody else loses.

The Republicans, first of all. They've got a very good shot at regaining the White House in 2000, particularly if they resist the impulse to nominate a dreary loser with a familiar face.

The occasional Democrat trying to scrounge the courage -- and the big bucks -- to challenge Al and his goofy enviro-nuttiness has to grit his teeth and pretend he believes the president lest an impeachment bestow the presidency on a man who won't get a better shot than this.

And the rest of us lose, and not just by the humiliation of having to watch a president thrown out of office because he couldn't imagine that the laws the rest of us observe apply to him, too. He may not be a better man than that, but we've got to believe we're still a better country than that.

The grim truth, which nobody seems to have noticed yet, is that an impeachment of Bill Clinton -- or revelations that would require his party to sit on him until he resigns -- would assure the country of six more years of flower-power government by the children of the '60s.

Al Gore would not be so dumb as to pardon President Clinton for whatever low crimes and misdemeanors Kenneth Starr finds against him. Gerald Ford learned to his sorrow how remorselessly history lets no good deed, such as sparing the nation the agony of putting a president on trial, go unpunished.

President Gore could count on Americans, generous and forgiving to a fault, to rally around him in an effusion of mindless gratitude. Republicans would fall all over each other with Kemp-like obeisance, puddling the floor like excited puppies, to cosset the new president with due and deference. Anyone who criticized the new commander in chief in his first months of office would risk public flogging.

No one knows this better than Bill Clinton, which is why, if

his senior aides have correctly assessed his intentions, he will simply add a few more whoppers to the inventory when he is deposed by Kenneth Starr for the Monica Lewinsky grand jury next month.

This is how he played the odds in Arkansas, where his lies, evasions and quarter-truths became commonplace, a routine the home folks expected of him. They're giggling in Little Rock now over his most recent exhibition of courage when, on his recent visit home, he paid a lengthy solo visit to his mother-in-law. How could a grand jury appearance be as frightening as that?

His brazen boldness when everybody's got his number still confounds everyone elsewhere. A chorus of legal eagles and assorted other wise men are incredulous that the president appears to be eager to test his liar's luck with a grand jury, to season the old lies with new ones. Like a man with a hot hand at a Biloxi blackjack table, he just can't quit.

Well, why should he? Look what he has survived already, going back to ancient times in Little Rock: disclosures that his 12-year tenure as governor of Arkansas, which is studded with more Baptist churches than gasoline stations, was secured with campaign contributions from a convicted cocaine dealer, that he connived with bank robbers to finance Whitewater, that he left a trail of five-minute seductions that, as London's Daily Telegraph observes, "touchingly showed no bias on grounds of race, class, age, weight or, for that matter, looks."

Edwin Edwards, the governor of adjoining Louisiana, once famously remarked that he could get by with anything "as long as they don't find me in bed with a live boy or a dead girl." Who can doubt that the Arkansas mercury could shop through a graveyard unscathed, too?

The president, like any athlete sexual or otherwise, nevertheless risks overestimating himself. Kenneth Starr is dull and plodding, but he's as relentless as that posse that pursued Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid to Bolivia. The famous dress with the semen stains is back. Monica's first lawyer, William Ginsburg, scoffed that it didn't exist, but the dress is only one of many things Mr. Ginsburg doesn't know about. If the prosecutor has found it at last, it could be the conclusive evidence from the smoking gun.

Forensic tests will no doubt be run on the dress, and when these reveal that someone in that dress went bump in the night with somebody, a fight will inevitably follow over whether the president of the United States must submit to a DNA test. The humiliation -- not to the president, but to the rest of us -- never ends. Observing that the endless investigation has cost upward of \$40 million, Sen. Patrick Leahy of Vermont, the senior

Democrat on the Judiciary Committee, cried out: "Wrap this sucker up!" An inadvertently injudicious choice of words, but a sentiment both Bill and Al understand.

Conservatives Blast Executive Order

The Washington Times 7/29/98

Conservatives have turned up the heat on the White House for an executive order that they say is a slap in the face of states' rights.

"This is part of a systematic effort to subvert the Constitution," Rep. Bob Barr, Georgia Republican, said yesterday at a House hearing on the executive order.

The National Governors' Association (NGA) says the order is "wrongheaded and unacceptable," Gov. Michael O. Leavitt, Utah Republican, testified before a subcommittee of the House Government Reform and Oversight, headed by Rep. David M. McIntosh, Indiana Republican.

The document, intended to guide the executive branch on the line between enforcing federal law and respecting state and local rights, appears at first to bolster states' rights. "Preserving state authority provides an essential balance to the power of the Federal Government," it says.

But to conservatives' exasperation, it adds, "Preserving supremacy of federal law provides an essential balance to the power of the states."

"Where all previous executive orders on federalism aimed to restrain federal actions over states, the current version is written to justify federal supremacy," said Mr. Leavitt, who serves on the NGA's executive committee.

The order has gotten little print media attention, but there has been a growing grass-roots interest, spurred by talk radio. Researchers at the Senate's library say they are now getting nearly a dozen calls a week about the issue from concerned citizens.

That interest now has prompted action, with four bills offered in the House and Senate in the last two weeks to repeal the order.

The White House has been worried about a repeal for a month and asked the Senate Appropriations Committee not to cut funding for implementation of the order. On Thursday, Rep. Joel Heffley, Colorado Republican, plans to offer an amendment in the House that would do just that.

Jacob J. Lew, acting director of the Office of Management and Budget, defended the executive order in a letter July 22 to

committee's chairman, Sen. Ted Stevens, Alaska Republican.

The letter, a copy of which was provided to The Washington Times, said the administration has strongly fought efforts to limit state and local government powers included in other legislation. That same day, the Senate approved by unanimous consent, and without debate, a nonbinding resolution asking the president to repeal the order.

Bowing to criticism, Mr. Lew said the White House delayed by 90 days, until November, implementation of the executive order: time the administration is using to explain the move to state and local governments.

What angered state and local governments most about the Clinton executive order was that they were not informed or consulted on it even though it calls on the federal government to confer with the smaller governments more.

White House Press Secretary Michael McCurry said not talking to state and local governments first was an error.

"Obviously, in agreeing that we were going to have an additional 90 days, we're more or less conceding that point," he said. Now the White House will "seek the views of organizations that represent state and local levels of government, take into account their views and then move forward."

But Mr. McCurry stressed that the White House does not plan to change the executive order, and he challenged Mr. McIntosh's claim that the White House is usurping state powers.

Mr. McIntosh opened Tuesday's hearing, which he headed, warning "the new order would wreak havoc on the balance of power envisioned by the Constitution between the states and the federal government."

Mr. McCurry told the Washington Times, "He's got a point of view, and he's entitled to it. But it's not necessarily going to be shared by the president or by a range of state and local officials that we work closely with."

G. Edward DeSeve, an acting deputy director at OMB, said, "We saw it as an update of [previous] executive orders based on the unfunded mandates legislation and recently decided Supreme Court cases," not as a radical change in the White House's thoughts on federalism.

Nonetheless, Mr. DeSeve told Mr. McIntosh, the White House will "start with a clean slate" while working with state and local groups to redraft the order.

So just as the issue is catching fire, some of the groups most upset have been assuaged.

"I think this is a good-faith effort," said Vermont Lt. Gov. Douglas Racine, a Democrat.

Asked by Mr. McIntosh whether legislation is needed to block the White House, Mr. Racine said Congress might better spend its time looking at its own pre-emption of state and local rights.

As examples, he and other witnesses cited pending legislation that would block states from imposing Internet taxes, override local environmental laws to allow companies to place telecommunications towers, and increase the presence of federal courts in land-use disputes with local governments.

Four Escape Routes for Bill Clinton

The Washington Times 7/28/98

Bill Clinton and Harry Houdini, wherever he may be, have a lot in common. Both are masters of the improbable escape.

The difference is that everybody rooted for Houdini to succeed, whether he was entombed in a coffin or weighted with chains in a trunk submerged in a tank. The president is entangled in a young woman's lingerie, a grand jury subpoena and a hundred lies, and a lot of people are rooting for the lies and the lingerie.

A man couldn't help rooting, at least a little, for Bonnie and Clyde as the feds closed in on them, and it's difficult now not to have a twinge of sympathy, however slight, for Bonnie and Clod as Kenneth Starr begins at last to draw the net. The feeling grows that the game is finally afoot.

The news that the president has been subpoenaed, Monica Lewinsky has been interviewed and an appeals court has told Bruce Lindsey, the president's alter ego and one of the last surviving cronies of the Arkansas mafia, that he too must testify to the Monica Lewinsky grand jury, dots the last i and crosses the final t in this seamy if not exactly steamy saga. Who wouldn't feel cornered?

The president doesn't have many options left. The subpoena, issued two weeks ago and acknowledged by the White House only when it would share the front pages with the Capitol shootings, puts Mr. Clinton in a true dilemma, with every escape route blocked and every alternative looking worse than the others.

He has four choices. He could comply with the subpoena willingly, go before the grand jury in whatever venue his lawyers can work out with Mr. Starr, and answer the man's questions with as much liar's skill as he can muster. This is fraught with risk. Assuming that he and Monica were more than friends, which is an assumption nearly everyone makes, does he continue to lie about it, and compound perjury with more perjury? He doesn't know what other evidence Mr. Starr has. If he tells the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, he testifies against himself, giving the lie to his earlier sworn denials.

He could flout the subpoena, and tell Mr. Starr to go to hell. This would require a certain measure of courage and chutzpah. Chutzpah he has in plenty, but Bill Clinton has never shown

himself to be endowed with courage. Harry Truman could have pulled it off, but Harry Truman, whose personal integrity was never questioned, would never have got himself in this jam in the first place.

He could fight the subpoena, and this is no doubt the most attractive choice. His lawyers would cloak the challenge in the colors of the flag, and he could make endless speeches about how he was only doing it for the presidents Republican as well as Democrat who would follow after. This would set up a historic constitutional crisis. His lawyers would have work for months, and in the end, lose. This might buy Mr. Clinton the rest of his term, but it would be bought at the cost of paralyzing the presidency and crippling his party in Congress for a generation. All this for a few minutes of cheap sex, without even taking off his clothes. Other presidents would flinch at this. **Richard Nixon, to give his ghost its due, had the grace and gumption to resign rather than put the nation through such an ordeal. Bill Clinton doesn't care. There's always someone to take the hit for him. The landscape, stretching from Texarkana eastward to the Potomac, is littered with the corpses of foolish but loyal friends.**

The fourth option might actually work, but the man who didn't inhale, who dodged his generation's war and fled to another country to mock men braver than he, could never bring himself to take it. He could admit it all, ascribe it to a moment of human weakness, and say that yes, he did lie in his deposition, and he did it not because everyone lies about sex but because he wanted to protect his wife (his nose would grow 12 feet 4 inches in 13 seconds, in full view of the camera). And for his daughter, and even Monica. "Where I come from," he might say, "a man is taught to lie if necessary to protect women, and I'm truly sorry that I gave in to a momentary temptation of the flesh. I believe in amazing grace, and that God has forgiven me, and I hope you will, too."

A lot of Americans would gag, choke and retch at this, but a lot of them wouldn't, and if delivered with a tear on his right cheek, a catch in his voice, a nibble at the lower lip at just the right moment, it might just succeed, particularly if followed by chastened spinning by the formidable White House spin team. James Carville, Rahm Emanuel and Lanny Davis would appear as if humbled, displaying honor and candor for once instead of dementia and arrogance, to suggest that everyone around the president had learned something from the episode. America loves a redeemed sinner, and redemption is easier if preceded by repentance, sincerely faked.

Southern Gallantry Gets the Heave-Ho

The Washington Times 5/5/98

The clintonoids have given Southern gallantry an entirely new meaning: Never take a hit if you can find a woman big enough to hide behind.

Hillary Clinton is not so much a Tammy Wynette wannabe, crying to stand by her man, as a post-feminist original, eager to stand in front of her man. She's absorbed so much shrapnel for her man that she couldn't get through the metal detector in any airport in America.

She's the little woman who trots faithfully at the heels of the wife-abuser, smiling cheerfully through her bruises. Hillary has earned the nation's pity, Kenneth Starr's caution, and her own poll ratings prove it. She may not enjoy the humiliation but she can tolerate it, buoyed by the notion that she will

eventually make something out of her good ol' boy, or at least extract the only favors she wants from him. The head-shrinker term for this is "co-dependency." Down home, where the head-shrinker business is so bad most of the shrinks are on food stamps, they call it "settling" -- for whatever you can get.

Young Bill Clinton did not pay close enough attention down home, as he absorbed the manly values of Hot Springs. Lucky Luciano, Frank Costello, Owney Madden and Carlos Marcello, whatever evil they may have plotted in the bathhouses lining Central Avenue, never publicly humiliated their women, nor cast them as surrogates to take the punishment when due.

Webb Hubbell is eager to take a second fall --his term for it is a "roll over" -- for Bill Clinton even if it means his wife has to go to prison, too. Do these guys have no shame?

Well, not much. The president is merely living up to expectations. A man who lies to get out of wearing his country's uniform, and flees to foreign shores to parade his contempt for the land that gave him life, liberty and privilege, does not have to stoop further to sacrifice the woman he promised to love, honor and protect for whatever cheap gratifications of the moment fall in his path. In the Arkansas I grew up in, such a man would have been scorned, or worse, and certainly not elected governor.

Webb Hubbell seemed to have been cut from longer-staple cotton. He, too, was honored with high office by the men and women he grew up with, first as chief justice of the state Supreme Court, then as mayor of the state capital, finally as a senior partner in one of the most prestigious law firms in the state. But one look at those leggy models in the Victoria's Secret catalog and he turned into a tub -- a very large tub -- of quivering muscadine jelly. He allowed his clients, who didn't know it, to outfit his wife in fine silks and satins.

Before the shopping spree was over, he was overbilling his clients by nearly a half-million dollars, and in a rare outburst of honesty explained: "So does every lawyer in the country." This kind of honesty is all that Kenneth Starr wants from him about whatever shady stuff Hillary was doing for her clients, since Mrs. Clinton seems unable to recall the details herself.

And if his wife has to twist slowly, slowly in the wind to protect Hillary, well, that's just the risk His Former Honor (or whatever disgraced Supreme Court justices want to be called) will have to take. Anyone listening to the infamous prison tapes of telephone conversations between the Hubbells can hear the plaintive terror and wishful regret in Suzy Hubbell's voice.

"I am the one that has to explain this to Marcia," she says of White House aide Marsha Scott, assigned to monitor the loyalty level of FOBs the Clintons are ready to dispose of. "She says you are not going to get any public support if you open Hillary up to this. Well, by public support I know exactly what she means. I'm not stupid."

Replies loyal husband: "And I spent Saturday with you saying I would not do that. I will not raise those allegations that might open it up to Hillary. And you know that. I told you that."

Says the fall-guy wife: "... Marsha is ratcheting it up and making it sound like if Webb goes ahead and sues the firm, then any support I have at the White House is gone. I'm hearing the squeeze play."

Replies loyal husband, who knows what the mob expects of him: "So, I need to roll over one more time."

Webb later explains to his mouthpiece that he's got his wife under control: "And I talked to Suzy a little bit last night, and I just had to say, 'Suzy, there's a reason why we're not going to say anything.'"

Replies the lawyer: "Right."

But there's nothing right about it. Just when we think we've seen (and smelled) everything the Clintons and their cronies could have tracked into the house where Jefferson, Lincoln, Wilson and two Roosevelts slept, Bill Clinton reminds us anew that we ain't seen nothin' yet.

Starr Aide Insists Leaks Motion be Pulled

The Washington Times 5/8/98

Whitewater prosecutors Thursday told President Clinton's personal attorney to withdraw a motion accusing independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr's office of leaking secret grand jury information -- or face the consequences.

In a terse letter, deputy independent counsel Jackie M. Bennett Jr. told David E. Kendall that his motion was "not only wrong, but reckless."

"Although we understand your keen desire to once again change the subject when you receive bad news, we demand that you withdraw the motion ... by noon on Friday, May 8, 1998," Mr. Bennett said.

"Otherwise, we will take appropriate action. ... We owe you no courtesy after [Wednesday's] abusive filing."

Lawyers and others close to the Monica Lewinsky sex-and-lies grand jury probe said appropriate action could include a motion by Mr. Starr to Chief Judge Norma Holloway Johnson to find Mr. Kendall in contempt for filing a motion he knew was false, or to have the Washington lawyer sanctioned for filing a frivolous motion.

"If they were playing hardball before, this would be called death ray now," said one lawyer familiar with the Starr-Kendall flap.

Mr. Kendall filed a motion Wednesday with the U.S. District Court in Washington accusing the office of leaking still-sealed grand jury information on a judge's ruling denying the president's claim of executive privilege.

The sources said Mr. Starr's office was livid over what it perceived as untrue and unwarranted threats by Mr. Kendall to seek a court order to hold the independent counsel in contempt "for these latest flagrant leaks" concerning the judge's executive privilege ruling.

Mr. Bennett labeled as "categorically false" accusations that the independent counsel's office leaked

information on Judge Johnson's ruling to Fox News, as claimed by Mr. Kendall. Fox News said its attribution that Mr. Starr's office was the source of the executive-privilege ruling was a "mischaracterization" and the erroneous attribution was due to a miscommunication between reporters.

"We have been advised that you now have perfect knowledge of the source of the reports," Mr. Bennett said in his letter.

The sources said the independent counsel's office has decided that it is going to respond immediately when inaccurate or incorrect statements are made.

Mr. Kendall did not return calls to his office for comment but said in a letter to Mr. Starr on Wednesday that it was "disappointing that your commitment to your secrecy obligations ... is only verbal."

Under federal law, it is illegal for a court officer to leak grand jury materials or sealed documents.

This week's attack by Mr. Kendall is not the first time he has accused Mr. Starr of leaking grand jury information. Last year, in an unusually accusatory letter, he said Mr. Starr violated grand jury secrecy rules in a "leak-and-smear" campaign aimed at discrediting first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton.

The letter, which had been approved by Mr. Clinton, accused Mr. Starr of conducting a "public-relations offensive" he called "unprecedented and profoundly ill-advised," saying the independent counsel had embraced tactics "wholly inconsistent with your professional obligations as a prosecutor."

White House Press Secretary Michael McCurry acknowledged at the time that Mr. Kendall had discussed the letter with the president after he became "somewhat provoked" by an article in the New York Times Magazine and "just felt enough was enough and it was time to say some things publicly."

Mr. Starr rejected the accusations, denying any suggestion of impropriety. He said that neither he nor his staff had violated grand jury secrecy rules and that information in the article came from public court records.

The White House has continued a campaign to discredit Mr. Starr over the past several months, much of it led by adviser Sidney Blumenthal. Mr. Blumenthal has strongly attacked Whitewater prosecutors, labeling Mr. Starr as a "zealot on a mission divined from a higher authority" and describing deputy independent counsel W. Hickman Ewing Jr. as a "religious fanatic."

Mr. Blumenthal attacked the two prosecutors mercilessly in a speech at Harvard, saying, "Ken Starr is on an endless quest, if not for vindication, then of vindictiveness. But I am certain that in historical retrospect this perverse episode will be viewed in its proper perspective, as Jefferson viewed the Alien and Sedition Acts, in his words, 'a reign of witches.'"

Meanwhile, Mr. Clinton's personal secretary, Betty Currie, testified for three hours Thursday before the sex-and-lies grand jury, followed by a White House steward, Glen Maes, the fourth White House

steward to be called.

Mrs. Currie, who testified for six hours on Wednesday, is expected to be called again, according to her attorney, Lawrence Wechsler. "We will be back. I'm not sure when," he said. She was the first witness called when the grand jury convened on Jan. 17.

Mrs. Currie and the White House stewards, who also act as valets to the president, are in a position to observe the comings and goings of those who visit the White House Oval Office.

The grand jury is investigating accusations on 20 hours of secretly recorded audiotapes of Miss Lewinsky that she had an 18-month sexual relationship with Mr. Clinton and that the president and White House insider Vernon E. Jordan Jr. told her to lie about it in the Paula Jones sexual misconduct lawsuit.

Mr. Clinton and Mr. Jordan have denied the accusations.

The president told Mrs. Jones' attorneys in a Jan. 17 deposition that he talked with Mr. Jordan about helping Miss Lewinsky find a job, but he said the search was initiated by Mrs. Currie. Mr. Jordan's attorney, William Hundley, said there was "no question" Mrs. Currie acted on Mr. Clinton's behalf.

Gingrich Takes to Road with Attacks on Clinton

The Washington Times 5/8/98

House Speaker Newt Gingrich Thursday charged President Clinton is ignoring crimes in his administration, saying "it's not enough to be passive ... if a crime has been committed."

"The American people have a right to know," the Georgia Republican told the New Hampshire Legislature in Concord.

His remarks, applauded by Republicans in the chamber, prompted a walkout by about two dozen Democratic lawmakers. As they filed out, Mr. Gingrich said, "People can walk out, but what I'm saying is a fact about a crime."

Republicans responded with sustained applause.

Mr. Gingrich went on to criticize Whitewater figure Webster L. Hubbell, saying "he had to resign and go to jail. Between resigning and going to jail, he got \$720,000 from 18 different sources, including \$100,000 from Indonesians."

The comments were the latest exchange in Mr. Gingrich's war of words with congressional Democrats, who continued Thursday to shift public focus off the probes of administration wrongdoing by criticizing GOP investigative efforts on Capitol Hill.

House Minority Leader Richard A. Gephardt repeated his demand that Rep. Dan Burton step down as chairman for a committee holding hearings on fund-raising abuses. And he accused Mr. Gingrich of prejudging the outcome of the investigations of the president.

"Your statements, which prematurely reach conclusions in this matter, diminish your constitutional role as speaker," Mr. Gephardt said in a letter to Mr. Gingrich.

Clinton spokesman Michael McCurry also weighed in on Mr. Gingrich's comments, saying, "If he's got evidence of crimes, I think that would probably be news to [independent counsel Kenneth W.] Starr, and he probably should go see Mr. Starr. He has not done so, so that would indicate to me that this is hollow rhetoric rather than factual information."

Rank-and-file Republicans joined the fray Thursday, warning that if Democrats think the embarrassment from having weakened Mr. Burton's power will alleviate the pressure from Mr. Gingrich, they have another think coming.

"Burton's clumsiness doesn't change the fact that these Democrats have been playing errand boy for the White House, in concert with all the president's men," said Rep. Joe Scarborough, Florida Republican.

He said Republicans on Mr. Burton's House Government Reform and Oversight Committee will offer a resolution of their own next week if Democrats follow through with their plans to force a vote on the ouster of Mr. Burton as chairman. The GOP resolution would seek mainly to discredit Rep. Henry A. Waxman of California, the senior Democrat on the committee and most vocal critic of Mr. Burton.

Plenty of Republicans say privately they support ousting Mr. Burton for his handling of the fund-raising probe, most recently for his clumsy release of taped jailhouse conversations of Mr. Hubbell. But they refuse to go along with what they view as political, partisan attempts by Democrats to undermine the probe as a whole.

Instead, when the committee meets next week to discuss immunity for four key witnesses, for which Democrats so far have refused to comply despite Justice Department approval, Republicans say they plan to fire back with as tough an attack on Mr. Waxman as the one Mr. Burton has weathered.

"During the beating up on Dan Burton, we can make it clear what they are trying to do," said Rep. John Linder, Georgia Republican.

Mr. Linder hinted that the main thrust would be to paint Mr. Waxman -- a vocal foe of the tobacco industry -- as a defender of one of the witnesses for whom Republicans seek immunity, Kent La, one of the biggest tobacco brokers in China who has donated money to the Democratic Party.

"That may be the only tobacco executive that Henry Waxman has ever tried to help," he said.

However, Mr. Scarborough said the GOP counteroffensive would not in any way be a defense of Mr. Burton but, rather, an effort to portray Democrats as stonewallers of the investigations and gatekeepers of the White House. "This won't be a defense of Dan Burton," he said.

When the speaker returned to Washington later in the day, he was received poorly again by a group of civil rights leaders, who objected to Mr. Gingrich touting a GOP school voucher proposal on the steps of the Frederick Douglass House in Washington's Anacostia neighborhood.

"This is blasphemy. This is hypocrisy. If this were Frederick Douglass's time, they would have whooped Newt Gingrich the way he was whooped by his master," said Nana Anderson, one of about a dozen protesters who heckled Mr. Gingrich, House Majority Leader Dick Armey and other lawmakers who were present.

The Runaway Bigots in the White House

The Washington Times 5/8/98

For most Americans, religious faith is something precious to live by. At the White House, it's both a prop for a photo-op and a club to pound the unwary.

You can find Bill Clinton nearly every Sunday morning on the steps of the church, waiting for the photographers, with one hand in Hillary's and the other clutching the biggest Bible he can find. If his Bible gets any bigger he'll need help carrying it.

Ordinarily, it's not nice to notice such things, since a man's religious faith -- or lack of any -- is his business, not ours. Only God can make a tree or examine a man's heart.

But these are not ordinary times, and Bill Clinton is not an ordinary president. In his desperation to salvage what's left of his presidency, nothing is off limits, nothing is over the line. Anything goes, everything goes. The president's mad dogs, contemptuous as they may be of anyone who wears the military uniform, nevertheless look to old Tecumseh Sherman for their inspiration. "I can make the march and I can make Georgia howl," he told an admiring Lincoln in 1864 on the eve of his infamous march from Atlanta to the sea. "I propose to kill even the puppies, because puppies grow up to be Southern dogs." This would become the order of battle for a White House 130 years later: Burn everything to the ground, and plow up the ashes.

When Sidney Blumenthal and the demented James Carville were loosed on Kenneth Starr and Hick Ewing, proposing to mock and jeer at their evangelical Christianity, the president gave them no caution about observing the decencies and restraints that guide the rest of us. The president, a Baptist, might even have relished Mr. Carville's mean-spirited jibes at Mr. Starr's faith. Mr. Clinton grew up in Arkansas at a time when the country Baptists and the rural Churches of Christ were particularly hostile to each other, often engaging in bitter public debates over fine points of theology. This was entertainment in the small towns where the movies were widely regarded as the work of the devil.

Mr. Carville, who hails from the deep swamps where only gators and snakes feel at home and the voodoo queen Marie Leveau is held in high repute, makes particular sport of Mr. Starr's practice of singing hymns --a cappella, in the tradition of the Church of Christ -- as he jogs along the river bank in the early hours of the morning. "I sing a hymn," Mr. Starr once told a Christian businessmen's breakfast, "and I sing it aloud. And then I pray."

Mr. Carville hooted, and made notes. "He goes down by the Potomac and listens to hymns," he said the other day, "as the cleansing water of the Potomac goes by, and we're going to wash all Sodomites and fornicators out of town." Mr. Carville's cruel and cryptic put-down of homosexuals did not go

over well at the White House, where the gay constituency is highly valued, but there was no rebuke for the rest of his soliloquy.

Mr. Carville is a free-lance spinner, of course, since he no longer has any known official tie to the White House, and he often takes flight on riffs that make even the president's paid spinners wince. He's harmless enough, and, unlike the street people who accost the unwary with similar mumbled fantasies about CIA radio transmitters in their teeth, he rarely demands spare change.

Sidney Blumenthal is another matter entirely. Although the White House tried to distance the president from Mr. Blumenthal's ugly attack on Hick Ewing, calling him a "religious fanatic" because he admits that he prays for divine guidance, he's a government employee and the president is nominally responsible for him. One White House aide describes him as "the bigot-in-chief, but he's the first lady's bigot-in-chief."

Sidney's ties to Mrs. Clinton's apron -- he's more a lady-in-waiting than an aide, and is said to give great pedicures C make him untouchable. The president, even if he wanted to, is in no position to demand the first lady rid the White House of him.

And there's no evidence that the president wants to. He has used the forms of religious faith often, misquoting Scripture and distorting the expressions of his critics' faith, and now has loosed the White House mad dogs to spread venom to sanctuaries where Mafia dons would never go.

Cyber-Sid

The Washington Times 5/7/98

Want to see why Christians and conservatives are infuriated at White House adviser Sidney Blumenthal? Want to see President Clinton celebrated as America's savior, and see Ronald Reagan vilified as a nostalgic, regressive, "evanescent image"? Want to see a top aide in the Clinton administration mock independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr as a "zealot on a mission divined from a higher authority" waging "an onslaught on rights that is unethical, illegal and always political," with the assistance of "religious fanatic" Hickman Ewing?

Well, thanks to the miracle of Internet technology, you can now see what the fuss is all about. Harvard University has posted on its Web site the entire text of Mr. Blumenthal's April 23 speech at the university's John F. Kennedy School of Government, a speech in which Mr. Clinton is celebrated, Mr. Reagan is condemned and all the administration's critics are impugned as vicious enemies of social justice.

Blumenthal's Whopper

The Washington Times 10/6/98

Presidential aide Sidney Blumenthal failed to tell the truth B to put it politely -- when he spoke to the press earlier this year after an appearance before the sex-and-lies grand jury.

"Today, I was forced to answer questions about my conversations, as part of my job with [the White House], and I wrote this down, the New York Times, CNN, CBS, Time magazine, U.S. News, the

New York Daily News, the Chicago Tribune, the New York Observer and there may have been a few others; I don't remember right now," Mr. Blumenthal intoned. "Ken Starr's prosecutors demanded to know what I had told reporters and what reporters had told me about Ken Starr's prosecutors."

However, reporter David Marash, on ABC's "Nightline" Friday, said grand jury transcripts released by Congress tell a different story, the Media Research Center reports.

"A look at the grand jury transcript shows prosecutors pressing Blumenthal not about his contacts with the media, but with the president, the first lady and other top White House politicians and about the messages that they wanted Blumenthal to spin into the media," Mr. Marash said.

Rebuking Blumenthal

The Washington Times 10/7/98

A grand juror in the sex-and-lies scandal rebuked presidential adviser Sidney Blumenthal for --how shall we put it -- misleading the American people about his earlier testimony.

Mr. Blumenthal, after his first appearance before the grand jury last summer, told the awaiting media horde that the prosecutors were mostly interested in his contacts with major newspapers, magazines and television networks. However, as newly released grand jury transcripts show, that never happened.

"We had some serious concerns," the forewoman told Mr. Blumenthal. "The work we are doing here is very serious, and the integrity to our work as representatives of the people of the United States of America is very important to us. We are very concerned about the fact that, during your last visit, that an inaccurate representation of the events that happened were retold on the steps of the courthouse." Mr. Blumenthal's response: "I appreciate your statement."

The New York Post, in an editorial yesterday, commented: "No wonder the Clintons love Blumenthal. Who else but a liar can so appreciate another liar?"

The Clinton Presidency and America's Future - April 23,1998

Sidney Blumenthal

Sidney Blumenthal: Well, thank you Marvin. It's good to be here with old friends, even old neighbors, colleagues. It's a little bit like "This is Your Life." I've lived here a long time. I should add, given that all of the Democratic clubs are cosponsoring this event, welcome fellow Democrats. It's a special pleasure for me to be back here in this Forum. The last time I was here, a year and a half ago, it was in a very different role, as a playwright, to watch a performance of my play "This Town," an absurd comedy about a scandal obsessed capital. That, of course, was sheer fantasy. Now that, at least for now, I'm not a playwright, or a journalist, or an author, but the assistant to the president, I

can tell you that even the most imaginative art can not rival life, from the sublime to the ridiculous. Sublime first: A week ago, I sat in the chamber of the Chilean congress, as President Clinton delivered an address extolling democracy as the highest value, "above all," he said. Augusto Pinoche, the former dictator, now Senator for Life, boycotted the President's speech, and his supporters sat on their hands in Chile and throughout Latin America. Although every government but one is elected, democracy remains a paramount issue. So the President's speech was a signal event in Chilean politics and in the hemisphere.

There was a personal resonance for me also, at this event. More than twenty years ago, when I was a young journalist in Boston, I met a Chilean exiled leader who was at Harvard at the time. Interviewed him-- It was one of my very early articles. And I ran into him there. He was a senator. He sat in the front row of the Chilean congress, while I sat across the aisle in the American delegation.

Now the ridiculous: A couple of months ago, I was waiting outside in the corridor outside the grand jury room for my turn to answer Ken Starr's questions. I noticed that Terry Messner, the former Watergate Deputy Counsel and now a private investigator working for Democrats, was also waiting. We'd never met. I observed to him that though we had a number of friends in common, it had taken Ken Starr to make a proper introduction. Then I was called into the grand jury room. Among the questions, "Have you ever met Terry Messner?" And finally, "Have you ever said anything positive about Ken Starr?" I paused and replied, "I can't recall."

The antics of Washington may appear like those of a hot-house theater, in which many of the actors who speak their hurried lines have little sense of the drama's meaning. But these events are not beyond our comprehension. And the issue of democracy abroad, as I hope to make clear, is not far removed from its fate at home. In Washington, the chief riddle of the day is this: Why is President Clinton popular? To opponents, the question itself is inexplicable.

But, in fact--in fact--President Clinton has been more popular over a longer period of time than Ronald Reagan ever was. Why is this so? Some contend that it marks a sea change in culture, a transformation of American values perhaps, for the theoretically inclined, ... (inaudible) made its manifestation of the cultural contradictions of capitalism.

But there is another less opaque way to approach the problem. What has President Clinton achieved? And what kind of future are we preparing for our nation? Once we look at the question from these angles, it may be apparent that the Clinton presidency has struggled through a difficult transitional period, met and mastered many of its challenges, and established, at the turn of a new millennium, the makings of a new era.

It is often hard to gain perspective on the President, through the swirl of controversy and contention. The past may be felt to be more familiar, certain and reassuring. Soothing nostalgia and wishful thinking, after all, were animating elements of Reaganism. But the Clinton presidency has a different, more practical and ambitious mission: To make America a modern nation.

The administration's policies have reshaped the economy, reformed the instrument of government, and recast progressive politics. These actions have been of the time, by the time, for the time. They have not proceeded from dogmas or, least of all, nostalgia. The President's policies have been

remedial, preemptive and reconstructive, all at once. The lead weights of the past have been thrown off in order to move forward, not to regress to a dream time.

No progressive model of politics can avoid changing along with society and the economy. The modern imperative is to shape our interests and value to new realities. The governing idea of the Clinton presidency is the idea of the nation. Not who we imagine we were, but who we might become. The goal is to create a new social contract for a global economy, in which opportunity is widened, in which fiscal discipline fosters confidence in a government able to invest in education, the environment, child care and health care, in which civil society, social harmony, and public safety are restored, and in which a multi-cultural people can forge a common identity.

If there is a name for the Clinton approach as a politics, it is this: One nation politics. And this is the cynosure of the new social contract: the 1997 balanced budget agreement that included new health coverage for five million children and the creation for the first time of tax tuition credits for everyone to attend college, the Hope Scholarships. For the first time in more than a generation, we have the means to meet our ends, the capabilities to realize our purposes.

We see surpluses as far as the eye can see, in the words of Gene Spurling, the director of the National Economic Council. The Clinton administration has restored solvency, and not merely in the fiscal sense. We are able, again, to think about how we can shape our society and to conduct a practical politics around our ideas.

Creating the new nation, the American nation at the turn of the new century, the 21st century, is a project that is just beginning. But one nation politics, the method of modernization, is rooted in a traditional concept: "The great object of the institution of civil government," President John Quincy Adams declared in 1825, in his first annual message to Congress, "is the improvement of the condition of those who are parties to the social compact."

For the Clinton presidency, this project, a great project that falls to every generation, has not been easy. It has required confronting the burdens of the past and struggling with hostile forces that seek to confound and destroy one nation politics and all that it promises.

On the eve of his inauguration, in December, 1992, President-elect Clinton was informed by the outgoing director of the budget that the federal deficit had been miscalculated and was about \$60 billion more than previously estimated. It was expected to rise to \$357 billion by 1997. What a joke. Clinton didn't know how bad things were until right before his Inauguration. Since Reagan's supply-side tax bill was passed in 1981, based on the panacea that cutting taxes and increasing spending would miraculously lead to a balanced budget, progressive social policy had been blocked.

David Stockman, Reagan's early budget director, acknowledged in an interview with me for the New Yorker that once the policy-makers recognized that an astronomical deficit had been produced, it had the consequence of paralyzing government, an outcome that confirmed the conservative view that government was, and should be, ineffectual, and solidified the Republicans politically.

And there were deficits as far as the eye could see. At the start, the prospect of coping with the deficit seemed as if it would completely thwart President Clinton. His plans would never materialize.

He would be absorbed in remedial activity forever. Then the political conditions that had plagued the Democrats since 1968 would be reproduced. From the agony of 1968 onward, when the Democrats disintegrated politically, the troubles for recreating a progressive politics only increased.

The election of 1980 was filled with recurrences of the indictments of 1968. The standing negative in the year of Reagan's victory was identical in argument to that of '68. But added to the foreign policy indictment and the party strife indictment were the indictments that the Democrats couldn't run the economy and couldn't express the national temperament. It's optimism. It was malaise deluxe.

On the eve of the 1992 election, it appeared that, even in the midst of recession, the burdens the Democrats carried were becoming heavier. There were still deficits as far as the eye could see. The tools of governance were left to rust. Government, it was said, couldn't rise above the deficit. The only appropriate role of government was to stand aside.

The issue of government, and, therefore, of politics, was settled. The assumption was that the Democrats could gain and hold the presidency only if unusual circumstances created an ephemeral breach in the wall of Republican dominance. George Bush's failure to fill the evanescent image of Reagan by surmounting the recession, a result, in part, of Reaganism, seemed to create that breach.

But something more than an aberration was possible. The ending of the Cold War had profoundly shifted the tectonic political plates that had been in place for more than a half century. Even more, the end of the Cold War was an abrupt conclusion to the 20th century of total war, the age of extremes, as the historian Eric Hobsbawm put it.

Nineteen-ninety, in my book, *Pledging Allegiance*, I wrote, "The ancient questions that had been closed for decades were now reopened. But one question strangely went unasked, the American question. Just as the Cold War's beginning had radically transformed American politics, so would its ending.

For nearly six years now, President Clinton has been remaking progressive policy and politics while in office. The new economy, of course, depends upon the initiative of entrepreneurs and the energy of workers. But it would not have been able to flourish unless a new framework of policy had been set in place. The 1993 deficit reducing budget of President Clinton, for which the Democrats paid a steep price in 1994, was essential, an unquestioned factor, according to Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan, whose appointment, by the way, was itself another act of policy.

The anxious class, identified by Secretary of Labor Robert Reich, has begun to see anxiety lessened and opportunities widened. For 20 years, average family income stagnated and real wages declined. But since 1993, family income has risen more than \$2,000, and, last year, real wages increased 2.3 percent. The minimum wage championed by the administration, and the earned income tax credit, have ensured that the benefits of the economy have spread to the working poor.

By 1996, 4.3 million people were lifted out of poverty by the earned income tax credit. The poverty rate is down. It's not nearly enough, but we can begin to see a new social contract at work.

The current Republican Congress, however, cannot decide how to deal with the President's new approach. As it has lost its ideological and programmatic thrust and focus since 1994, it has become even more partisan. This may be one more sign of the acceleration of history. Now, Republicans can

choose to play a constructive role of working with the President or they can resist, voting down 100,000 new teachers and new school construction, as they did this week.

They can act as tools of special interests, the tar and nicotine of the old politics, as Speaker Newt Gingrich did this week in joining the tobacco companies in assailing an effort to reduce teen smoking and support children's health. They can follow a strategy of trying to tear down the President, as a way to build themselves up. But as Senators D'Amato and Thompson have discovered, that approach has only backfired for them. Dan Burton, however, for his part, can't crawl out of this hole, because it is his natural habitat.

The congressional Republican party today is so fractured that it must stand still to avoid breaking apart. Its fear of movement, especially forward, expresses itself as a policy of general immobilism, tending toward shutdown. And this policy is not restricted to the domestic arena. With the end of the Cold War, the internationalism that marked the bipartisan consensus on America's role in the world has eroded. Old forms of nativism, xenophobia and isolationism have emerged from under the rocks.

The moment when the United States is at the zenith of its economic, military and political power in all its history, the very idea of internationalism is being challenged as it has not in decades. For example, when United Nations weapons inspectors were at risk in Iraq, and the International Monetary Fund was intervening to stabilize Asian economies, a handful of Republicans tied IMF funding and the payment of US dues to their anti-family planning agenda.

Rather than debate family planning on its merits, they used it to hold US foreign policy hostage. This is more than a dangerous precedent. It is entirely possible that the US could lose its vote in the General Assembly of the United Nations this year for non-payment of our debt--entirely possible.

We are, as never before, the indispensable nation, but our strategy to gain adherence to the standards of democracy, global prosperity and peace means we must act along with others, who share the risks and burdens of leadership.

In Latin American, from where I returned last week, the US advanced an agenda for a second generation of democratic reforms, to protect a free press, train an independent judiciary, promote education. Elections are only one part of democracy. And institutions that involve an active citizenry must be built up. As the President pointed out in Santiago, economic growth cannot be long sustained without democratic development, including raising the living standards of the poor.

With Great Britain, we have forged a new special relationship, the 21st century alliance, as the President has called it, based not only on our traditional mutual interests, but on our common conviction in the necessity of a new social contract. This is an entirely new basis for the relationship. Since last November, when First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton and I travelled with an American delegation to meet with a British delegation chaired by Prime Minister Tony Blair, we have held extensive discussions about the specifics of the new social contract and its politics.

Next month, after the G8 Summit in Birmingham, we will hold another meeting at Chequers, led by the President and the Prime Minister. While President Clinton has developed a progressive politics in office, Tony Blair has had a model from which to learn before he assumed office. Many of the criticisms of Blair and new labor, by the way, from both the left and the right, are exactly similar to

those of the President.

Among other things, the emergence of trans-atlantic one nation politics makes it increasingly clear that far more than personality is at stake. It should go without saying that if we are to be an example to the world, we must be faithful to democracy at home. And now I will be more responsive to the question about Mr. Starr.

We are plunged, at least in Washington, into a politics of defamation, a consuming world of innuendo, false witnesses, allusion, leaks, and smears. The abuse of the Office of the Independent Counsel by Kenneth Starr is a transparently disguised attempt to destroy this presidency.

The original intent of the Office of the Independent Counsel was to remove it from politics. But Starr is profoundly political in his intent. The problem is not simply the largesse from Richard Mellon Scaffe , the eccentric, right-wing billionaire, Starr's numerous conflicts of interest, ideological and financial, his speeches at Pat Robertson's university, his alliances, brazen alliances, with individuals determined to inflict whatever damage they can on the President.

It is not simply that he has assembled a crew of prosecutorial pirates with lengthy records of prosecutorial abuse, and installed a chief deputy, Hickman Ewing, a religious fanatic, who has proclaimed that he operates from a presumption of guilt. It is not simply that Ken Starr has jettisoned the language of law, speaking now of defilers of the temple, the apocalyptic rhetoric of a zealot on a mission divined from a higher authority. The ultimate problem is that, in his fervor, he is waging an assault on American rights, that he has engaged in an anti-Constitutional destructiveness.

He assaults freedom of speech and the right to petition the government. He has attempted to impose his very own sedition act. He abuses the grand jury to act out his personal temper tantrums and harass critics. He leaks with abandon, in violation of grand jury rules, criminal rules, and legal tradition. He uses the instruments of intimidation and smear without restraint.

Ken Starr is a figure whom the framers sought, in their design, to have rendered impossible, an inquisitor of unlimited, unchecked power. Starr, however, lacks any skepticism about his own certitudes, or even any sense of his unfamiliarity with criminal law. His lack of knowledge of the Constitution is glaring. His doctrine that the First Amendment is concerned with the truth is precisely the doctrine the First Amendment was enacted to prevent. *Wrong! Wrong! Wrong! This is complete propaganda Ken Starr has had get permission from a panel of federal judges each time he had expanded his investigation.*

But Starr is sure he knows the truth and that he should be its judge. His self-righteousness, his insecurity, his partisanship, his breath-taking hypocrisy, have fueled an onslaught on rights that is unethical, illegal, and always political. Now he has appointed himself grand inquisitor for life.

Ken Starr is on an endless quest, if not for vindication, then of vindictiveness. But I am certain that in historical retrospect this perverse episode will be viewed in its proper perspective, as Jefferson viewed the alien and sedition acts, in his words, "a reign of witches."

When we stand for liberty at home, we gain respect for ourselves around the world. There is an indissoluble link between the cause of democracy in our own country and abroad. "Let us," John

Quincy Adams admonished, "not be unmindful that liberty is power."

This was also an admonition for responsibility, for those in a democratic government to use it to forge a social compact of general improvement that extends liberty. When we practice one nation politics, we make the nation. When we make the future, we honor our true past. Thank you. (applause)

Mr. Kalb: Thank you very much, Mr. Blumenthal. I would like to take the liberty of just asking the question and citing the obvious, that there are two microphones here, and people ought to come on up, and, when you get to your turn, please give us your name, ask the question. My brief one will be, Can one assume that everything you've said about Kenneth Starr is a view shared by the President?

Mr. Blumenthal: You can assume that I'm the assistant to the President.

Questioner : Hi, my name is Rick Granelle. I'm a student here at the Kennedy School. You speak tonight of freedom of speech, and, yet, I am wondering how you reconcile suing someone for \$30 million? And also, when you did this, have you talked to the Vice President about getting involved? Is this an administration suit? Or is it your personal lawsuit?

Mr. Blumenthal: Well, this question refers to my defamation suit against Matt Drudge, the Internet gossip columnist. And it's an interesting story. You know, when I went into the White House, Marvin, my wife said to me, "You know, the day you have to hire a lawyer is the day you're out of there."

And I hired a lawyer within four hours, which was a record. (laughter) The day I entered the White House, the Drudge Report had a completely false report, saying I had a history of spousal abuse that I was covering up. And so, I sued him. And it is my belief that I'm protected by the First Amendment, as defined by New York Times v. Sullivan, the greatest ruling for free speech in world history, which says that public figures, when defamed for knowingly reckless libel, not only have the right to sue, but can claim damages.

There is such a thing as libel and slander, which is defamation, and that also defines what is protected speech. It is my own personal suit. I am pursuing it with my wife. The President and the Vice President have personally expressed their sympathy to me about the situation and the suit. And I'm grateful that they act decently as people, as well as in their official capacities.

Questioner : Good evening. My name is Will Monahan. I'm a junior at the college. My question is simple. Do you think Ken Starr will ever bring an end to this investigation? And what do you think it's going to take to actually bring an end to it?

Mr. Blumenthal: Starr said he sees no end in sight, as of last week. I take him at his word. I think it's entirely possible he will be a shadow on the presidency, even past President Clinton's tenure. It is my view that there is nothing anywhere, that there is no case. He has, in the Whitewater matter, one witness against the President, with claims, David Hale, a convicted felon, con man, embezzler, swindler, who is now accused of being a pampered witness, having consorted with agents of Richard Mellon Scaffe, and having even accepted material things, such as a car and cash.

Eric Holder, acting on behalf of the attorney general, he's the deputy attorney general, wrote Starr a

letter, strongly suggesting that he might have a conflict of interest in investigating this witness. Starr has responded by accusing the Department of Justice of having a conflict of interest.

So, Starr himself is now fighting with the Department of Justice of whether or not to investigate his only witness. That's where this investigation really is right now. In the Lewinsky matter, there is no case. There is no crime, there are no accusers. There's innuendo and there are stories. And the case from which it arose has been thrown out by a federal judge as having no merit. So, the materiality of this is non-existent.

And yet Starr says the end is not in sight. So, it's not for me to decide when to end this.

Questioner: Good evening, sir. My name is Tom Cotton. I'm a senior at the college. I have two questions, both pertaining to Mr. Starr. First, although you did not say the words in your speech this evening, you seem to be implying that Mr. Starr, as Mrs. Clinton has said, is a member of a vast right-wing conspiracy. I was wondering if Democrats Janet Reno and Eric Holder, who referred the matter to Starr, asked the matter to be referred to Starr, as well as Democrats Monica Lewinsky and Kathleen Willey, have somehow been subverted by this right-wing conspiracy?

And, second, you had claimed, or you accused, Mr. Starr of unethical, immoral behavior, and I was wondering if you consider it especially moral or ethical for you, as a paid member of the White House staff, by taxpayer funds, to be defending President Clinton on private charges, or, I presume, alleged conduct which led to these ... (inaudible) as a private, not public, matter?

Mr. Blumenthal: The only grounds on which Ken Starr can bring a case against the President is abuse of office. Those are public grounds. That's a torturous question, but if you're asking if I believe that there's a vast, right-wing conspiracy, there's certainly-- It's not something on which I have a theory, but only suggest facts.

And I certainly think that the role of the Scaffe money ought to be looked into. It's now a question, one small part of it, that has lapped up on the only witness in the case. Ken Starr himself has numerous ties to the Scaffe operation. It's undeniable. He quit Pepperdine because it was funded by Scaffe. He's been associated with a number of groups that are funded by Scaffe. The Independent Women's Forum, for which he wrote an amicus brief on behalf of Paula Jones, which he never completed when he assumed his office of independent counsel, in and of itself, it ought to have been grounds for not taking the office under a sense or prudence and propriety. In itself, it is a conflict of interest.

There are other groups, as well, Federal Society, funded by Scaffe, and so on and so forth. I mean, you can go through this sort of schematic list. Is there a right-wing? Absolutely. Is it out to get the President? Absolutely.

Questioner : My name is Allison Camorada. I have a couple of questions about the AOL thing. Are you surprised that a judge dismissed your suit against AOL? And, second, what would you like to see happen to Matt Drudge? (laughter)

Mr. Blumenthal: Yesterday, Federal Judge Paul Friedman of the DC district ruled in this case--it was an early ruling--on AOL's participation. And I was encouraged by his reasoning. He said if you were

writing on-- The opinion is not widely circulated. I don't think very many people have seen it. He said if you were writing on a blank slate, he would rule in favor of the plaintiffs, meaning my wife and myself. And he said, however, that he felt handcuffed by the law passed by Congress, the Communications Decency Act of 1996, which immunized all content providers. The judge himself suggested it was a quid pro quo in his ruling.

I think that those are interesting grounds for appeal. And I think that Internet content providers ought not to be the only ones who act like publishers in the world, who are not subject to the First Amendment. I don't think they should be removed from the Constitution, even by an act of Congress.

In the matter of Drudge, I just want to see the system of justice work, and go through this process. There is an additional process, if you're interested in this case, which involves discovery. He said he has had sources for this defamation, and, through the discovery process, we may find out exactly how this was done. It seems to me to have been very much a political dirty trick.

Questioner: Do you think that there's a place on the Internet for gossipy, you know, columns like his?

Mr. Blumenthal: I think that there's a place for all sorts of speech for which there is wide latitude as established by *New York Times v. Sullivan* anywhere in this country, and that defamation is defamation.

Questioner : Hi. My name is Sarah Keel. I'm a second-year student at the Kennedy School and a long-time reader and fan of the *New Republic* and, thus, of yours. I have a question regarding, actually, Marvin Kalb's introduction of you. He described your interchangeable roles. You were a journalist and then you became an adviser to the President. And a recent *Vanity Fair* article claims that, while you were a journalist, you took an active role in advising political candidates on policy and speech content. And I'm wondering if you could address these allegations and comment on what you feel the line is between being an objective journalist and an active journalist?

Mr. Blumenthal: I engaged in all sorts of journalism. I worked for the *Washington Post*, as well, for four years. And worked for the *New Republic*, which is an opinion journal. And for the *New Yorker*, in which I was a sort of cross between a reporter and an analyst and a columnist. And I had, as I have now, many close friends with people in politics. And I talked with them as many people in the press corps do, and shared social relations with them.

I think these lines are much gauzier in general than people imagine. And I think it's important for people to know what your engagements are. And I tried to make clear, always, exactly where my beliefs, sentiments and analysis lay, tried to make it as clear as possible, and tried to be as persuasive as possible about it.

Mr. Kalb: May I have your permission to follow up on that question. I think what she's getting at, though, is, shouldn't there be, in Washington, but everywhere, some more clear line between a journalist and a politician? Because the people have to know whether the information is reliable. So, if you are, in fact, as this article alleges, *Vanity Fair*, providing political advice to candidate Gary Hart, to candidate Bill Clinton, and then writing about it, people can get confused. And I think that's at the heart of this question.

Mr. Blumenthal: In my case, I think no one was confused about whatever I did. Some of the stories are apocryphal, as well. But I think there ought to be clear lines, especially for established media, newspapers that purport to be completely objective, newspapers of record, and so on. But journalism is a large church. And there's room for opinion, analysis, commentary. And, as we all know, Washington journalism, the lines are not indistinguishable, but people do socialize, they do know each other, and they do have relationships.

They know secretaries of state and they know people engaged in politics in the Congress. There was an age in which that sort of access journalism, if you will, was considered to have the highest status, the age of Litman, Restin, and Alsop. And it seems to have flipped on its head in the post-Watergate era. But I think we're going to see a new journalism in reaction to Whitewater.

While everyone seems to be reacting to the Watergate syndrome, I think there'll be a Whitewater syndrome, as well. I think this will be the new--

Well, I think people are going to have to be very, very careful in the future about using anonymous, uncorroborative single sources, about feeling, because of the pace of technology, the need to engage in this competition and put out things that are not fully checked, to rush to judgement on rumor and innuendo, for fear of falling behind. And also for fear of being stigmatized by a path that is engaged head-long in the pursuit of the prey.

Questioner: Hi. My name is Curt Stevens. I'm at Boston University. During the Reagan years, it was said that Speaker O'Neill and President Reagan could get together at eight o'clock in the evening for a drink and put politics aside. It seems that, in the last 20 years, that there has been, that civil discourse has gone away, and that we can no longer have a civilized discussion of the issues of the day. Instead, it resorts to name-calling. And just recently, Republicans have said some terrible things about the President lately on the floor of the House. And the same thing comes out of the White House, where they will attack the speaker or Republicans on both sides.

What do you see can be done to get us out of this vicious circle, so that we can once again have a legitimate, civilized discussion of the issues, rather than attacking people's motives or religion, and even their patriotism, as opposed to just a discussion of where they stand, what the issues are?

Mr. Blumenthal: I think it's a very important question. I would just say, to begin with, that nobody at the White House has ever attacked Speaker Gingrich personally, nor anyone else in the Republican leadership personally. But I think it's a very important question. You know, I believe that last year, on both sides of the aisle in Congress, the Republicans and the Democrats went on a retreat together to discuss the possibility of establishing more civil dialogue.

I think it's a very important question. And I think that part of it involves-- It's a very complex question. It involves the nature of attack politics. It involves the utility of negativity in politics, because it's very useful. It works. And it also involves this new permutation in journalism, which gets harnessed by this sort of politics.

I think it's very, very hard to disentangle all of these things. But I do think that reflecting on it and having a reflective element is essential. And I think it is part of a larger project of reestablishing civil society.

Questioner : Hi, my name is Robert Willingsgam. I'm a senior at the college. What I wanted to ask you is, do you have time in your schedule now to do any creative writing? And what your next projects, as far as plays and screenplays, might be?

Mr. Blumenthal: Yeah, I wish I did. I'll tell you what, something about writing in this environment, which is that I'm an author, I'm a playwright, I've been a journalist for nearly 30 years, and written ... (inaudible) history. And I don't keep notes. And I'm somebody who would keep notes. This is a very unusual experience. I see a lot other people don't see. I have learned a lot that would provide insight to other people. Memory is not perfect. But I cannot keep notes, nor does anyone else I know in the White House, because of threat of subpoena. And I regard all this as a real crime against history. So, on that point, I feel that strongly everyday.

Bob Kuttner : I'm Bob Kuttner , an old friend of Sid's. A lot of the reporters who seem to have the most visceral hatred for Bill Clinton are people who are roughly on the same place in the political spectrum as Clinton. You did not have these kinds of visceral hatreds for Bush or for Carter, certainly, or even for Reagan, even though a lot of reporters were just disgusted with where he was taking the country. Why has this centrist, intelligent, charismatic, modernizing, centrist President been such a lightning rod for such hatred?

Mr. Blumenthal: Well, your comment is incredibly interesting. And I think that there are members of the press corps right now who are engaged in independent, enterprising journalism on stories that are not pack stories, not only about policy, but even about the so-called scandal matters. And I think that we're in a very interesting place in journalism, where what you describe may be beginning to have run its course as not productive in any sort of way, either personally, professionally, politically, and certainly not towards the contribution to, as a previous questioner said, to a civil society.

Questioner: I'll try to make it quick. If your hypothesis is, if I understand it correctly, that the President is popular because he's helped the American people adjust to new realities, then why is the President, why is government as a general institution, not trusted any more than it was six years ago?

Mr. Blumenthal: This is an old conundrum of politics in America. And while esteem for government has risen, it's still in some disrepute. And what I think that you'll find is that the oldest study of American political science is correct--this was by Free and Cantrelle --in which they found that if you asked general questions, Americans tended towards more conservative positions, but if you asked specific questions, they tended toward what they defined as operational liberalism, at the time.

I think that you'll find something very similar today. I think that when we discuss specific issues, and from there talk about their benefit and where they fit into general progress, whether it's education, child care, health care and the environment, that people are very supportive. If we have a theoretical abstract discussion, people respond as they have since the original study decades ago was taken.

Questioner: Hi. My name is Heather Thompson. I'm a LL-1 at the law school. This is going to sound like a political question, but it's really not. This is a very personal and sincere question. As a person just starting out in my public service career, personally one of the biggest concerns to me, if I ever do hold elected office or become very politically involved, is providing a good role model and a good, healthy environment for my community and the children in my community.

My concern is that once you get to the level of the White House, is it possible to take those considerations into your daily decision-making anymore? Or is it solely for personal political survival, in order to make your day-to-day decisions and your reactions to the news, and how you conduct yourself, and how you present the issues?

Mr. Blumenthal: I think-- The people I work with are very focused on the purposes of what we think of as helping the country, and we think of specific people. We're not zealots. We're not ideologues. And we're not, I think, completely removed from ordinary experience. We have families, we have children, and we have to deal with all the demands of life, as well.

You might find that, in the White House, actually, these are even more pressing, dealing with, say, the issues of a working family, which are things we hold policy meetings about, and try and work policies out about, which has contributed to the child care initiative that, today, we held a huge child care event at the White House. So, I'm not disillusioned about that by my experience at all.

Nor am I disillusioned by my own experience. A number of people say, you know, "Do you have regrets about this?" And my feeling is, "Not at all." While, on the one hand, I've been defamed, I've been hauled before a federal grand jury, false stories have been spread about me, people write nasty articles, and it's not simply that that is the price of public service and what public service has become today. You know, politics is a very contentious arena. And if you care about these things, then you have to be willing to bear that. But even more than that, it is worthwhile, in my view, to act on your convictions and what you believe in, and to have the experience of actually making those changes that do affect people's lives, and see that happen.

I will tell you one example, I was speaking to Marvin about this before I came out here, in Chile, I had been working very hard in Latin America since last fall, before the President's trip, where, in October, the President directly raised the issue of freedom of the press in Latin America.

This is not some sort of do-good, you know, issues, the way it may sound here. There were a dozen journalists killed in Latin America this year. There were more than 100 killed in the last decade. Threats and physical intimidation are constant. There are laws of contempt for speaking ill of public figures. There's criminal libel, very different from civil libel. And while it can't be made perfect in Latin America, what can happen is what did happen, which is that, in some of the Americas, an effort I was involved in, we have helped create a new position within the organization of American states, a special rapporteur for freedom of expression, who will monitor and call attention to violations of freedom of the press throughout the hemisphere.

For working journalists in Latin America, and I spent a lot of time with them, this is something real. And it matters also for their societies and their democracies, because, as I said, elections are not enough. You need the institutions of democracy to be supported. So, I feel really proud to be able to have contributed in that way, and hope to make other contributions, as do other members of the administration, especially the President, the First Lady, and the Vice President.

And I find their example to have a really beneficial effect on everybody else inside the administration, as well. So, regardless of how it may seem, for those of us on the inside, we do feel we're making a difference. And I would encourage, at the Kennedy School of Government, people to

think seriously about government.

Mr. Kalb: Mr. Blumenthal, thank you very much, particularly for those last comments. (applause)

Introduction:

Marvin Kalb : Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I'm Marvin Kalb, director of the Shornstein Center on Press, Politics, and Public Policy here at the Kennedy School, and it's my pleasure to introduce Sidney Blumenthal tonight. This event is cosponsored by the Shorenstein Center, the Democratic Caucus of the Kennedy School, the Democratic Caucus of the University, and a few other Democrats.

Sidney Blumenthal is forty-nine years of age. He is a writer with a list of impressive credentials, having worked at different times for the New Yorker, the New Republic, the Washington Post, and Vanity Fair. He has written five books, including *The Permanent Campaign*, which contributed vitally to our understanding of contemporary politics. He's even written a play that pokes fun at the White House press corps. So far, so good.

But Sidney Blumenthal is also one of the most controversial figures to hit Washington, D.C. in a long time. Since August of last year, Blumenthal has been a special adviser to the President of the United States, a speech writer on subjects such as Iraq, and other foreign and domestic policy problems, and the highly regarded State of the Union Address. He is also said to be close to the First Lady, speaking to her every day about a wide range of issues. He has felt the sting of the Internet when Matt Drudge, who has his own page in that strange new world, described Blumenthal as being guilty of spousal abuse, of all things, a charge Blumenthal denied, and Drudge quickly withdrew. But Blumenthal demanded to know his sources, and launched a thirty-million dollar defamation suit against Drudge.

Blumenthal has also become absorbed in the Monica story, on February 26, being summoned to Kenneth Starr's grand jury proceedings to provide the names of reporters and news organizations he talked to about the case. When Blumenthal emerged that day, he proudly declared, "If they think they have intimidated me, they have failed."

Blumenthal is also a former journalist, who was often criticized by other journalists, Maureen Dowd of the Times referring to him as, "Supercilious Sid," and Newsweek accusing him of "smug toadying." What all of this suggests is that Sidney Blumenthal is one of those modern Washington figures who can zip through the revolving doors of press and politics and leave everyone confused about his ultimate professional loyalty. However, there is no confusion about his political loyalty, which goes from his heart and his head directly to Bill and Hillary Clinton, who happen to inhabit that big white house on Pennsylvania Avenue.

So it's my pleasure to introduce Sidney Blumenthal, who is here to discuss the Clinton presidency and the future of America.

Minority Vote

The Washington Times 5/12/98

Response to Inside the Beltway's current reader poll -- Is your dad more like Ward Cleaver of TV's "Leave it to Beaver" or Bill Clinton? -- has been overwhelming, especially if you're President Clinton.

Only hours into the polling, the official tally: Ward 497, Bill 1.

The majority of respondents, to our delight, took the opportunity to produce entire passages about their fathers C many touching memorials, others directly to the point.

"My dad may have been a drunk," says Barbara, for example, "but he still beats Clinton by gazillions."

"If my father were like Bill Clinton, my mother would have killed him," notes Bill Rodriques of Decatur, Ill.

"My father was much more like Ward Cleaver, including the time I threw a croquet mallet through the family car windshield," recalls Wil Smith of Glenwood, Md.

"Thankfully, my father resembled Ward Cleaver," writes Rhonda Mohrmann. "Also to my benefit, my brother resembled Wally more than Roger."

"Clinton couldn't take out my father's trash, with apologies to our sanitary engineers," writes Roger Ferguson.

My father "taught me as well as his four other daughters that we could be whatever we worked hard enough to be," says Katharine P. Winterer, "Herman's third daughter," of Folded Key Farm in Weston, Conn.

"Actually, my dad was more like Winston Churchill -- short, fat, irascible, given to bombast and excessive drinking," writes Elliott R. Curzon, who disqualified himself from voting.

As for Bill's lone vote, it isn't all that flattering: "Unfortunately, my father was more like Bill Clinton than Ward Cleaver. For the most part, he still is," says 40-year-old Duncan Hopkins of Portland, Maine.

Finally, Donna, of Phoenix, observes: "Boy, are you behind the times. Besides Ward and Bill, you need to add 'None.'"

"None is what many children have for both a father and a mother these days. I am a baby boomer but I was raised like a [Generation X'er]. My mother married four times before I left home and she worked all the time. Based on personal experience, I have a warning about the coming fatherless generations: Be afraid, be very afraid!"

Playing the Warrior to Flee Angry Women

The Washington Times 8/21/98

Is there anything this guy won't do to save himself? Probably not. Maybe if he hadn't acted, a joint

Afghan-Sudan task force would be steaming into the Chesapeake this morning to launch a pincer movement on the nation's helpless capital.

But who can believe him? Why Afghanistan? Why Khartoum? Why not Port-au-Prince? Surely there's a banana republic in South America that needs bombing. Yes we have no bananas, and there's a threat to the rum for Coca-Cola.

Every man with any experience with an angry woman has at least a little pity for Bill Clinton this morning. We've all known that this was the vacation in hell: Martha's Vineyard is an island that has been glowing white-hot in the dark since the Clintons landed there Tuesday morning. But wasn't there some other way to escape Hillary and her fury?

Sudan and Afghanistan deserve the punishment ordered by the kids from the '60s, desperate to salvage the president's vacation (if not his his presidency). The State Department has been saying since April that Sudan and Afghanistan harbor terrorists. Why wait until August?

The Sudanese government has condoned -- nay, encouraged -- many of the "objectionable activities" of Iran, funneling money, food, medicine and probably arms to radical Islamic terrorists operating in and through the Sudan. Islamic fruitcakes from around the world use Afghan territory as a base from which to spread death and the destruction of innocents, not just American innocents but innocents of Islamic countries.

But why now, just as Monica Lewinsky returns to the U.S. Court House in Washington to parse new lies in the story the president told in his Monday-night address to the nation. It's a good question, and one the president and his men, trying to stoke war fever, do not address. They don't address the question because there's nothing useful they can say.

Some of us have been saying since the day the man from Hot Springs announced that he would attempt to flee Arkansas for the wider stage in Washington that this man would continue to lie about and cheat on and betray anyone and everyone, his family, his friends, and ultimately his country if that became necessary to save himself. Harsh words, and words that subjected some of us to criticism, condemnation, censure and even calumny for refusing to be taken in by soft soap applied by the master applicator.

The order to unleash missiles and put at risk the solemn word of the United States of America, is seen this time as too clever by more than half, the act of a man with his back to the wall, caught between his lubricious lies to two angry women. We can indulge a fleeting impulse of sympathy for any man so cornered, but no patriot can indulge believing him. The land we love is worth more than that.

The bad news for Bill Clinton is that the nation, beginning with the men and women of Capitol Hill (and the pundits and commentators of a thousand newspapers and television studios), is finally getting on to him. The men and women of the 70 percent approval rating are voices of ignorance -- not of lack of intelligence or smarts, but of ignorance born of decency, willingness to offer a sinner an undeserved even break, and above all born of not paying attention.

One of the first questions posed to Bill Cohen, the secretary of defense who is the latest Clinton deputy asked to fall on his sword for the liar-in-chief, was whether he saw the resemblance to the

movie "Wag the Dog," in which a president caught boffing a young woman starts a diversionary war with a small country on the back side of the world. Mr. Cohen could only fall back on boilerplate: "The only motivation driving this action today was our absolute obligation to protect the American people from terrorist activities. ... That is the sole motivation." To their credit, the reporters, 89 percent of whom would have identified themselves as Friends of Bill a month ago, minded their manners and didn't snicker.

A few politicians, privately contemptuous, ran for the nearest camera to make cheap and insincere rah-rah for the lobbing of a few missiles, as if this were the morning after Pearl Harbor or Omaha Beach, to attempt to burnish their bona fides. One who didn't was Arlen Specter, the Republican senator from Pennsylvania, who was careful but honest. "Let's give the president the benefit of the doubt," he said. Then he gave Mr. Clinton the benefit of his doubts.

"I think we have to raise certain concerns and look for evidence because those questions will be raised around the world. They're being raised around the world as we speak."

Yes, they are. Bill Clinton insisted on taking enough rope to hang himself, and yesterday he was in full flight from the gallows.

Who Gets the Last Word Offering Judgment?

The Washington Times 8/21/98

A lot of people who pride themselves on being decent and nonpartisan about sex say they wish they had never heard of Monica Lewinsky. They don't say, however, that the president should have sent the pizza back. That would be expecting the dog to ignore a bone with lots of meat on it. No, they just wish they hadn't heard about Monica.

. . . . This is understandable, but unrealistic. The whole sordid episode goes to the heart of the character of the man who lives in the White House, a man who has sought the satisfaction of instant gratification with the recklessness of a Casanova who somehow or other always got away with it.

. . . . There were close calls, of course.

. . . . Instead of the husband arriving home unexpectedly, he got a few women angry enough to cry about the sheep in wolf's clothing. The president's men saw that the reputations of the women involved with the president were muddied with reliable old stereotypes. Gennifer Flowers was a scheming vamp; Paula Jones was trailer-park trash; Kathleen Willey was a vengeful supplicant.

. . . . That's what Monica Lewinsky must have been afraid of when she saved the stained navy blue dress. The joke that it's the modern equivalent of pressed flowers is funny, but it's more plausible that she wanted to have evidence to fight back with, if fighting back became necessary, as in fact it did.

. . . . Bill Clinton's reckless disregard for the feelings of others has finally put him in jeopardy as the

first "feeler-in-chief," exposing his hypocrisy. He reveals himself to be very selective in deciding whose pain he feels.

. . . . Despite her high ratings in the polls, he has put the first lady's "feelings" in jeopardy, too. Hillary has had to defend her husband and to survive herself by creating fantasies -- a vast right-wing conspiracy, a cabal out to dis Arkansas. When will she apologize? And to whom? She is a passive victim as wronged wife, but an active player as wife of the president.

. . . . Lying, stretching the truth, is, in fact, the hallmark of the First Couple. "In the strange p.c. terms of their culture, the Clintons appear to be 'differently moraled,' " writes witty observer Noemie Emery in the Weekly Standard. "This is the Church of Bill, in the State of Bill, with its own mores and standards."

. . . . But the Bill(s) in this church must be paid. That's what Bill Clinton's appearance before the grand jury was all about. His speech to the American people was about skipping out on the debt. It sounded a lot like a famous explanation of Yogi Berra: "I really didn't say everything I said."

. . . . We may afford the moral relativism of the Clintons when there's peace and plenty, but we want the truth for the history books. What history will show is the pattern of deceit. The sex scandal will not be as important as the questions over the Chinese takeout of the '96 election, the looting of the FBI personnel files, or the abuse of the travel office. But it will be seen as responsible for getting the public's attention.

. . . . The cliché that surrounds this whole sordid business holds that "making false and misleading public statements for the purpose of deceiving the people of the United States" (in the Congressional vocabulary of the bill of particulars against Nixon) when it's about sex isn't as serious as lying about other things. That's arguable, but irrelevant. Yes, we knew when we elected Bill Clinton that he had caused pain in his marriage, but we didn't know that he would retrieve that pain for the rest of us with "improper" sexual adventuring in the Oval Office. No pollster ever asked a voter whether he would vote for a man in the expectation that he would seduce an intern as soon as he got to the White House.

. . . . Historians, not pollsters, will make the final judgment of our 42nd president. It won't be a chapter Americans will read with pride, or even 70 percent approval.

Of Scandals and Presidential Leadership

The Washington Times 8/21/98

It is a clear sign of the depth of trouble besetting Bill Clinton's presidency that the news of Thursday's U.S. bombing of terrorist facilities in Afghanistan and Sudan was greeted with an unusual amount of skepticism. As Sen. Dan Coats asked, rudely but relevantly, "Was the president trying to deflect attention from his personal scandal?" Following Mr. Clinton's performance Monday night, we have now reached a point where the commander in chief is unable to act decisively without provoking suspicions of his motives, not just abroad, but here at home. This is not a good state of affairs.

Sending in cruise missiles in retaliation for the attack on the American embassies in Kenya and

Tanzania two weeks ago was surely an entirely justified response. If Americans and American embassies are under attack, it is the obligation of the government to move swiftly and forcefully to punish the perpetrators. If there is evidence that Saudi millionaire Osama bin Laden, from his base camp in Afghanistan, directed the attacks in East Africa, and if he continues to issue threats against Americans, then he surely is a fit target for punishment. Terrorists of all stripes need to know that there is a price to be paid, and so do countries that provide them with a base. Of course, it remains to be seen exactly how much damage we have done. Apparently Mr. Bin Laden was not killed and the "headquarters" hit with U.S. cruise missiles was probably quite primitive and can be rebuilt.

Still, tuning into CNN Thursday, it was hard to avoid the impression that, if not World War III, then at least something on the scale of Panama or Grenada was going on. The administration put on an extraordinary show. True, after two days with his humiliated wife on Martha's Vineyard, the president looked relieved in the extreme to be back in the role of commander-in-chief. But did we really need the high drama of two briefings from Mr. Clinton, a preliminary briefing at the Vineyard at 2 p.m. and an Oval Office briefing at 5.30 p.m. --which, by the way, lasted for 9 minutes, more than twice as long as the presidential mea sorta culpa on Monday night? The Oval Office speech offered nothing new, only a stirring attack on terrorists the world over. Truth to tell, not many Americans need to be persuaded of their iniquities. Then there were the briefings from the secretary of defense, the Joint Chiefs chairman, the secretary of state, the national security adviser. This has to have been the most thoroughly briefed minor military action in history. Never have so many spoken at such length and said so little. All that, plus the drama of the president departing on Air Force One, landing at Andrews, boarding a Marine helicopter for the White House, getting off at the White House.

May we compare Mr. Clinton's behavior to his reaction when the the two embassies were actually bombed August 7? At the time, he was in Aspen, Colo., fundraising and golfing. He certainly didn't feel a need to break off his trip. Or his reaction when the Capitol Hill shootings took place on July 24. At that time, Mr. Clinton was fundraising in the South. He did agree to shorten his trip by a day to be home for the memorial services. Or think back to the beginning of the NATO bombing campaign against the Serbs in Bosnia in August 1995, the largest bombing campaign of his career -- in fact, the largest bombing campaign in Europe since World War II. Unlike the strike Thursday, that campaign even involved airplanes. With pilots. At the time, Mr. Clinton was vacationing with his family in Jackson Hole, Wyo. He displayed no urgency to return to Washington.

No, that was quite a show Thursday. For all the news coverage of Mr. Clinton, the names Ken Starr and Monica Lewinsky hardly came up. Presumably Mr. Clinton was only too happy to have it that way.

All the President's Evasions

The Washington Times 8/21/98

Over six years ago I wrote a column recalling the celebrated aphorism of Heraclitus, "You never bathe in the same river twice." So for Bill Clinton, I wrote, "You never bathe in the same lie twice."

Mr. Clinton, I continued, was the creator of the "polymorphous lie." Every time you dipped your toe into it, it was different. At present, two presidential victories later -- and after his hearing before the grand jury, followed by a terse, resentful, four-minute speech to the nation --I'm somewhat

disconcerted to find that I'm joined by virtually 100 percent of the American press.

For the good of the country, I'd much rather, sincerely, have been wrong. But as it happens, for all these years now B and it's been sometimes rather lonely -- I've been dead right. I don't frankly know if Bill Clinton carries a lying gene in his DNA, but to put it mildly he's an odd duck. As the country awaited his much-touted "confessional" speech Monday night it expected not unreasonably that he would confess to something, that in his tone he would seek forgiveness. But there was nothing confessional in the speech at all. If there's something genetic in Mr. Clinton it's his inborn conviction that he can talk his way out of anything, that he can out-talk, out-charm, and out-manipulate any adversary, including the draft and perhaps God. As president, he's shifted his ground endlessly, sometimes baffling his friends as well as his adversaries.

But this Monday, in this key speech, he was angry. From his opening sentence, his tone was testy, grudging, obstinate, certainly unrepentant. There was no contrition anywhere. Even Monday, he insisted that his earlier denials under oath about sexual relations with Monica Lewinsky had been "legally accurate" -- by which he seemed to subscribe to a ludicrous definition of "sexual" too squalid to be reproduced here.

Even in his opening sentence he said he was being forced to answer questions "no American citizen would ever want to answer." There wasn't much indication in the speech that before the grand jury he had been argumentative, contentious and obstinate, or that there had been questions he'd simply refused to answer: including perhaps those on conspiracy, obstruction of justice and witness tampering.

In his speech to the nation he confessed -- if that is the word for a man speaking with barely contained anger -- to having a "relationship" with Miss Lewinsky that was "not appropriate." It was "wrong" and he was "solely and completely responsible," he said, reading off a teleprompter. He'd misled people, he said, "even my wife." But, as he's said several time before: "At no time did I ask anyone to lie." This was possibly the most disingenuous statement in his whole four-minute declaration. A criminal coming before a grand jury doesn't ask his crony, "Hey, buddy, will you do me a favor and lie for me?" There are more subtle ways of conveying the idea.

Almost at the midpoint of his "confession," Mr. Clinton suddenly went on the attack, implying that the real villain of the affair is the independent counsel, Kenneth Starr, who had carried out an investigation that had "gone on too long, cost too much, and hurt too many innocent people" -- seeming to forget that the investigation had taken so incredibly long and hurt so many people because he and his staff had stonewalled at every turn. It's time to stop "prying into private lives," he declared indignantly, as if the White House hadn't been doing precisely that. He also clearly implied that the president of the United States engaging in some form of sex play in the Oval Office with a 21-year-old trainee with whom he's supposed to serve in loco parentis is his private business.

"Now it's time to move on!" cried Mr. Clinton toward the end of his speech. And if I were he, I, too, would be eager to move on. "To repair the fabric of our national discourse," he said piously. But is he the one to repair the fabric of our national discourse?

For whatever reason, writes Stanley Renshon in "High Hopes," Bill Clinton "appears to have come to believe the best of himself and either to avoid or discount evidence from his own behavior that all is

not as he believes it to be. He attributes to himself the best and most sincere of motives. His errors, when acknowledged, are the result of basically correct efforts gone temporarily awry, misunderstandings that, if one knew more of what he knew, would disappear."

Now this is the description of a man with a strong psychopathic streak, a man some would call delusional. Monica Lewinsky, however, is not delusional. She was doubtless filled with girlish dreams and was very foolish indeed if she believed Bill Clinton when he promised her -- as she says he did -- that they had formed a durable relationship that would outlast his mere presidency.

Miss Lewinsky is now absolutely outraged that Mr. Clinton should have dismissed his relationship with her to all the world as "not appropriate" and "wrong." She testified once again yesterday on this affair before the grand jury and, as Congreve wrote, "Hell hath no fury like that of a woman scorned."

Meanwhile, opinion polls favoring the president are teetering on collapse: Do you have a favorable impression of the President? No: 57 percent. Do you think he's honest and trustworthy? No: 73 percent. Do you think he obstructed justice? Yes: 58 percent. Do you think he should resign? Here those favoring resignation jumped from a mere 28 percent immediately after the speech to 36 percent Wednesday morning.

The Speech: Beginning of the End . . .

The Washington Times 8/21/98

The speech was a disaster. On substance, the president's remarks on the Lewinsky affair were entirely unilluminating -- and inevitably, the conclusion one draws from that fact is that Mr. Clinton is simply unable to offer an explanation for fear of the consequences. Concerns about privacy take on a certain urgency when you have so much to hide.

The most important phrase in the speech was "legally accurate," the president's description of his deposition testimony in the Paula Jones case. On this line, Mr. Clinton makes his stand. His highest aspiration is now that future generations will say of him, "When Bill Clinton swore to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, his testimony was legally accurate, by gosh."

Success even at this level is by no means assured. It is a mark of the desperation of the president's current plight that he and his lawyers have been and will be working night and day contorting, teasing and worrying the words of his deposition testimony in pursuit of that two-word seal of approval, "legally accurate."

It's almost as if this president --the man who ended welfare as we know it, balanced the budget, worked for peace worldwide and was the first of his party to win re-election since FDR -- has downgraded his dreams of a legacy once again. Never mind Mount Rushmore. Monday marked the passage from "survived politically for two full terms" to "wasn't indicted." "Legally accurate" is another way of saying "not guilty," and Mr. Clinton has clutched the term to his bosom like a life belt.

In style, the president was uncontrite and combative. For days, virtually all of political Washington was pointing the way to salvation: Come clean and apologize. That would completely deflate the

independent counsel investigation. (So, Mr. Starr, in testimony that was ruled out of bounds in a case that was thrown out of court, the president told a lie about sex, which he has admitted to and apologized to the American people for B and you're still investigating?)

Mr. Clinton would eat crow and be forgiven. Historians would not be kind, but we would all, as they say, move on.

Nope. He threw the whole thing back at us, defiant in his insistence that this is no affair of ours, sharp in the attack on the investigator who insists it is, and at the end of the speech, brazen in the demand that we shut up about it.

This was breathtakingly misguided. True, since the Monica Lewinsky story broke, the president has enjoyed high job approval ratings. But swimming below that question in the polls like so many sharks have been survey questions revealing a great deal of public distrust of Bill Clinton. The president has not exactly been admired for his character, honesty and integrity. On the contrary.

He has benefited, however, from the fact that a substantial number of people don't like this whole sordid story one bit and want it to go away. Sex with an intern? A dress with a stain? Get the kids out of the room.

In short, many Americans have chosen to exercise their God-given right not to pass judgment if they don't want to. Didn't we just have an election?

The president did not encourage them in this tendency by going on national television and admitting, sort of, to lying to them for seven months and blaming them for talking about it. Unsatisfied now with Americans' indifference to his appetites, Mr. Clinton has demanded a declaration of indifference to his appetites. That's a lot to ask.

One day, historians will offer rich accounts of all the backstage maneuvering at the White House that led to this disastrous day and this disastrous speech. That's because Monday, August 17, 1998 will be remembered as the day President Clinton lost his last chance to save his tattered presidency.

The Straight Scoop on Faith and Morals

The Washington Times 6/19/98

You've got to give Father McCurry credit for contending for the faith, whatever his is.

The Right Rev. Michael McCurry, the president's press agent, is St. Stephen reincarnated, taking no guff from anyone in matters of faith and immorals. He would cheerfully take a stoning on behalf of Bill Clinton (and on some days, does).

He put Cardinal O'Connor in his place on the subject of Holy Communion, as the pope misunderstands it, and now he's told every major religious denomination in America where to get off on whether the practice of homosexuality is a sin.

As the presiding prelate of the Church of What's Happening Now, Father McCurry is not only a Bible scholar, but an authority on psychiatric medicine, too. He'll pull out a psychiatric definition of good mental health faster than you can say Prozac.

The pope and his priests, as well as the leaders of the Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, Orthodox Jews, Pentecostals, Three Seed-in-the-Spirit Rapsclions and even some Episcopalians, believe and teach that the practice of homosexuality is a sin, however quaint the notion of sin may be in our own enlightened age. But who are they to stand up to the Official U.S. Theologian, whom President Clinton now regards as of at least Cabinet rank.

Father McCurry has efficiently adjusted the president's beliefs on the subject of homosexuality and sin. When he was a mere governor, and a high-decibel singer of hymns at the Immanuel Baptist Church in Little Rock, Mr. Clinton cheerfully accepted the Baptist teaching that sexual congress outside of marriage is a sin. (He put an asterisk beside oral sex while waiting for a waiver from his pastor, which is yet to come.)

Father McCurry straightened him out once he left Little Rock, as he tried to do the other day for Sen. Trent Lott, the majority leader who, in a welcome homily to conservatives about the responsibility of Christians to knock off the derision and treat homosexuals with sympathy and compassion, observed that, true to the teaching in his Baptist church in Mississippi, the practice of homosexual sin is, well, a sin.

This provoked this reproof from Father McCurry, presumably speaking *ex cathedra*:

"This is a case in which, contrary to fact, contrary to statements of the medical community and those who are expert, the majority leader has taken an incorrect view that homosexuality is a disease. For over 25 years, it's been quite clear that sexual orientation is not an affliction, it is not a disease, it is something that is a part of defining one's sexuality."

So there. If the American Psychiatric Association takes a vote of its member shrinks and they say it's no longer a disease, how can a pope argue with that? Father McCurry puts the question in modern perspective: Who are you going to believe in matters spiritual, your neighborhood witch doctor, or God? (Since it's now possible to determine what's a disease and what's not by taking a vote, next year we should ask the American Medical Association to vote cancer -- breast, prostate, belly and all --out of existence.)

John Cardinal O'Connor is no doubt still puzzled by Father McCurry's ruling on who is entitled to partake of Holy Communion at a Roman Catholic altar, and who is not. When Baptist Bill wanted to be seen taking Communion in Africa, and the cardinal objected, Father McCurry lectured him sternly in the correct interpretation of Roman doctrine.

Rep. Dick Armey of Texas, the majority leader in the House, tried to come to the rescue of Mr. Lott, offering several verses from the Bible.

"The Bible is very clear on this," Mr. Armev told reporters questioning him about Mr. Lott's remarks. He cited I Corinthians 6:9-11, and verses 18 and 20. "I do abide by the Bible."

Father McCurry trumped the Bible with his catechism from the American Psychiatric Association. You can't find a higher authority than that.

No one uses the trappings of religion as cleverly as Bill Clinton. Most pols and other charlatans who find religious belief, and religious believers, inconvenient merely try to ignore the heartfelt convictions of the true believers. Mr. Clinton, on the other hand, rewrites Scripture to make it fit the argument of the moment, and Father McCurry goes a step further, instructing the prelates of other denominations about what their doctrines are -- or should be.

David Smith, spokesman for the Human Rights Campaign, the largest homosexual-rights lobby, puts the White House poop in straight language. "Nobody is saying that Mr. Lott or Mr. Armev should not be able to hold those beliefs," he says. "The problem is when those beliefs start infringing on public policy."

Religion is OK, as long as no one takes that stuff seriously. That's how Bill Clinton deals with it. You could ask Father McCurry.

Seems Like Old Times Down in Arkansas

The Washington Times 7/20/98

The more things change, the more they stay the same.

You can take the boy out of Hot Springs, but you probably can't take Hot Springs out of the boy president.

Nobody paid much attention to Bill Clinton's private life when he was the governor of Arkansas. Those who knew him well thought it was too sordid to examine, and he was only the governor, after all. By one reckoning he was sleeping with half of the reporters assigned to cover the governor's office, or trying to, so a lot of people in Arkansas never learned who he was.

Mr. Clinton seems to think he's the governor of the United States, with all the perks pertaining thereunto -- this is the source of his continuing headache -- but to most of the rest of us he's the president of the United States, and some of us even expect him to show a little regard for the dignity if not the majesty of his office.

Through the offices of the weary and increasingly fractious Mike McCurry, who like it or not has inherited Betsey Wright's Ministry of Bimbo Eruptions, the White House affects a fine outrage at the suggestion that the president has assigned pimp duties to his bodyguards.

Tim Russert of NBC raised the possibility of such pimp duty, which the White House rightly calculates, given the president's reputation, will be regarded by the public not as possibility, but

probability.

"There are lots of suggestions coming out of people close to Ken Starr that perhaps the Secret Service facilitated for President Clinton," Mr. Russert reported. "Remember that code word, it was used about the state troopers in Little Rock."

Indeed it was, and the troopers in Arkansas grew tired of "facilitation" duty, and eventually squealed. The possibility that Secret Service facilitators will squeal to the U.S. grand jury terrifies certain parties. The frantic White House effort to quash the Secret Service subpoenas is unprecedented, made all the

more curious by the fact that this is not a question of national security the White House is trying to quash, but questions about what stains are on the Oval Office rug, and who put them there, and when, and how. The Starr investigation, which once looked somber and tragic, now looks like the third act of

"What the Butler Saw."

"If in fact Ken Starr is trying to find information that can in fact conflict with President Clinton's sworn testimony that he did not have sexual relations with Monica Lewinsky, he is going for it," said Mr. Russert. "Was a Secret Service agent an accomplice in trying to cover up a relationship with Monica Lewinsky?"

"Members of Congress have been talking to investigators, people, lawyers associated with the grand jury, people who are free to talk, and they are coming to some conclusions that perhaps Secret Service agents may have been, quote, facilitating. We don't know whether that's Republican spin, partisan spin, ideological spin, or there's a germ of evidence. Ken Starr is determined to find out, and it has caused deep concern at the White House."

This set off a McCurry soliloquy, with the press-room padre employing words rarely used from a pulpit, like "venomous" and "slime," defending the honor of his boss (the soliloquy was punctuated from time to time by snickers from the reporters) and the Secret Service men who, like Fearless Fossdick, are trained in the arts of pleasing the boss.

Mr. Russert was asked yesterday whether he wanted to withdraw or amend his remarks in the wake of Mike's attempt to deliver a little revival-like fire and brimstone. "Not a chance," he replied. "It's easy to try shoot the messenger. And Mike McCurry is good at his job, seeking political advantage on any day possible."

President Clinton continues to govern exactly as he governed Arkansas. Dick Morris, who knows the president better than most, observes how the Clinton men threatened Linda Tripp in the way they threatened David Hale, the original Whitewater bag man whose testimony convicted Jim Guy Tucker and the McDougals. Just before that trial began, the county district attorney, a longtime Clinton sycophant named Mark Stodola (and a onetime debtor of the McDougal bank), filed an obscure criminal charge against David Hale, accusing him of filling out an insurance form incorrectly. "That indictment achieved its goal," says Dick Morris. "The jury pool in the Tucker-McDougal [trial] heard loud and clear the intended message: Hale is a liar who cannot be believed."

Only Bill Clinton knows what his bodyguard could have seen or heard; the rest of us are entitled to assume that whatever it was, it was smarmy. The past, the man said, is prologue, and Bill Clinton is teaching a credulous nation what every Southerner understands from birth, that the past is not dead, it is not even past.

Liberal Media

On Wednesday's Today Geraldo Rivera displayed the kind of "open-minded" view that earned him the only interview Mike McCurry allowed with Clinton during the China trip. On the July 29 show the new member of the NBC News team was paired with Laura Ingraham. Here's the ending exchange caught by MRC news analyst Geoffrey Dickens:

Katie Couric: "Let me ask you this question Laura. If Monica Lewinsky wrote the talking points herself the White House is reportedly, according to the New York Times, quite jubilant about this latest development because it blows a hole in Ken Starr's theory that this was a case of obstruction of justice."

Geraldo Rivera: "Amen!"

Couric: "If Monica Lewinsky wrote the talking points herself is this a case of obstruction of justice?"

Laura Ingraham: "Well it's certainly not on that point Katie. You are absolutely right. If she wrote the talking points, maybe with the help of her mother or maybe her mother's friend, then of course that piece of evidence will not link the White House to obstruction. But apparently what we read in the New York Times today there are other suggestions of 'we don't have to tell the full truth, you can tell prosecutors that Betty Currie was the person you were visiting not me, Monica.' Now that seems like a pretty clear suggestion to lie."

Rivera: "But my God Laura! As a lawyer where was the, the talking points were the banner that the right wing ran up the hill and said, 'Bruce Lindsey suborned perjury, he's the one, the talking points are going to bring down this President.' And now suddenly the talking points are history. Just like Whitewater, just like Travelgate, just like Filegate. It's going to turn out that this President is the most maligned and assailed man in the history of the Executive Office and we'll all be deeply ashamed."

Ingraham: "Have you been talking to Sid Blumenthal again today?"

Couric: "And that will have to be the last word. I'm getting better at cracking the whip with you two."

Rivera: "Oh, I love a strong woman."

Sounds like just the man for Hillary.

No wonder the White House loves Rivera, a fact illustrated by Mary Murphy in "China Chronicle," a day by day look in the August 1-7 TV Guide at how the networks covered Clinton's China trip. Here's one of her entries for June 30:

"8 P.M., Geraldo Rivera's Suite. Rivera is beaming. 'I've been to see the boss,' says Rivera, referring to Clinton. 'McCurry took me up to the 45th floor to an alcove outside the President's bedroom. He came out. He told me he's just gotten a message from the Dalai Lama and that the Dalai Lama was ecstatic that progress had been made.' Rivera was not permitted to bring a cameraman with him upstairs, but his informal audience is nonetheless an obvious mark of favor. I ask McCurry why Rivera -- and not [CBS reporter Scott] Pelley -- got the interview. 'Because Geraldo was arguably the biggest network name on the trip,' he says. 'Besides, when it comes to scandal stuff, Geraldo has been as open-minded as you

would want a journalist to be. We notice things like that. So we felt a little private time with Clinton was not inappropriate."

And it has paid off then and since. On Today back in June he offered a glowing account of his Clinton encounter and relayed the "joke" he told about Bill Clinton: "I was thinking if they give him any more airtime he's going to have to register as a pro-democracy dissident." For more on Rivera's "reporting" that day,

Geraldo's Line

The Washington Times 6/30/98

NBC talking head Geraldo Rivera, traveling with the president in China, makes no effort to hide his political views, which pretty well parrot the White House line when it comes to the Monica Lewinsky sex-and-lies scandal.

Brent Baker of the Media Research Center reports this exchange Friday between Mr. Rivera and John Hockenberry, who was filling in on CNBC's "Rivera Live."

Mr. Hockenberry: "If, as you say, the Linda Tripp testimony leads to a Monica indictment it will be the ultimate betrayal of Monica."

Mr. Rivera: "And I think that's what Linda Tripp was aiming for along with her mentor, Lucianne Goldberg, the book agent. They wanted to make money on a book, but once push came to shove they were perfectly willing to sacrifice the young former White House intern on the altar of greed, on the altar of hatred for Bill Clinton and his administration, and I think they're going to accomplish that at least in the short term. But if it comes to trial, Linda Tripp will be facing some severe questioning by Monica Lewinsky's very capable counsel. And, my God, a first-year law student hearing those tapes will be able to make her look like exactly what she is, a treacherous, back-stabbing, good-for-nothing enemy of the truth."

Glorified High School

The Washington Times 7/1/98

Linda Bloodworth-Thomason, the Hollywood producer (and wife of Harry Thomason) who is a close friend of Bill and Hillary Clinton, says Washington is just jealous of the first couple.

"Washington reminds me of a glorified high school, and the president and the first lady are the new kids who transferred from some hick high school in Arkansas and have the audacity to be brilliant, self-assured, and good-looking. This does not please the mean and horsey head cheerleader, Sally Quinn,"

Mrs. Bloodworth-Thomason tells the New Yorker's Jeffrey Tobin.

OTHER

Newspaper Editors Voted for Clinton

Editors Realize Liberal Slant
MediaWatch February 1998

.....Asked how they think the public perceives newspapers, 89 percent said "liberal" compared to a measly 1.2 percent who responded "conservative." Another 4.3 percent said moderate. Many editors were willing to concede the slant, with more than three times as many describing American dailies as liberal over conservative: 25.1 percent to 7.8 percent with 62.9 percent tagging papers as moderate.

The E&P poll of editors completes a trilogy of recent surveys documenting liberal views throughout the newspaper reporting process: A Freedom Forum poll released in 1996 of Washington bureau chiefs and congressional correspondents determined that **89 percent voted for Clinton in 1992**. Just 15 percent of staff reporters at papers across the country identified themselves as conservative in a poll issued last year. The survey by the American Society of Newspaper Editors showed that 61 percent of their newsroom staffs considered themselves liberal.

GOP Skeletons

The Washington Times 8/16/98

Pat Robertson says he has to believe that possible "skeletons in the closets" of some congressional Republicans could explain why they've treated President Clinton with "kid gloves" in the Monica Lewinsky scandal.

"I don't know what skeletons are in the closet, but ... I imagine there are some. And they don't want to get into that kind of a nasty struggle," the founder of the Christian Coalition said Saturday on CNN's "Evans, Novak, Hunt & Shields."

Mr. Robertson, who described Mr. Clinton as a "liar" and "serial philanderer" in the CNN interview, was asked about threats purportedly being made by unnamed Democrats to expose "sexual improprieties" or other character flaws of GOP House leaders, should Republicans elect to conduct impeachment hearings against the president.

The threats were detailed in a report recently on the Internet by Salon magazine.

Such retaliation is "not fair ... that's not the way you're supposed to play it," Mr. Robertson said, adding:

"But there's some thought that those FBI files were taken for a purpose. And who knows how much raw data has been accumulated on the private lives of individuals?"

On NBC's "Meet the Press," Rep. Barney Frank, Massachusetts Democrat and a member of the Judiciary Committee, said he believes the report in Salon was "unfounded."

Urban Cowboy

The Washington Times 7/8/98

Finally, subscriber B.A. Rucker observed this week: "President Clinton said today that he admired and was influenced by the values of Roy Rogers. I wonder which values he meant? "Honesty? "Bravery? "Ability to shoot straight? "Standing up for what's right? "Marital fidelity?" Horse manure?"

Ad Campaign

The Washington Times 7/14/98

Conservative Christian groups took out a full-page ad yesterday in the New York Times that said homosexuals could change by accepting God.

The Christian Coalition, Concerned Women for America and the Family Research Council took out the Times' ad. It is to be followed by similar displays in The Washington Post and USA Today later this week, Reuters news agency reports.

The advertisement features the testimony of Anne Paulk, a self-described "wife, mother and former lesbian," who says she was able to change her identity through a commitment to Christ.

"Leaving homosexuality was the hardest thing I've ever had to do," Mrs. Paulk says in the advertisement.

"As I grew in my relationship with God, I knew He had changed me forever. Gone was the hardness. Gone was the hurt. And gone was the shrill cry inside, replaced by God's still, small voice," the advertisement quotes her as saying.

Tracey Canaty of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force angrily denounced the ad as a "perversion," Reuters said.

A little violin music

for the Secret Service

What's really bugging the Secret Service is that the agents are accustomed to pushing people around, and they thought they could push a few federal judges around, too.

It didn't happen. Judge Laurence Silberman, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and finally Chief Justice William Rehnquist handed them their heads and that part of the anatomy they sit down on.

We haven't heard such bawling and mewling over a judicial decision since the Supreme Court ordered the desegregation of the public schools four decades ago.

Secret Service bodyguards are brave, courageous and probably true. We can, as the lawyers say, cheerfully stipulate that. But they are bodyguards, after all, not men who won the Medal of Honor at Guadalcanal, Omaha Beach or in a flaming

bunker at Pleiku. They're not necessarily hired for their brains, but for their willingness most of all to hold another man's life in higher regard than their own, and they're certainly not hired to debate and determine public policy.

Like all bodyguards -- indeed, like everyone else on the planet -- Secret Service agents are always on the scout for ways to make their jobs easier. They closed Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House for the first time in 200 years, taking their cues from the agents who protect Kim Jong-il behind his fortified palace in Pyongyang, and they took the precaution of flattering any congressmen who might object by closing a few streets near the Capitol, making them feel important, too.

The president's bodyguards, unlike the Dear Leader's agents in North Korea, are not empowered to shoot anyone who looks suspicious. (Not yet. Getting protective privilege comes first.) But the president's Secret Service bodyguards occasionally rough up innocent spectators, and occasionally arrest citizens who have the brass to exercise their right to tell the president what a jerk they think he is. Dolly Kyle Browning, one of the several Arkansas women who have been identified as Bill Clinton's mistresses, ran afoul of a bodyguard's ire at the president's high-school class reunion last year in Hot Springs. She was exercising a woman's right to ignore the attentions of an old beau, and when the president persisted she referred to him with a term not necessarily of endearment. The president, to his credit as a Southern gent, waved a bodyguard away just as he was about to wreck the lady's smile. We all remember the Chicago couple who, on being greeted by the president, told him what they thought of him, and, like Mrs. Browning, made no threat to the president's person. The bodyguards arrested them, anyway, and subjected them to a KGB-like interrogation.

It's only right to cut the bodyguards a little slack. We have a history of assassinating 9.3 percent of our presidents. John F. Kennedy was No. 4. Indeed, the Kennedy assassination was not the finest hour for the Secret Service, with tales of how several of JFK's bodyguards spent the evening before he died working on hangovers in Dallas honky-tonks. Every bodyguard, whether for a movie star, a Mafia don or a president of the United States, is always wary, nervous and even a little bit frightened.

But by all accounts, Kenneth Starr doesn't want to talk to the bodyguards about presidential foreplay, merely to ask questions about what they saw at certain times on specific dates, to corroborate testimony already taken from other more-willing witnesses.

The lawyers for the bodyguards and retired agents have been running from talk show to talk show, to go on and on about what "professionals" the agents are and how presidents will be bumped off right and left if the agents have to obey the law like everyone else. When someone suggested to one of their lawyers that the agents should testify precisely because as professionals they're trained to be attentive and observant to felonies around them, their lawyers retreated to the unkind defense that no, no, they're just dumb cops with myopia.

"If Gorbachev is meeting with the president," he said, "we'd all be interested, but the uniformed division officers are specifically trained ... to not be attentive to what's going on." Retorted Jonathan Turley, an observant law professor at George Washington University: "I would hope if Gorbachev came out of the Oval Office with tossed hair and smeared makeup, they would notice it."

As citizens these professionals have a duty like the rest of us to obey the courts, and as agents of the government they have an obligation to shut up and find ways to do their jobs. A bodyguard's lot is not always a happy one, but nobody's interested in how difficult those jobs may be. Volkswagen mechanics and hairdressers have tough jobs, too. Nobody gets free coffee and doughnuts.

DRAFT DODGING

Luck and calculated risk
USA Today 8/16/98

It wasn't long after the Flowers episode that another allegation cropped up: that as a young man Clinton had dodged the draft.

In *First in his Class*, biographer David Maraniss notes that Clinton described his escape from the draft as a "fluke." But his own words at the time show that as a graduate student at Oxford University in 1969, he was determined to avoid serving in Vietnam yet preserve his dreams of holding political office.

He came up with a middle-ground solution so he could escape the draft without becoming a resister: After receiving an induction notice in 1969, he signed up for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps at the University of Arkansas Law School, which won him a deferment.

Clinton then gave up the deferment in a now-famous letter to the university's ROTC director in which he said he had agonized over how to "maintain my political viability."

By then, Maraniss reports, it was clear to Clinton that the Selective Service was cutting back on draft calls. It was a calculated risk that worked.

"But of course it was not a fluke," Maraniss writes. "He fretted and planned every move . . . and he was ultimately lucky."

The story of his deferment, the letter and his escape from service was difficult for the public and reporters to sort out. Months later, in an interview with talk radio host Don Imus, Clinton insisted that he never tried to "mislead" anyone when he offered conflicting stories about what had happened.

He said he had given "lots of answers off the top of my head" and acknowledged, "I could have handled it a lot better."

Allies warn Clinton against double talk
The Washington Times 8/16/98

Lawmakers and former aides to President Clinton say a legal strategy in which he admits having sex with Monica Lewinsky but insists he did not perjure himself in an earlier sworn denial will not fly.

Rep. Barney Frank, Massachusetts Democrat and a staunch Clinton supporter, said yesterday on NBC's "Meet the Press" he believes that an acknowledgement of oral sex or other sexual contact with Miss Lewinsky by Mr. Clinton would mean the president lied in his Jan. 17 deposition in the Paula Jones case.

"Oh, yes, I do believe he has [lied] ... if he says that he had sex with her, yeah, I am one who believes that sexual contact of that sort is sex," said Mr. Frank, a member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Sen. Orrin G. Hatch, Utah Republican and chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, agreed.

Interviewed on NBC, Mr. Hatch said, "President Clinton does have a reputation as a kind of a serial legal manipulator of legal terms, and if he goes in there and tries to manipulate the terms and use lawyerlike language to try ... and not tell the full truth, I think it's going to hurt him."

The GOP senator said Mr. Clinton "would be laughed out of the country" if he tries to tell a federal

-- Continued from Front Page --
grand jury today that the definition of sexual relations used by

lawyers for Mrs. Jones when he gave his deposition in that sexual misconduct case "excluded" the kind of sexual activity he purportedly engaged in with Miss Lewinsky.

Mr. Clinton's scheduled testimony today before a grand jury probing the Clinton/Lewinsky sex-and-lies scandal was the only topic discussed on Sunday network news talk shows. Much attention was focused on news reports indicating Mr. Clinton will change his story and acknowledge having "inappropriate" or "improper" activity of a sexual nature with the former White House intern.

An article in yesterday's editions of The Washington Post quoted an unnamed source close to the president and his legal team as saying Mr. Clinton will admit to "sex play" with Miss Lewinsky but would deny committing perjury when he swore under oath in the Paula Jones sexual misconduct lawsuit that he had not had sexual relations with Miss Lewinsky.

According to The Post, Mr. Clinton would argue that he did not view receiving oral sex from Miss Lewinsky -- as opposed to giving oral sex -- as an "affair" or a "sexual relationship," when he said in his deposition in January that he did not have a sexual relationship with her.

"In this formulation that his lawyers have floated, they would suggest that the president had specific knowledge that he received oral sex but didn't perform it," George Stephanopoulos, a former senior Clinton adviser, said on ABC's "This Week."

But Mr. Stephanopoulos noted that this explanation would not help the president explain away testimony he gave in the same deposition in which he said "he had no specific recollection of ever meeting Monica Lewinsky" alone.

Said Mr. Stephanopoulos: "So in that case, you are caught. There's no good answer. That's why he can't do the halfway measure."

On NBC's "Meet the Press," former White House Counsel Lanny Davis said he does not believe the president should claim that he had a different definition for sexual relations when he gave his deposition. "I don't ... if he makes the judgment that he wants this story behind him, then he's got to be absolutely candid in every detail."

David Pyke, an attorney for Paula Jones and a participant in Mr. Clinton's deposition earlier this year, was asked on CNN's "Late Edition" why the president wasn't specifically asked if he had engaged in oral sex. "We wanted to maintain some level of decorum," he said, adding: "To say that's not sexual relations is not credible."

Were Mr. Clinton to contend that the recipient of oral sex is not engaging in a sexual relationship, he would be at odds with at least four of his top advisers who have stated publicly that sex is

sex. Videotapes of the statements of the four -- Ann Lewis, James Carville, Rahm Emanuel and Paul Begala -- were replayed yesterday on "Meet the Press."

"We've got to get beyond playing word games. People know what constitutes sexual relations," Rep. Charles T. Canady, Florida Republican and member of the House Judiciary panel, said on CNN.

Former White House Chief of Staff Leon E. Panetta, interviewed on NBC, recalled that Mr. Clinton made a "pretty unequivocal statement" during a televised Jan. 26 appearance when he said, "I want to say one thing to the American people. ... I did not have sexual relations with that woman, Miss Lewinsky. ... Not a single time. Never."

If he changes his story, Mr. Panetta said, "He's got to say it in a very clear, direct and unequivocal manner."

On ABC, Sen. Robert G. Torricelli, New Jersey Democrat and a member of the Senate Judiciary panel, who has said for months he believed the president's denials about having sex with Miss Lewinsky, now says it was "not right" if Mr. Clinton did have sexual contact with her. But this by itself is not an impeachable offense, he said.

"If there is a contradiction, and it appears there might be, he has to explain it. But I think he can."

Anita Hill, whose 1991 accusations of sexual harassment by her former boss, Clarence Thomas, jeopardized his nomination as a Supreme Court justice, offered this advice to Mr. Clinton yesterday on CNN's "Late Edition":

"What I want to hear from him is the truth. But I don't think we want all the details. We don't want to know everything."

Patricia Ireland, who also appeared on that show, said that if Mr. Clinton had consensual sex with a young intern, it "may be inappropriate; it is certainly not impeachable.

"I think if Congress is going to take any action, the only people who should be allowed to vote are the ones who have never lied about their sex lives either," Mrs. Ireland, president of the National Organization for Women, said.

Miss Hill said "if there was a sexual relationship" between Mr. Clinton and Miss Lewinsky, "it appears that it was a consensual one." If that was the case, she said, this did not constitute sexual harassment since sexual harassment has to be "unwanted."

Editorials

Run, Hillary, Run

The first lady should run for the Senate, so she can be asked the ethical questions she's so far evaded.
By Christopher Hitchens

July 12, 1999 | In her terrible book "It Takes a Village," Hillary Clinton gave us an intimate glimpse of the political and decision-making process as it played out chez Clinton in the crucial gubernatorial year of 1986. It was beginning to look like a tough race, and the question became, How to break it to Miss Chelsea?

One night at the dinner table, I told her: "You know, Daddy is going to run for governor again. If he wins, we would keep living in this house, and he would keep trying to help people. But first we have to have an election.

Skipping lightly over the remainder of that nauseating passage (Hillary Clinton proposed a "role-playing" dinner-table game in which her 6-year-old daughter had to play Gov. Clinton, and then sit and listen to hypothetical abuse of the candidate, until she cried, which she repeatedly did) one notes that the "priorities" and "agenda" haven't altered all that much. First one has to have a house, and then one has to have an election. In between, Daddy B most ably seconded by Mummy -- makes like he wants to help people.

In almost two decades of unstinting service to the Nation magazine, I have never quite penetrated to the pulsing quick and core of New York liberalism. I understand dimly that Hillary Clinton must have somewhere to live. I also quite see that she must have something to do, and somewhere to sit. I haven't yet had it convincingly explained to me why this is all up to us, and why a nomination to the United States Senate is not just hers for the asking, but hers even without the asking.

Over the Independence Day weekend, I couldn't open a newspaper without being prompted again to wonder if I had missed something. The July 3 New York Times advised me solemnly of the predicament of the soon-to-be homeless Clinton, as it appeared from the vantage of Westchester County:

The \$3.8 million North Salem house that Mrs. Clinton likes is owned by James Kohlberg, of Kohlberg & Company, an investment firm he started with his father, Jerome Kohlberg, a founder of the leveraged buyout firm Kohlberg Kravis Roberts & Company. Jerome Kohlberg is also a Democratic contributor.

Then on July 4, Parade magazine brought me a carefully posed cover story, in garish color, about the first lady's current squat. Pegged to the bicentennial of the White House, and ostensibly written by Hillary herself, it was pitched with an affecting folksiness. ("I almost fell off of my chair ... On my birthday in 1995, I came down the formal staircase to find the entry hall transformed into a 1950s-style living room -- replete with plastic-covered divans and rabbit ears on top of a big old TV!")

But the grand historical note has also to be struck, even in these pulp pieces: "No one can enter the Lincoln Bedroom without thinking of President Lincoln drafting the Emancipation Proclamation. Or walk into the Map Room without picturing FDR commanding our forces during World War II ... The president and I know that we are only short-term tenants."

RUN, HILLARY, RUN | PAGE 1, 2

Again, one catches that thin, high note of accommodation anxiety. Of course, when the president and Mrs. Clinton were asked who they had had to stay overnight in the Lincoln bedroom, the humble "tenants" replied that it was nobody's business but their own. It took the Center for Public Integrity several months of intrusive questioning to establish that almost 80 high-tab donors had been entertained there, for as much as \$400,000 a night. (It was, however, stipulated that unmarried contributors could not sleep together. Excuse me, but there are still some standards.)

The map room and the Roosevelt room were used, "privately" to be sure, to receive John Huang and Roger Tamraz and other cats, who saw the president rather more often than his own Cabinet did. (He convened two Cabinet meetings last year, both of them devoted to his own self-pitying explanation of the Lewinsky affair.)

Also in the map room, he had his blood drawn for the DNA match that showed him a liar. Hillary Clinton does not say what emotions overwhelm the visitor to the Oval Office, scene of so many special moments between the president and Monica Lewinsky, but Parade magazine makes up for this reticence by printing a photograph of the president himself in this hallowed room. He is shown embracing his daughter.

So let me see if I have this right. The Kohlberg family is looking for an impeccable tenant, and may lower the rent for a distinguished customer, while Clinton is soliciting a bargain from the family firm that brought us "Barbarians at the Gate" and the buyout of R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. Was it for this that she banned, or fondly imagined she had banned, all smoking materials from the White House?

I leave to one side the much-hyped question of the first lady using military airplanes and reimbursing the taxpayer at a phony rate: After the travel office scandal and the rip-offs cited above one must not strain at swallowing a gnat or two. I think that I hope she

runs. I want to ask her several questions, and her backers one question.

To her: Was it not your idea to bring back Dick Morris and employ him in the White House under a code name? Was it not your idea to put health care into the hands of the HMOs? Do you still maintain that people dislike you because you are "from" Arkansas? Did you watch the NBC interview with Juanita Broaddrick? Did your daughter watch it? What did you think? (And don't dare, after what you have allowed, to accuse anyone of "dragging" Chelsea into anything.) How come the Chinese government made out a check, through an intermediary, to your chief of staff? Are you still in favor of sexual abstinence for teenagers? What did you mean when you told Larry King that "there is no left in the Clinton White House?" Have you recently reviewed the client list of Harold Ickes?

Oh, and the question to her New York backers? Why haven't you asked these questions? Well, I mean to say, after all she's done for us ... This is the servility of mind -- from the applause for privately financed housing to the indulgence of publicly financed Air Force jets -- that characterizes the banana republic. By the debased standards of today's New York liberalism, then, Hillary is, in both senses, home-free.

salon.com | July 12, 1999

On presidential lying

The Washington Times January 25, 1999

Eight senators yesterday were shown a tape of President Clinton's famous finger-wagging denial of an affair with Monica Lewinsky -- "But I want to say one thing to the American people. I want you to listen to me. I'm going to say this again. I did not have sexual relations with that woman, Ms. Lewinsky."

The senators -- four Democrats and four Republicans -- were then asked for their reaction.

The following is an edited transcript of the responses on NBC's "Meet the Press," hosted by Tim Russert.

Mr. Russert: Senator Hollings?

Sen. Ernest F. Hollings, South Carolina Democrat:
Nobody believed him then. Nobody believed him then. The country's found him guilty. They know. He didn't come into the presidency under good behavior, he came into the presidency under misbehavior.

Mr. Russert: But he said to the country, "I want you to listen to me." It was rehearsed, it was calculated --

Mr. Hollings: That's right.

Mr. Russert: -- an attempt to deceive. Is that --

Mr. Hollings: That's bad. That's terrible. But I don't think it caused deep harm to the country, and you can look at the occurrences over the past year. The country's together, the economy's doing good, the country's all pulling together and everything else.

We're the ones that are causing the trouble, and what we're doing is misusing the impeachment clause. ...

Mr. Russert: Patty Murray, on the comment the president made on Jan. 26, the use of the phrase "that woman," a kind of pejorative term. Did that trouble you?

Sen. Patty Murray, Washington Democrat: It did. And that statement caused a lot of hurt and anger and disappointment in the president's personal behavior and from all of us who respected him from that point.

But separating respect for his personal behavior and respect for his judgment on how to run this country, on our education policy, on our economy, are two separate things. And I think that he still has the trust on that, but he's lost it on the personal side.

Mr. Russert: Olympia Snowe?

Sen. Olympia J. Snowe, Maine Republican: Well, I'm concerned, and I think we were all upset, by the fact that the president deliberately lied to the American people, because what it did was undermine the office of the presidency. It did represent a serious breach of trust, and I think we're all going to have to pay the price in some way, collectively, over the years ahead to rebuild the confidence not only in the office of the presidency but in our governmental institutions, because people, having watched the president of the United States directly lie to the American people. And I think that's the tragedy of it all.

Regardless of how this trial comes out, it is a tragedy of enormous proportions, and we're all going to have to work to repair that damage.

Mr. Russert: Slade Gorton?

Sen. Slade Gorton, Washington Republican: That clip, that statement, was a clear abuse of the power of the presidency of the United States, and it was designed as exactly that. I think it's extremely serious, and it did undercut the presidency and did undercut the United States of America. It is not a part of the charges of impeachment that the House brought, so in that sense, at least, it's most indirectly in front of it. It isn't a part of this trial.

Mr. Russert: As a Democrat, Carl Levin of Michigan, what did you think of that?

Sen. Carl Levin, Michigan Democrat: I was very bothered by it. I think he lied to the country about a very intensely personal matter. That's very different, however, about whether -- from whether or not he committed perjury in front of a grand jury on that subject, which is a legal issue, or whether or not he obstructed justice.

But I think he ought to be censured for that comment to the country, but, again, a very different issue from whether he ought to be removed from office for committing a high crime and misdemeanor.

Mr. Russert: Larry Craig?

Sen. Larry E. Craig, Idaho Republican: The first article for Richard Nixon was that he lied to the American people. That's what the House said. That was the first article of impeachment.

Bill Clinton lied to the American people. Richard Nixon resigned. This president stuffed it in our face. That's what he thinks of the presidency, and that's a tragedy for this country.

Mr. Russert: Should he resign?

Mr. Craig: He should resign. He should have resigned months ago, but he will never resign. He doesn't respect the presidency.

Mr. Russert: Tom Harkin?

Sen. Tom Harkin, Iowa Democrat: You know, Tim, I think the American people are so far ahead of us on this. It's been said the American people can abide sin but not hypocrisy, and I think the American people say, "Look, don't focus on the sin, focus on repentance."

Bill Clinton has profoundly and profusely apologized to the American people for that statement and for what he said to mislead the American people. We can spend all our lives focusing on the sin. I think we ought to spend more time focusing on repentance and forgiveness.

Mr. Russert: Gordon Smith?

Sen. Gordon H. Smith, Oregon Republican: Tim, I think that statement has meant more than just fodder for Letterman and Leno. It has poisoned so much of our politics, so much of our country. I actually think the president, in continuing to try and repent, as Senator Harkin has said, we ought to make some gesture to children, whether it's in a censure motion -- it probably is a bill of attainder.

But, you know, after this is all over, we're going to -- I hope we're going to turn to education and what the federal role ought to be in education. I'm not sure we can print enough money in the federal city to make up for that bad example, but we ought to start, we ought to try, and the president ought to continue to reach out to young children to say that what he did

there was wrong.

From www.hulka.com:

Anagram of The Month - [1/17/99] 2:02am

A President Clinton of the USA@ can be rearranged (with no letters left over, and using each letter only once) into:

"To copulate he finds interns"

or

"He finds interns to copulate"

A fan of Bill, Larry

The Washington Times 1/20/99

The widow of rock musician Frank Zappa has become one of the Democrats' biggest donors. One reason: Bill Clinton "reminded me of Frank, in that he was really smart and perceptive and inclusive."

Gail Zappa received condolence letters from both President Clinton and Vice President Al Gore shortly after her husband's death in 1993, Connie Bruck reports in the New Yorker, and in 1995 Mrs. Zappa donated \$100,000 to the Democratic National Committee.

Shortly thereafter, she met Mr. Gore "at one of those infamous White House breakfasts," she said.

Mrs. Zappa is not bothered by the sex scandal swirling around the president, and she certainly has nothing bad to say about pornographer Larry Flynt, a friend.

"I just see him as being on a spiritual mission," she said of Mr. Clinton. "I feel that nothing can stop it."

Truth And Consequences: The Internet

Bares All

By Bill Frezza

Watching Bill Clinton's ship of state slowly sink into a foul mire

of its own making, one can't help but be transfixed with the same horrible fascination that drew so many viewers to the blockbuster movie "Titanic." Everyone knew the outcome in advance, yet the awesome spectacle of the great ship going down, accompanied by flashback commentary describing the exact nature and progress of its mortal wounds, served as an abject lesson on the wages of hubris.

Regardless of one's political leanings, it's fair to say that we are

facing a watershed in our nation's history--not just the destruction of a flawed politician, but the unraveling of the

imperial presidency.

"Old media" and hard times created the imperial presidency when Franklin D. Roosevelt transformed a constitutionally limited government of enumerated powers into an unbridled leviathan. As federal power grew, escaping the fetters crafted by the founders, mass media played a key role in molding public opinion. Gulled by brilliant propagandists, the citizenry abandoned its instinctive distrust and invested its faith not just

in elected rulers but in a new class of pundits, journalists and opinion leaders who, they were told, could be trusted to serve as disinterested watchdogs over the burgeoning central power.

Unfortunately, this "fourth branch" of government was driven by a business model that could not help but foster a symbiotic relationship between the press and the very people they were supposed to watch. In addition, the false scarcity created by government spectrum policy resulted in an oligopoly of broadcast networks whose interests were far more common than diverse. While the outward appearance of an adversarial press was maintained, in fact the media took care to protect the people and institutions from which they drew their power and influence.

The destruction of the Clinton presidency never could have happened at the hands of old media. Clinton's defenders and apologists are absolutely right: This president's disgraceful behavior and persistent mendacity make him no different from either his predecessors or the hypocrites who occupy Congress. The only difference is that the old media elites have lost their ability to frame the debate.

Instead, the white blaze of the spotlight has moved to the Internet, which has no owners, brooks no pundits and offers no controls. The Internet imposes no limitations on content and hence requires no manipulating or manipulated editors. The Internet's business model will not create a symbiosis with the nation's rulers because it has no unified business model. It is a diverse, decentralized, irreverent, snarling watchdog that our founding fathers certainly would have loved.

The release of the entire Starr report on the Internet was not a calculated act of political sabotage by the Republican party. Rather, it was a panicked act of surrender. By disenfranchising the intermediaries that ruled the airwaves for half a century, a precedent has been set that will undermine the spin doctors of both parties, along with the millionaire news anchors who serve them.

Let's have it out. Let's have it all out, every bit of dirty laundry in every nook and cranny in Washington. Let the accusers and the accused go down together, and by breaking through the fog and smoke, lay waste to a self-perpetuating political machine that has run amok.

What old media and hard times created, new media and good times can destroy.

And as this process unfolds and federal paralysis sets in, perhaps the people will awake from their stupor and realize that they don't need an all-powerful president and Congress to "run the country." This country and its resourceful, hard-working citizens are fully capable of taking care of themselves.

The path to power for Hillary Rodham
The Washington Times 10/5/98

The Clinton administration is a lot like the Vietnam War.

Association with Bill Clinton, like participation in the war he successfully dodged, has no power to make a reputation, but it has ruined dozens.

Hillary Rodham Clinton intends to be the exception. First, she has to overcome some legal arguments of her own invention.

Mrs. Clinton -- or Mrs. Rodham, or Mzz Rodham, if she prefers -- stands in a unique place in the history of the presidency. Twenty-four years ago, as a 26-year-old lawyer freshly minted at Yale, she joined the staff of the Nixon impeachment committee and was assigned to research the Constitution to find the grounds on which to drive Richard Nixon from office. She applied herself to the task with a partisan zeal missing in the ranks of the Republicans researching the case against Bill Clinton.

Now she's willing to adopt any role -- tough advocate, abused wife, helpless little woman, political strategist, shrew-in-chief -- to keep her husband in office until conditions ripen for a resignation.

Miss Hillary, one of 43 lawyers who found work on the House Judiciary Committee's special impeachment inquiry staff, looked first in 1974 to see who had been impeached in the past, for what, and how.

There wasn't a lot to go on. Andrew Johnson is the most famous officeholder to be impeached, in 1868 on the grounds that he had dismissed certain Cabinet officers favored by the Radical Republicans, who were determined to inflict maximum ruin on the 11 Confederate states.

Most of what she found was outlined in an unsigned chapter of an early staff report about the impeachment of federal judges. She found a caution there: These past impeachments do not "fit neatly and logically into categories."

But Congress, she was sure, could impeach an officeholder for "exceeding the constitutional bounds of the powers of the office ... [for] behaving in a manner grossly incompatible with the proper function and purpose of the office; and ... [for] employing the power of the office for an improper purpose, or for personal gain."

A lot of constitutional scholars, and certainly most wives, would find in those stipulations ample grounds for impeaching a voluptuary-in-chief who has behaved in "a manner grossly incompatible with the proper function and purpose of the office ... "

The arguments Miss Hillary studied so diligently that summer

stressed that the House had placed less emphasis on criminal conduct than on how an official "violated his duties or his oath or seriously undermined public confidence in his ability to perform his official functions."

President Ford believed that Congress can impeach a judge, or a president, on any grounds it chooses. This seems about right. A shrewd man poses this hypothetical: Suppose, on Dec. 8, 1941, President Roosevelt announced that he had been planning a vacation cruise to South America, to be gone for a month, and despite the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, he intended to go ahead with his plans to take a break from the pressures of office. He certainly would have committed no crime, felonious or otherwise, if he had done that. But could anybody doubt that Congress would have been irresponsible if it had not impeached him for it?

And now Miss Hillary is playing defense, which is not nearly as much fun as playing offense, whether the game is football, politics or maybe even marriage. But sometimes the rewards are greater on defense (ask any Redskins defensive tackle who has recovered a fumble in the Dallas end zone, a politician who pounced on his opponent's fatal gaffe on Election Eve, or the suffering wife who at last found the incriminating Holiday Inn receipt in her philandering husband's pants pocket).

Some home folks who know the Clintons best insist the solution is at hand for the mystery of why Miss Hillary, the tough feminist who brooks no insubordination, has recently portrayed herself as the abused little wife (nothing could be more humiliating for her). The White House spinners are working through the nights to invoke pity for her -- pity that can be converted to sympathy, then to admiration, finally to affection.

That's when Bill Clinton will talk resignation, first with Al Gore, to arrange Miss Hillary's succession to vice president. Only the Republican majority in the Senate -- the toughest Stonewall Brigade this side of Saddam Hussein's Republican Guard -- would then stand between Hillary on her path to ultimate power. Mr. Gore would know better, but he would understand that this would be his last chance to be president.

The nation that got Bill Clinton's baby-boomer presidency as the inevitable legacy of the Vietnam War would get Hillary Rodham as the legacy of Monica Lewinsky.

Federal land grab called 'political' Clinton's Utah deal not justified by environmental claims, says report

By Sarah Foster

Copyright 1998, WorldNetDaily.com

While the U.S. House of Representatives has already approved President Clinton's designation of 1.7 million acres of Utah land as a federal wilderness area, the House Resources Committee has yet to read a blistering report by its own staff characterizing the deal initiated by the president just seven weeks before the 1996 election, as a blatant political act under the guise of environmental protection.

"The only thing the president was trying to protect by designating the Utah Monument was his chance to win re-election," the report bluntly states. "The 'threat' motivating the president's action was electoral, not environmental."

WorldNetDaily has obtained a copy of the document that outlines the administration's record of deception in the formation of Utah's Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument. **Scheduled for release last week, the report is being withheld from distribution and public release in part to ensure passage of Utah-related legislation.**

In the Senate, there's the "Utah Schools and Lands Exchange Act of 1998," a bill which would give Utah 139,000 acres of federally held land, certain mineral rights, and \$50 million in exchange for all of Utah's claims to lands within national parks, monuments, forests and federal areas. Authored by Utah Republican James Hansen, it was approved by the House in June. Still in the House is the pork-laden Omnibus Wilderness Bill, also by Hansen, which includes the identical legislation -- just in case it doesn't get through the Senate on its own.

Hansen, who chairs the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, has admitted he agreed to the deal, which was suggested by the administration, and persuaded Resources Committee Chairman Don Young, R-AK, to pull the report from its scheduled release.

"The report ... outlines many serious violations regarding the creation of the monument, but I am happy to forego committee consideration as long as we are making progress on other issues which are critical to the people of Utah," Hansen said in a written statement.

Aptly titled "Monumental Abuse," the report concludes there was no threat to the environment, it was "illusory." And the president's statement -- wherein he described the area as a "national treasure" -- "was as far away from accuracy as he was from Utah."

The House Resources Committee has been investigating what went on behind the scenes in the establishment of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument and why it was done in the first place. "Monumental Abuse" contradicts the official version at every point.

The White House claims designation was necessary to protect a fragile and important ecosystem in southwest Utah from mining and development. In particular, the president wanted to include the 1,650-square-mile Kaiparowits Plateau within the monument to save it from an impending mining operation. The Kaiparowits Plateau contains the largest undeveloped coal field in the country and was to be developed by Andalex Resources, Inc., which held the leases on 34,000 acres. Most of the paperwork had been completed and the project was on track. Andalex planned on mining 100 to 120 million tons of coal over a 45-year period.

This would have meant hundreds of jobs, new businesses, and millions of dollars in taxes and royalty revenues for cash-strapped local governments. That didn't matter to Clinton, who was angling for

environmentalist votes. "Mining jobs are good jobs, and mining is important to our national security -- but we can't have mines everywhere, and we shouldn't have mines that threaten national treasures," the president intoned to his audience at the Grand Canyon photo-op. There, in an adjacent state (he didn't dare go to Utah), he signed the proclamation creating the monument.

Clinton didn't mention that the coal he was effectively locking away was a low-sulfur, clean-burning coal called "compliance coal," so-named because it meets requirements set by the EPA. It is in demand worldwide as a fuel for electric plants. Nor did he mention that one of the only other places in the world where comparable coal is found is Indonesia, the home of Mochtar and James Riady, the Chinese government-connected billionaires who poured millions of dollars into Clinton campaigns in 1992 and 1996.

The report builds on one released last November by the staff of the Resources Committee.

The earlier report revealed that the administration, notably the President's Council on Environmental Quality, knew that the monument area wasn't "threatened" or even particularly significant. The Kaiparowits Plateau wasn't part of the monument considerations until months into the process. The CEQ had been looking at other areas for Clinton to designate, like areas near Arches and Canyonland National Parks and Lake Powell.

In a March 25, 1996, e-mail Katie McGinty, who chairs the President's Council on Environmental Quality, expressed certain qualms she was having.

"i'm [sic] increasingly of the view that we should just drop these utah [sic] ideas. we [sic] do not really know how the enviros will react and I do think there is a danger of 'abuse' of the withdraw/antiquities authorities especially because these lands are not really endangered," she wrote.

A few days before, on March 22, CEQ staffer Linda Lance had written an e-mail questioning "the political consequences of designating these lands as monuments when ... they're probably not the areas of the country most in need of this designation."

And no reference was made to the Kaiparowits Plateau before March 27, when it was mentioned in an e-mail by Tom Jensen, a CEQ staffer.

"KM (Katie McGinty) and others may want to rope in the Kaiparowits and Escalante Canyons regions if this package [other areas that were being considered] doesn't seem adequate to the president's overall purpose," Jensen said.

The subcommittee staff report concluded that the monument designation was "almost entirely politically motivated to assist the Clinton-Gore re-election effort," and that Clinton had evaded the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)."

Following that first report, the subcommittee decided to dig deeper and requested a further review as to whether there was any actual threat posed by development of the Smokey Hollow Mine, as the Andalex project was called.

On Nov. 5, 1997, the Resources Committee sent a letter to Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt asking

for each version of the Preliminary Draft Environmental Impact Statement (PDEIS) prepared for the Warm Spring Project/Smokey Hollow Mine.

The National Environmental Protection Act requires an environmental impact statement for almost any project these days, from a supermarket to a coal mine. These are analytical documents evaluating a project's potential impacts to the human environment and offering reasonable alternatives. Significant designations, such as declaring an area a wilderness, also require an EIS.

NEPA compliance is overseen by the Council on Environmental Quality.

An EIS is drafted by the government agency that oversees the project. For Andalex's Smokey Hollow Mine the Bureau of Land Management and the Office of Surface Mining, Reclamation and Enforcement were jointly responsible. They began work on the EIS in 1990. Private third-party contractors were called on for outside expertise and independent analysis, but were barred from communication with Andalex.

Babbitt refused to release the EIS to the committee, claiming such a document is "privileged" because of the "predecisional" nature of the material.

To obtain a copy the Resources Committee had to pry one loose with a subpoena. This was served on Nov. 12, 1997; the requested documents were ponied up a week later. They include all the notes and correspondence on the project. The present report is based on these documents, in particular, the 561-page EIS.

Here are some of its points and findings:

"To have at least the appearance of credibility, the president had to point to some sort of threat. As far as the Clinton Administration was concerned, the coal mine fit the bill. After all, in a campaign where image reigned supreme, reality was of little consequence. As the campaign dust settled, a new question arose: was the development of the coal mine actually a threat to justify sealing off 1.7 million acres of southern Utah? The PDEIS makes it clear the answer is no."

"The Clinton administration's own agencies determined after a full review, that between killing the mine and approving it, approval was the 'preferred alternative.'"

Scientists and land managers of the BLM concluded that the land that would be affected by the coal mine wasn't -- as Clinton claimed -- "the most remarkable land in the world." Significantly, "its high potential for future development outweighed its low wilderness values."

Even if the land were remarkable, "Construction and operation of the proposed project would have no direct, physical impact on any of the wilderness study areas or the potential designation of wilderness areas in the Smoky Mountain area," according to the BLM.

In his proclamation statement, Clinton drew attention to alleged "world class paleontological sites", "important cultural resources" and a "spectacular array of unusual and diverse soils" and "cryptobiotic crusts" -- all of which he wanted to protect from the mine. He spoke of a "spectacular array of unusual and diverse soils" and "cryptobiotic crusts" and showed concern

for "many different vegetative communities." **It was all untrue. The EIS reports there was nothing of significance in the area and the mine would have "minor to negligible impact."**

Perhaps the most striking revelation in the report concerns Andalex and how its project was derailed by CEQ and Interior Department honchos in Washington.

Andalex officials had worked diligently with BLM officials at the local level. During the EIS process, the company contacted a variety of federal, state and local agencies and interest groups. They had spent \$8 million dollars, and held over 500 public meetings to explain the project and solicit information and suggestions from concerned local residents. They agreed to many proposals to ensure an environmentally sensitive operation. For instance, when there were concerns that the buildings on the site would be too visible, Andalex agreed to locate these in a valley away from the viewshed, even though this would be more costly.

Their efforts were in vain -- for once the decision was made by CEQ in late March, 1996, to "rope in the Kaiparowits" there was an all out effort to kill the mine.

A heretofore uninvolved agency within the Department of Interior -- the Office of Environmental Policy -- suddenly became very involved and began working closely with CEQ. The Office of Environmental Police went so far as to tell the Utah BLM officials what should be included in the EIS. For instance, Andalex had figured they'd be mining only 100 to 120 million tons of coal over the life of the project. The Office of Environmental Police said another alternative should be included that would show Andalex mining much more coal than planned. It wouldn't be true, but it would create the illusion that the mine would have greater impact. It would be easier to deny a permit based on an EIS that contained such an alternative than the one that reflected Andalex's actual plans.

This kind of meddling from Washington did not sit well with the local agents. An e-mail from one environmental policy agent to the director of the agency shows the reception his ideas were given.

"As expected, the field personnel are very unhappy," the e-mail reads. "They feel that I was not given all the information that should have been reviewed by me as part of the review process. They feel that had I looked at all the information, some of my recommendations may have been different."

The dispute between the Office of Environmental Police and the Utah agents became moot when Clinton

designated the monument. Seven years of work by BLM and Andalex to make the mine a reality was swept away.

"What did the affected communities think of the Utah Monument?, the committee report asks rhetorically.

"What effects will it have on the local and state economies? On the environment? No one knows because the analysis for the Utah Monument designation, required under NEPA, was never done ... For the Clinton Administration, the ends of political expediency justified the means of abusing the process and the rights of the people of Utah."

Reagan wore coat, tie in Oval Office
WorldNetDaily.com 9/23/98

By Michael Reagan

My father, Ronald Reagan, held the presidency in such honor and reverence that he was never in the Oval Office without a coat and tie. Bill Clinton has such disrespect for the presidency that he was often in the Oval Office without his pants.

The president who thus exposed himself has now been exposed to the entire world: Behold Bill Clinton, the shining hero of liberalism! Behold the self-anointed messiah of the progressive movement! Behold the leader of "the most ethical administration in history."

Though it is too early to say if he will be impeached, the jury is in on Bill Clinton's character. We know beyond a reasonable doubt that Bill Clinton is an out-of-control sexual predator who publicly posed as the feminists' best friend while secretly using Monica Lewinsky.

His real attitude toward women comes through loud and clear now.

With their standard-bearer exposed as a yet-to-be-convicted felon, the Democratic Party has no one to lift up as an example and a hero. So, in a squalid attempt to justify the most corrupt President in American history, Bill Clinton's defenders now drag the entire history and tradition of the presidency into the gutter. They have slimed Washington, Jefferson, FDR, Eisenhower, and even

Ronald Reagan.

Typical of these defenders of the indefensible is Mario Cuomo, who on CNN's "Larry King Live" said, "I liked President Reagan. I certainly wouldn't have trusted him if he said to me I never had an extramarital affair." (On behalf of the Reagan family, I have publicly demanded an apology from former Gov. Cuomo. We shall see if he has the decency to offer one.)

Those who claim the President's sex life is personal and none of our business conveniently forget one thing: A President whose sex life is outrageous, out of control, and out of bounds is a threat not only to the nation's morals, but to the nation's security. During l'affair Lewinsky, Clinton was clearly aware of this fact, which underscores (if underscoring is needed) his utter recklessness.

In the 445-page Starr report, we read that Bill Clinton told Monica Lewinsky that "he suspected that a foreign embassy (he did not specify which one) was tapping his telephones, and he proposed cover stories. If ever questioned, she should say that the two of them were just friends. If anyone ever asked about their phone sex, she should say that they knew their calls were being monitored all along, and the phone sex was just a put-on."

Does this sound like a man who is worthy to be the leader of the Free World?

The Code of Federal Regulations provides rules for issuing security clearances. Is Bill Clinton qualified to hold the most sensitive national security post in our government? Read this excerpt from the federal regulations-and you tell me:

Code of Federal Regulations, Title 32, Chapter 1,
Part 147 SEXUAL BEHAVIOR

"Sexual behavior is a security concern if it involves a criminal offense, indicates a personality or emotional disorder, subjects the individual to undue influence or coercion, or reflects lack of judgment or discretion.

"NOTE: The adjudicator should also consider guidelines pertaining to criminal conduct (criterion

J); or emotional, mental, and personality disorders (criterion I), in determining how to resolve the security concerns raised by sexual behavior.

"END NOTE: (Sexual orientation or preference may not be used as a basis for or a disqualifying factor in determining a person's eligibility for a security clearance.)

"Conditions that could raise a security concern and may be disqualifying include:

"(1) sexual behavior of a criminal nature, whether or not the individual has been prosecuted;

"(2) compulsive or addictive sexual behavior when the person is unable to stop a pattern of self-destructive or high-risk behavior or that which is symptomatic of a personality disorder;

"(3) sexual behavior that causes an individual to be vulnerable to undue influence or coercion;

"(4) sexual behavior of a public nature and/or that which reflects lack of discretion or judgment."

Federal regulations couldn't be more clear: Bill Clinton wouldn't even qualify for a national security clearance.

Is There No Rest For the Wary Penitent?

The Washington Times 9/11/98

At last Bill Clinton feels some pain of his own, and now it's

the Democrats who are making unreasonable demands.

They want President Clinton to make a 50-state Contrition Comeback Tour, penitence pit stops on every major highway, remorse-and-regret rallies in every ballpark between Bangor and San Diego, and to stay at it until he apologizes to everybody at least twice.

They ought to get off the guy's back. How much sincerity can you expect one man to fake? Much cheaper by far to put up a 900 number and let the president say he's sorry in person to everybody who dials in.

"We have expressed the hope that the president will continue to demonstrate his contrition to his family, his friends

and to the American people," Tom Daschle, the leader of the steaming Democratic minority in the Senate, told reporters when he left yesterday's contrition klatsch at the White House. "He shared his feelings and apologized to us personally."

Father Mike McCurry, the White House theologian and press secretary who's been sneaking off at every opportunity to pack another suitcase, finally wants to talk about the president's scandalous behavior, and whether he should schedule more apologies.

"If he does -- and I expect he does -- I'm sure he'll make that apology. He's got a lot of amends to make and he will be making those amends."

Next up are the Cabinet secretaries, whom the president has played like an IZARD County fiddle. Some of them may remember how the president sent them out in January to repeat his lie that he was no more than a kindly celibate uncle to Monica Lewinsky. "I believe the allegations are completely untrue," Secretary of State Madeleine Albright told reporters then. "I'll second that, definitely," said Commerce Secretary William Daley. "Third it," said Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala. (His friends say poor Bill Daley has taken to shaving in the dark since the president admitted the lie, so reluctant is he to look his mirror in the eye.)

Even now Mr. Daschle and his colleagues are willing to play fools again. One of them asked the president whether there are any surprises lurking in the 445 pages of the Starr report, as delivered to Congress, and Mr. Clinton said "no, no surprises." This may be another Clinton word game; he can always say that "well, you asked me if there were any surprises and I said no, and that's the God's truth, because I wasn't surprised by any of that stuff."

The Democrats want to press the president into the role of groveler-in-chief, to spray him with enough deodorant to make him presentable to the public, or at least to reduce him to such a pitiful figure on the margin that he will quickly tire of it and quit, to flee to a more congenial habitat in Southern California.

Neither the Democrats nor the Republicans care any more than Bill Clinton does whether he's actually sorry. Most of them already think he's pretty sorry. The Democrats only want him gone, and if it takes a grovel to get him there that's OK, too. The Republicans only want to stumble past November 3, terrified of tripping over the president's briefs or Monica's bra.

The president is so desperate to save himself that for the moment he's willing to take their advice, as humiliating as it may be. He apologized so many times in his day in Florida that at the end of the day he was apologizing to himself.

"I tried to do a good job taking care of this country, even

when I haven't taken such good care of myself, my family and my obligations," he told a group of Democratic fat cats at the end of his long, emotional day. "I hope you and others that I have injured will forgive me for the mistakes I've made."

No word on the early returns, although Mr. Clinton is said to have accepted his apology promptly and forgiven himself at once, as an example to others.

Anyone who has ever given or received an apology understands that the more drawn out it is the less convincing it becomes. Politicians are usually not good judges of sincerity, anyway, and the Democrats demanding that the president wear a hair shirt to a public flogging on the Capitol steps figure that if he sings loud enough nobody will listen to the words.

Finding the right revival meeting could help. A yellow-dog Democrat columnist in Little Rock observed the other day that when black politicians get caught stealing they usually cry "racism" and when white pols get caught falling-down drunk or with their pants down, or both, they usually rediscover religion. The president has an opportunity today, when he entertains a group of friendly preachers at the White House. But he should remember that, Hillary to the contrary notwithstanding, he'll probably need stronger medicine than modern Methodists usually make.

Slick Willie's Political Snake Oil

The Washington Times 8/18/98

As you are reading this, the president of the United States, having delayed it for months, has already given televised testimony before a grand jury convoked by Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr -- testimony theoretically on a whole variety of subjects, but as far as the nation is concerned on only one: his alleged sexual relations with Monica Lewinsky.

The historical situation is novel from many respects, the first, obviously, being that an American president has never before been called on to testify before a grand jury for alleged crimes or misdemeanors, high or low. A second novelty is that no recent president has ever been so highly praised for his forensic and political skills, his ability to turn night into day -- by what is popularly known as the gift of gab. One can only assume that these Americans have led sheltered lives, and that they have never encountered in real life or even in literature one of the great characters of American legend: the snake-oil salesman.

In Mark Twain's "Huckleberry Finn," the author devotes chapter after chapter to two Arkansas rascals, "the king" and "the duke," who get themselves run out of one town on a rail (a tradition now unfortunately defunct), only to resume their

happy-go-lucky voyage drifting down the Mississippi on Huck's raft, still practicing their well-honed snake-oil skills, and still in Arkansas. (I'm sorry, Mrs. Clinton, but go argue with Mark Twain.)

I confess that from the beginning of his campaign for Democratic nomination for the presidency in 1992 (and well before that in Arkansas), Mr. Clinton, like his riverboat predecessors of the last century, lied as fast as he talked. Gennifer Flowers? Who was she? Oh, her. In New Hampshire, with a bellicose wife at his side, he swore on CBS's "60 Minutes" that he had never had sexual relations with that woman. Some years later, under oath now, he reflected that, come to think of it, he had had sexual relations with her, but "only once." This is a characteristic Clinton "evasion," if you can call it that. As if murder is only half as bad if you only kill the man once.

The list of what Mr. Clinton considers his clever evasions is long and often comical. He smoked marijuana but didn't inhale. He never broke the drug laws of the United States (since after all he was in Britain). His deceitful and ever changing explanations of how he didn't evade the Vietnam draft are too involuted to be repeated. And so he has gone, slithering from half-truths to lies and back again, proceeding from smiling audience to smiling audience, addressing people who either believe him or don't care. He has, they say, "the common touch," is wonderfully charming, sensitive, amiable. Tears come readily to his eyes on appropriate occasions as with a mediocre actor. He has rarely been called dignified. But does a charming, sensitive, amiable man have the moral authority to send half a million Americans into bloody combat, as did George Bush in the Persian Gulf?

As things stood, as at 1 PM yesterday he went into his life-or-death combat with the grand jury, Mr. Clinton had three choices: 1) clam up and say nothing (this is reportedly the course recommended by his personal lawyer, David Kendall, who even opposed Clinton's subpoena to appear); 2) the opposite extreme, "fess" all, tell the whole truth (this was wildly popular among pundits a week or so ago on the assumption that the American people, from their generous heart, would forgive him); and 3) according to some White House sources, Clinton has decided to change his story, admitting to some, but not all, of the charges against him -- "weaseling out," as it were. Sex: yes. Perjury: no. This is the Clinton position I have predicted from the very start.

Obstruction of justice and suborning of perjury, at least in recent decades, have been considered far more significant than a President's private behavior. But is sexual hijinks with an

unpaid 21-year-old trainee in the Oval Office really private behavior? The president will unquestionably be contrite, of course.

Another somewhat more learned piece of advice the president has received is to plead, not the Fifth Amendment (against self-incrimination), but the Fourth Amendment (against "unreasonable searches and seizures"). The unreasonable search of the president's memory being, according to this theory, a violation of his "right to privacy" -- a right not mentioned in the Fourth Amendment or anywhere else in the Constitution. By the time you read this, of course, the presidential strategy might already be known, perhaps followed by a brief public statement.

An almost universal view of this whole matter is that if President Clinton loses, the remaining two years of his presidency will be a mess, and he will be a "broken" man. But broken in what way, I wonder. Most truly broken men are broken because they have violated the dictates of their inner conscience. But in political matters, at least, Mr. Clinton has never shown any sign of having an inner conscience. A conscience? What's that?

A further possibility -- even if Mr. Clinton seems to come out ahead today -- is that, for reasons technical as well as political, this thing still won't be over. It might dog him until the end of his days.

Waiting for a verdict on who we really are
The Washington Times 8/18/98

Now we'll find out what kind of country we are, whether we still live in the America that most of us grew up in.

The president, looking surly and resentful, gave us the spin Monday night, that he never told a lie when he lied to us over the past seven months about Monica Lewinsky, and that we owe him a responsibility to forget, forgive and maybe give him a hug.

TV's talking heads -- there's an IQ of at least the sum of its age behind every one of those pretty faces -- started the day with assurances that the president's testimony, and his explanation (with no apology) last night writes finis to the scandal.

The president's preacher struggled earlier to find Biblical justification for presidential lies and lowlife. "King David did something that was much worse than anything that President

Clinton is alleged to have done," said the Rev. Dr. Phillip Wogaman of Washington's Foundry Methodist Church, noting that the king arranged the death of the husband of Bathsheba, his backstairs squeeze. "And King David, if I read my Bible correctly, was not impeached."

(And if I read my Constitution correctly, Bill Clinton is a president, not a king with the power to lop off the heads of his critics, and if I read my history correctly, kings have never been subject to impeachment, which is a formula for removing elected officials from office.)

The Rev. Jesse Jackson, passing by the White House when he saw all the cameras and racing in to get a little of the action, imagined a parable about the president, Samson and Delilah.

Samson, the Rev recalled, was tempted by Delilah, and God gave him another chance. Quoth the Rev: "Yet, the special prosecutor, I suppose, would have locked him up." So hectic was the day that the Rev didn't have time to rhyme, but he did take time to shamelessly invoke the president's daughter's forgiveness as a reason why we, too, should give her daddy a pass.

There was no word yesterday from Billy Graham, who was at least conspicuously absent, and the cardinals of the Roman church, the distinguished rabbis, imams, and other representatives of the kingdom of God kept a discreet silence, too. In a previous generation, the pulpits would have trembled with the thunder of outrage and rung with denunciations of sin and betrayal, but we should not expect that in an era when churchmen argue over how best to celebrate sexual perversions as legitimate sacraments of the marriage bed.

The politicians were mostly silent, too, and it was perhaps a measure of the depth of the Clinton dilemma that the only Democrats the TV networks could find to defend the president last night were mostly Rep. Barney Frank, who struggled to say something positive and concluded that only the 22nd Amendment could save the president from defeat at the polls.

There was not a lot from the Republican side, either. Sen. Orrin Hatch of Utah preached love and forgiveness until the president, having faked as much contrition as he could bear, concluded his speech with an attack on Kenneth Starr. Sen. Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania was not impressed, and neither was Rep. Bill McCollum of Florida. Both sit on crucial judiciary committees.

Most Republicans, like all the Democrats, are determined to wait until the pollsters and focus groups tell them which ethical standards and constitutional principles are safe to hold. They're eager to define deviancy down, in Pat Moynihan's memorable phrase; they just want to be told how far down.

The exception to the general gutlessness pervasive in the nation's capital was John Ashcroft, the Ozarks preacher's son and senator from Missouri. "The president should tell the truth," he said as the president sat down with his lawyers to parse his lies. "Americans want our president to represent the values we teach our children -- honesty, responsibility, accountability. Seven months ago, I asked President Clinton to take responsibility for his actions, to be accountable to the American people. ... Instead, all the president's defenders have denied the president is accountable as a role model, denied the president is responsible for his actions, and denied the president must be honest under his sworn oath.

"While President Clinton swore an oath to tell the truth, the Congress swore an oath to defend the Constitution. Congress should follow the principles in the Constitution, not the politics of the moment. ... If President Clinton committed the high crime of perjury, Congress should uphold its duty without delay."

Not so long ago this was the American creed, honored by rich and poor, Republican and Democrat, liberal and conservative, male and female, even lawyers. Maybe it still is. Or maybe Bill Clinton is a reflection of who we've become. The jury has gone out -- not on the president, who has convicted himself, but on the rest of us, who can neither run nor hide.

A profile in courage to lead the Congress
The Washington Times 9/8/98

If Michelangelo comes to town looking for a model for a profile in courage, someone should direct him to the Democratic side of the aisle.

Washington is the last place he should expect to find such a model, and Congress is certainly the last place in Washington to look, but a man who's been dead for 400 years can't be picky.

Some Republicans are eager to let Bill Clinton off with the meaningless vote of censure -- James Carville, Paul Begala and Rahm Emanuel would no doubt be relieved to join in a vote of "aye" --and it's the growing number of congressional Democrats who are saying no, no, no.

The Democrats have their own reasons for pushing for the impeachment route, of course, the chief one being the expectation that the Republican majority, terrified of provoking the backlash that would imperil their chances of holding on to that majority, will prevent it.

Nevertheless, Daniel Patrick Moynihan is the man of the

hour. His profile will do, admirably.

"You cannot have this kind of conduct as normal and acceptable and easily dismissed unless there is a great effort to do so," Mr. Moynihan says, invoking the plain talk and common sense that some of us had despaired of hearing again from our public men. Perjury in a civil case, lying to a grand jury and lying to the American people are all impeachable offenses, the senator says, and Congress should stay in session until it addresses President Clinton's behavior.

Pat Moynihan has been in Washington long enough to know where babies come from. Perhaps anticipating White House strategy, he describes Rep. Henry Hyde of Illinois and Sen. Orrin Hatch of Utah, the Republican chairmen of the committees that must take the lead in impeachment hearings, as "first rate" and of "impeccable standing." The president is advised not to sic the dogs on them, to keep Mr. Carville in his kennel. (Poor Buddy.)

Mr. Moynihan has a caution for Kenneth Starr, too. "I would hope that man, Starr, would get us his report. He's had enough time -- God knows enough staff." No doubt God does; the rest of us, including Mrs. Starr, certainly do.

Censure is the wimp's way out. The Founding Fathers put a perfectly good procedure in the Constitution for dealing with presidents who debase and defile the office, choosing carefully ambiguous language so as to give Congress all the room it needs to define what a president has to do to merit the old heave-ho. It never occurred to Jefferson, Adams, Madison & Co. that their descendants couldn't stand up to the ordeal of reading plain English.

Rep. James Moran of Virginia, another Democrat, doesn't think censure is "really an option," either. "I think we're bound to go through with impeachment proceedings. I do think this is the most serious crisis he has ever faced, and I don't really see any way out of it."

Trent Lott, at last getting his legs as the leader of the majority, is a Republican who gets it. Earlier this year, before it was clear that Mr. Starr had the goods, Mr. Lott suggested censure. Now he doesn't think so. Sen. Robert Byrd of West Virginia, still another Democrat, persuaded him.

"I have gone back and read the history of censure, and I've also read a treatise by Senator Byrd in which he basically concludes that censure means nothing. I don't think that the circumstances now call for something ... that would be interpreted by anybody as 'nothing'."

Joe Lieberman, no doubt astonished at what he wrought with his powerful speech on Thursday, softened his criticism a little over the weekend. The man whose friends regard him as

the noble rabbi now seems to prescribe New Testament redemption. He thinks maybe the president has the morality -- or at least the capacity for morality -- to be president yet. "Personally, I don't think lying about a sexual affair is grounds for impeachment." (That's all right. Joe hit the triple with the bases loaded.)

Many, perhaps most of us, would agree if that were all there was to it. But what has turned America's stomach over the past three weeks is the demonstration of the president's utter lack of discipline and self-control, frightening and unacceptable in the man who holds the lives of all of us in his hands. Some of us, who learned years ago the limits of Bill Clinton's character, nevertheless harbored the hope, naive as it was, that he might wake up on his first morning in the White House with a determination to repay the nation's gift with a vow to be a better man than he had ever been before. This would have occurred to most men, liberal or conservative, Republican or Democrat, Christian or Jew, black or white.

But it didn't, and we are led to the present moment. The Republicans in Congress should understand that they, too, are on trial -- that their constituents did not send them to Washington to get re-elected, but to do their duty, as serious men are expected to find that duty.

Quotes

Mike Speaks
The Washington Times 10/20/98

Mike McCurry wasn't mincing words in Pittsburgh last night when he evaluated his former boss, Bill Clinton:

"He is an enormously gifted and richly qualified leader for our nation but someone who is exasperatingly stupid in his personal life," Mr. McCurry said in his first public lecture since resigning as White House press secretary on Oct. 1.

He told about 200 people at the University of Pittsburgh that the Monica Lewinsky scandal will haunt his presidency forever, according to the Associated Press.

"I think there will be an asterisk next to his name in the record books," Mr. McCurry said, and that Mr. Clinton's presidency "will always be marred -- stained -- by the episode with Monica Lewinsky."

Mr. McCurry also admitted he was duped by Mr. Clinton's

initial public claim that he didn't have an affair with Miss Lewinsky.

"I was aware of the potential for deception," he said, "but I just didn't want to believe he had the capacity to deceive."

When one member of the audience asked Mr. McCurry how he felt about leaving the White House after three years, the former spokesman jumped in the air, spread his arms wide and shouted:

"Free at last!"

Foundation stone

The Washington Times 10/5/98

"I am pleased to sign into law ... the reauthorization of the Independent Counsel Act," President Clinton said on June 30, 1994.

"This law ... is a foundation stone for the trust between the government and our citizens. ... Opponents called it a tool of partisan attack against Republican presidents and a waste of taxpayer funds. It was neither. In fact, the independent counsel statute has been in the past and is today a force for government integrity and public confidence," Mr. Clinton said in signing the legislation.

-- President William Jefferson Clinton statement at White House signing ceremony, June 30, 1994, two months before Ken Starr's appointment.

<http://www.gargaro.com/clintonquotes.html>

"When I was a younger man and had a life," quoth the leader of the free world, "I owned an El Camino pickup in the '70s. It was a real sort of Southern deal. I had Astro turf in the back. You don't want to know why, but I did."

The full text from this speech can be found at right here

No Mr. President, really....we WANT to know what the Astro turf was for....

In the first debate Clinton told us:

"And the deficit has come down for four years in a row for the first time since before the Civil War. I meant to say since before World War II. But maybe it should be since before the Civil War."

The last time was actually 1944-1947 followed by a year of surplus increase.

(Historical Statistics, Bicentennial Edition by the Dept of Commerce)

In his speech to the Fraternal Order of Police in Cincinnati, OH during the 1996 election, President Clinton bragged on the strong Ohio economy. However, he forgot to tell the audience that at the time

Ohio had a Republican Governor, top five State officials were all Republicans, both the State House and Senate were controlled by Republicans, a Republican US Senator and 13 of 19 US Representatives were Republicans.

Thank you Mr. President for the strong endorsement of Republican principles and programs!

Clinton quotes the Bible - incorrectly.

Oct 1994 Remarks made at the signing of the peace treaty between Israel and Jordan. "Your Majesty; Mr Prime Minister, here in the Rift Valley you have bridged the tragic rift that separated your people too long. Here in this region, which is home of not only both of your faiths, but mine, I say, blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall inherit the Earth."

If Bill is going to quote the bible, perhaps he should do it correctly! Here is the CORRECT quote: Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God. Matthew 5:9 Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the Earth. Matthew 5:5

"Thanks for the poncho." President Clinton said this when he was presented with the Romanian tri-color flag during his visit in July. The flag did have a head-sized hole in the middle...But flags with the centers ripped out are the norm in Romania these days. With holes where the hated communist emblem used to be, such flags symbolize the 1989 anti-Communist revolt that led to the establishment of democracy. Shouldn't our President KNOW this??

Associated Press 8/27/97

"The last time I checked, the Constitution said, 'of the people, by the people and for the people.' That's what the Declaration of Independence says." President Bill Clinton, campaigning October 17, 1996. From a campaign speech given in California. Quoted in Investor's Business Daily October 25, 1996

Gee, Mr. Clinton, that statement is in NEITHER - that phrase was in the Gettysburg Address!! Hear Bill Clinton say this!

Click for Bill Clinton Sound Byte .wav (193K)

Click for Bill Clinton Sound Byte .au (70K)

(special thanks to Michael Rivero for providing the sound clips)

"Almost makes you want to go to jail out here."

- Bill Clinton - after being told that famed Bellver Castle (Spain) once served as a prison as well as a palace for kings

"I am the only President in who knew something about agriculture when I got there." (Bill Clinton, Washington Post, 4/26/95)

Ummm...geee Mr. Clinton, Jimmy Carter, Harry Truman, Thomas Jefferson, and George Washington who were all farmers before they were Presidents.

"I'm sure I spent more time in Texas than anybody else who had run for President recently." (Bill

Clinton in Longview, Texas, U.S. Newswire, 9/27/96)

Wait a minute.. George Bush (1980 - 1992), Ross Perot (1992, 1996), Phil Gramm (1996), Lloyd Bentsen (1976, 1988), John Connally (1980), or Lyndon B. Johnson (1960, 1964) -- all Texans who ran for the presidency or vice-presidency.

From Time magazine. 6/17/96 p. 104 refers to "Juanita" a recently discovered Inca mummy

"You know, if I were a single man, I might ask that mummy out. That's a good-looking mummy!"---Bill Clinton

(??) This needs no comment!

"We can't be so fixated on our desire to preserve the rights of ordinary Americans"
--William J. Clinton, USA Today, March 11, 1993

"When we got organized as a country and we wrote a fairly radical Constitution with a radical Bill of Rights, giving a radical amount of individual freedom to Americans ..." President Bill Clinton, 3-22-94, MTV's "Enough is Enough"

A RADICAL amount of individual freedom??

"It has not worked. No one can say it has worked, so I decided we're either going to do what we said we're going to do with the U.N., or we're going to do something else." A Bill Clinton quote in Washington Post on the U.N. operation in Bosnia.

What insight! He'll do what he said he would, or he'll do something else!

"African-Americans watch the same news at night that ordinary Americans do." Quote from Bill Clinton on BET interview

(heavy sarcasm) Oh GEE...they do?! Thanks for letting us know Bill.

"They let me shoot them, so I shot them" Statement by Pres. Clinton when showing reporters two ducks he had shot on a hunting trip the day after Republicans took control of the congress.

So wait...if they hadn't let you, you wouldn't have shot them?

As a candidate in 1992, Bill Clinton blasted Bush administration standards of behavior and pledged to conduct "the most ethical administration in the history of the Republic."

(Hysterical laughter....)

"I am curbing the influence of money in our political system" Bill Clinton writing to state attorneys that "this year provides the best opportunity in a generation to enact meaningful reform."

CURBING the influence of money?! This is the same president who swindled an impoverished

Indian tribe out of money, took illegal foreign campaign money, and held fundraising "coffees" in the White House!

The President in the Press

Middle Class Tax Cut

"I want to make it very clear that this middle-class tax cut, in my view, is central to any attempt we're going to make to have a short-term economic strategy and a long-term fairness strategy, which is part of getting this country going again." -- William J. Clinton ABC News, Primary Debate, Manchester, NH 1/19/92

Americans Pay More under Clinton

Sen. Pete Domenici(R)-New Mexico: "We're going to ask the American people to pay more so we can spend more, is that fair to say?" -- Dr. Alice Rivlin, Clinton appointee to the OMB: "That's one way to look at it, yes, Senator."

Lobbyists

"The period we're in is a lobbyist's dream come true" -- Joan Claybrook, head of the advocacy group Public Citizen, describing the atmosphere of the Clinton Administration.

Shades of Nixon!

"[Clinton's] Administration is easily the most reckless in interfering with the integrity of Federal investigative agencies since that of Richard Nixon." -- New York Times editorial, "White House Ethics Meltdown", 3/4/94

Ethics, Clinton Style

"For a team that Clinton promised would adhere to a "higher ethical standard" his administration has presided over an extraordinary amount of corruption and an unprecedented number of high-level officials forced to resign in disgrace." -- The Times (of London), Feb 12, 1995.

Health Care

"I can't worry about every under capatilized business" -- First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton, testifing before congress on the effects of Nationalized Health Care.

The Good Old Days?

"I never thought I'd miss Nancy Reagan. There can't be a rating [on the Clinton drug policy] when there hasn't been a performance." -- Rep. Charles Rangel (D-NY), April 24, 1993

National Debt, Take One

"The money we cut from the military would have been sufficient to lower unemplment, to increase growth, to give us what we need in education and training, were it not for the enormous inflation in health-care cost and the size of the deficit I confronted when I took office." -- President William Clinton, Rolling Stone interview 11/93

National Debt, Take Two

"[S]enior Administration officials, including Bentsen and Panetta, concede that the professed shock at higher deficit estimates issued after the election was largely feigned. Moreover, the new Clinton team issued initial budget projections soon after taking office that put absolutely the worst face possible on the deficit outlook, manipulating data to reinforce the impression that Bush had left Clinton with a fiscal nightmare." -- Los Angeles Times, April 24, 1994, p. D1.

Rights of ordinary Americans

"[the United States] can't be so fixed on our desire to preserve the rights of ordinary Americans..." -- President William Clinton, March 1, 1993 during a press conference in Piscataway, NJ source: Boston Globe, 3/2/93, page 3

Right to have a firearm

"...our absolute obligation under the Constitution to give people the right to have a firearm..." -- President William Clinton, March 1, 1993 during a press conference in Piscataway, NJ

What's Wrong with America

"You know the one thing that's wrong with this country? Everyone gets a chance to have their fair say." -- President William Clinton 5/29/93

Economics

"It was hard to see, but a week ago Friday the Clinton administration, while driving a large black sedan at high speed across the 14th street bridge, opened the door and shoved out their revised downward GDP estimate for this year, to 2.5% from 3.1%." - Wall Street Journal Monday July 12 1993 (p A12)

Warrants? We don't need no stinkin' Warrants!

"[President Clinton] said he directed advisers to craft a policy allowing police to search public housing for weapons in the wake of a federal court order barring Chicago officials from conducting sweeps without search warrants." - Associated Press: (Chicago Tribune, 4/10/94 Section 1 page 10)

Janous

"Stephanopoulos knew that it was a mistake to assume that any one moment with Clinton, any one conversation, day, or even week reflected Clinton's true feelings or unchanging fundamental attitude about something." -- Bob Woodward, in his book "The Agenda"

Existentialism

"The President's essential character flaw isn't dishonesty so much as a-honesty. It isn't that Clinton means to say things that are not true, or that he cannot make true, but that everything is true for him when he says it, because he says it. Clinton means what he says when he says it, but tomorrow he will mean what he says when he says the opposite. He is the existential President, living with absolute sincerity in the passing moment." -- Michael Kelly, "The President's Past," New York Times Magazine, July 31, 1994

Clinton on Terrorism

"It would be the equivalent of having the prime minister of England invite the Oklahoma City bombers to 10 Downing Street, to congratulate them on a job well done." -- Former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher responding to President Clinton's red-carpet welcome for Sinn Fein

leader Gerry Adams; Newsweek 5/15/95 page 19

I can't worry about every under capitalized business" -- First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton, testifying before congress on the effects of Nationalized Health Care.

"[the United States] can't be so fixed on our desire to preserve the rights of ordinary Americans..." -- President William Clinton, March 1, 1993 during a press conference in Piscataway, NJ source: Boston Globe, 3/2/93, page 3

"You know the one thing that's wrong with this country? Everyone gets a chance to have their fair say." -- President William Clinton 5/29/93

"It would be the equivalent of having the prime minister of England invite the Oklahoma City bombers to 10 Downing Street, to congratulate them on a job well done." -- Former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher responding to President Clinton's red-carpet welcome for Sinn Fein leader Gerry Adams; Newsweek 5/15/95 page 19

"[Clinton's] Administration is easily the most reckless in interfering with the integrity of Federal investigative agencies since that of Richard Nixon." -- New York Times editorial, "White House Ethics Meltdown", 3/4/94

The Big Creep!

The Washington Times 7/22/98

A rather sullen picture, we thought, of Hillary Rodham Clinton is splashed on the cover of the August issue of Psychology Today.

On closer inspection, we understand why. "After Infidelity," reads the bold headline stamped across Mrs. Clinton's soured mug.

We open the magazine to read the cover story, "Shattered Vows."

Poor Hillary, we thought, thumbing through the pages. How dare him! Sometimes infidelity is just about sex, we learn. That is often more true for men. One minute you think you have a special relationship, and then your partner contaminates it. You find out your partner has been unfaithful, and everything you believe is totally shattered.

Reading on, we come to a special section: "Advice to Hillary." Complimentary guidance from the magazine's editors and Peggy Vaughan, author of "The Monogamy Myth." Here's what they tell the first lady:

Yes, oral sex is infidelity.

Faithfulness is not a virtue that falls out of the heavens B it's a skill. And it can be learned. Get yourselves to the Smart Marriages conference in Washington, D.C. Disregard what other people say. All that matters is your ability to rebuild trust. It's a boundary problem, not a love problem.

Recognize your power and use it to renegotiate your relationship from the bottom up. Despite the hurt and anger, love can still survive. You may want to consider your shared history, shared goals and shared commitment to important causes. Affairs are less a reflection of the partner and the marriage than of broader forces in the culture that undermine monogamy. You may look realistically at your partner's other qualities and decide that on balance you prefer your spouse to other potential partners.

Clinton the Hollywood Freak

Hollywood celebrities came east to celebrate with Clinton and raise money for the DNC at three fundraisers in the Hamptons, the wealthy vacation area in eastern Long Island, New York. The only thing that came between Clinton and getting to the money: model Christie Brinkley. Upon seeing her Clinton stopped his motorcade Saturday afternoon and hopped out, with Larry Cockell no doubt at his side.

Clinton spent Friday and Saturday night at the home of movie director Steven Spielberg and his wife, actress Kate Capshaw. Late Saturday afternoon the Clintons attended a fundraiser hosted by conductor and homosexual activist Jonathan Sheffer. Amongst the guests at the \$5,000 per person fundraiser, the August 2 Newsday reported, were Julie Andrews and her husband, producer Blake Edwards.

Later on Saturday the Clintons made it to the home of actor Alex Baldwin and his wife, the actress Kim Basinger. "Well-known Hamptonites and presidential friends were invited to the secluded 5-acre estate," the AP reported, "including singer Billy Joel, actors Robert DeNiro, Tom Hanks and his wife, Rita Wilson, Spielberg and his wife, actress Kate Capshaw, and homemaking stylist Martha Stewart." Actor Chevy Chase made an appearance and the group "Hootie and the Blowfish" provided the musical entertainment at the biggest event of the weekend.

Some bites about who said and did what with Clinton during his Long Island weekend:

-- Setting the stage for his the big Saturday night fundraiser at his home, Alec Baldwin made clear he's trying to help Clinton overcome the Republican-fueled Lewinsky affair. Frank DiGiacomo wrote in his "The Transom" column for the August 3 New York Observer last week:

"Mr. Clinton can rest assured that Mr. Baldwin won't be bringing up Monicagate when he visits....Mr. Baldwin replied, 'My attitude about that is, I really don't care. There are rock-ribbed Republicans who are part of the Republican fabric who only have one dream' -- Mr. Baldwin said he did not mean rank-and-file Republicans, the kind he might be battling himself someday, if he enters politics -- 'that is, in Clinton, they would hope they have found their Nixon. When Clinton beat Bush, they never got over it. They hate him. They will do anything they can to smear him.'"

-- From Amagansett, New York, Washington Times reporter Paul Bedard, in the August 2 edition, quoted Baldwin as gushing:

"My wife and I, Kim and I...we believe in Hillary Clinton and in President Clinton. With all our hearts we believe in them."

-- Though reporters were barred from the Baldwin/Basinger event, the New York Daily News picked up a couple of quotes, reporting August 2: "The First Couple got a rock-star-style welcome from hundreds crammed into a white-peaked party tent on the front lawn of the 5-acre spread.

"After brief speeches, the Clintons plunged into the crowd to press the flesh -- as rock stars Hootie & the Blowfish belted out their hits. 'Even an old guy like me likes them,' joked the President.

"Flashing his trademark deadpan look, funnyman Chevy Chase refused to reveal any details of his high-priced chat with the

President. 'That's between me and the President,' he said. 'We have a lot of secrets.'

-- Popping out for Christie. All three New York tabloids on Sunday highlighted Bill Clinton's reaction when he spotted Christie Brinkley. Here's how the New York Post's Allen Salkin described the Saturday scene:

"As the day went on, just one person was able to halt the President's motorcade -- supermodel Christie Brinkley stopped Clinton's procession just by stepping out of her Sag Harbor house to wave at him as he drove by.

"Clinton hopped out and chit-chatted with Brinkley and her family about his just-completed golf game.

"Then the President posed for a few snapshots with Brinkley and her new baby, Sailor Lee, before he drove off. 'That was our baby's first photo-op,' said Brinkley's husband, Peter Cook."

And Baldwin worries about how Republicans will "smear" Clinton as a womanizer? -- Brent Baker

Clinton Clink

The Washington Times 8/6/98

Hundreds of Inside the Beltway readers, from as far away at Taiwan, are helping to decide what building, what monument, what memorial -- whatever, to rename after President Clinton.

Congress faces this difficult task now that it has finally found a federal facility -- Central Intelligence Agency headquarters -- to rename after Mr. Clinton's predecessor, George Bush.

The most popular recommendation thus far (212 in favor and counting) is to rename the towering Washington Monument the "Clinton Monument," or "Big Billy."

Go figure.

This 555-foot monumental suggestion is followed closely by renaming the Blue Plains sewage treatment facility after Mr. Clinton (100-plus votes), and in third place rename all the potties in all the parks "Clinton Depositories."

Other recommendations:

The Capital Grille to "Bill Clinton's Grand Jury Cafeteria."

The FBI crime lab to the "William Jefferson Clinton DNA Lab."

Department of Justice to "Clinton Injustice Center."

Department of Justice to the "Clinton Department of Just Us."

D.C. Jail to "Clinton Clink."

Smithsonian's first lady's evening gown collection to "Monica's Dress Display."
Old Faithful to "Old Unfaithful."
Oval Office to the "Clinton Bedroom."
Interstate 495 loop to the "Bill Curve."
D.C. General Hospital to "I Feel Your Pain Treatment Center."
Reagan National Airport baggage claim to "William Jefferson Clinton Baggage Claim."
Chinese Embassy to "Clinton Embassy."
Whitehurst Freeway to "Whitewater Freeway."
Ellipse to "Elusive."
White House fountain to "Eternal Fountain."
Chinese Laundry (9th Street NW) to "Bill's Chinese Laundry."

No happy endings

The Washington Times 8/11/98

"The House Democratic Caucus welcomed President Clinton into its midst Wednesday with a five-minute standing ovation. The lawmakers would have been better advised to throw him out of the room and demand his resignation. Clinton is to the Democratic Party what the Titanic was to its passengers. He's taking everybody down with him."

So writes political consultant John Ellis in the Boston Globe.

"Consider these facts. When Clinton was elected president, Ron Brown, then chairman of the Democratic National Committee, handed him a party apparatus that was \$5 million in the black and running like a top. Democrats controlled both houses of Congress and solid majorities of the governorships and state legislatures," Mr. Ellis said.

"All of these political advantages have been squandered in less than six years."

Mr. Ellis added: "Democrats dream of a happy ending. Clinton confesses, the country forgives, the [sex-and-lies] story goes away. But there are no happy endings in Bill Clinton's wake. And the worst is yet to come."

News blackout

The Washington Times 8/11/98

The television networks ignored Friday's report in The Washington Times that U.N. Ambassador Bill Richardson, already cleared by Congress to be the next energy secretary,

had misled lawmakers when he claimed he had offered Monica Lewinsky an actual job opening that ultimately went to someone else.

Mr. Richardson interviewed the former intern for a job at the behest of the White House. He offered her a position, which she eventually turned down. The Times story by Bill Sammon revealed that Mr. Richardson later scrambled to make it appear that there was a job opening that went to somebody else.

"Not a word Friday morning... Zilch in the evening too, though every network ran a Monicagate story," reports Brent Baker of the Media Research Center.

On Saturday, this newspaper reported that Sen. Frank H. Murkowski, Alaska Republican and chairman of the committee that approved Mr. Richardson for the energy post, asked President Clinton to delay swearing in Mr. Richardson until the committee can question him again.

That would seem to be big news, but "not a word about this development Saturday night on the broadcast networks," Mr. Baker said.

First Lady Cites Arkansas-Bashing

The Washington Post August 12, 1998

When the allegations involving her husband and Monica S. Lewinsky first arose seven months ago, first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton attributed the investigation to a "vast right-wing conspiracy." Now, she is blaming her husband's legal difficulties on anti-Arkansas bias as well.

"I think a lot of this is prejudice against our state," the first lady said in a telephone interview with the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette that was published yesterday. "They wouldn't be doing this if we were from some other state."

....the remarks offered a glimpse -- rare in recent months -- of how Hillary Clinton views the world, and her continuing strategy on questions about her husband's behavior: blame them on enemies, political, geographic or otherwise.

Former White House press secretary Dee Dee Myers said the outsider theme was a familiar refrain for the first lady. "Now it's the elite in Washington are lining up against us because we're not one of them," Myers said. "That's something that she's felt from the day they arrived in Washington."

Indeed, Hillary Clinton has been dealing with questions about her husband's fidelity since before their marriage, when she drove to Fayetteville in 1974 to help him campaign for a congressional seat and, one campaign aide recalled, he often found himself shooing an Arkansas woman out the back door when Hillary was coming in the front.

Hillary Clinton was key in helping Clinton, then campaigning for the Democratic nomination, fend

off Flowers's allegations, calling them as "trash for cash" and likening the rumors about Clinton's sex life to UFO sightings. She sat by his side during the crucial "60 Minutes" interview in which she declared that, "I'm not sitting here, some little woman, standing by my man like Tammy Wynette."

It was not until his deposition in the Paula Jones sexual harassment lawsuit nearly six years later that Clinton -- who told "60 Minutes" that his relationship with Flowers was "friendly but limited . . . a friendly acquaintance" -- acknowledged having a sexual relationship with Flowers, although he said they had only one intimate encounter.

At the same time, however, she said that -- if a president were proved to have had an adulterous liaison while in the White House, the American people "should certainly be concerned about it . . . if all that were proven true, I think that would be a very serious offense. That is not going to be proven true. I think we're going to find some other things."

Good advice

The Washington Times 8/25/98

On Aug. 6, 1974, three days before Richard Nixon resigned the presidency, the Arkansas Democrat reported:

"Bill Clinton, Democratic candidate for the 3rd Congressional District, said, 'There's nothing left to say. There's not any point now in his putting the country through an impeachment since he isn't making any pretense of innocence now.'

"Clinton said he believed the president should have stayed in office and resisted resignation if Nixon thought himself innocent. But now that the president has admitted wrongdoing, he should resign, Clinton said."

Clinton syndrome

The Washington Times 8/25/98

It's not about sex. Really.

That's what psychotherapist Jerome D. Levin writes in his new book "The Clinton Syndrome: The President and the Self-destructive Nature of Sexual Addiction."

"Sexual addictions are not about sex," writes Mr. Levin. "They are about insecurity, low self-esteem, and the need for affirmation and reassurance. At the bottom, the sex addict feels unloved and unlovable and so looks obsessively for proof that this is not so."

Mr. Levin writes that Mr. Clinton's "sexual proclivities over a lifetime were expansive and developed the strength and

persistence of a habit," and "that there were specific stresses in the president's life shortly before his alleged involvement with Monica Lewinsky that made him highly vulnerable to acting out once again his sexually addictive behavior."

Company he keeps

The Washington Times 8/25/98

One House Democrat worries that President Clinton's Hollywood friend Harry Thomason is a bad influence.

"That speech was produced and directed by a Hollywood guy," Rep. James P. Moran, Virginia Democrat, told Barron's last week, referring to the president's televised confession Aug. 17. "I like to think Clinton has more substance than that. Hanging around people like Thomason is lethal."

'Craven and cowardly'

The Washington Times 8/25/98

The real victim of the Lewinsky saga? White House secretary Betty Currie.

So said lawyer Ann Coulter on CNBC's "Rivera Live" Friday: **"The president was apparently willing to let Betty Currie take the fall for the obstruction of justice charge. ... It is so craven and cowardly, it's like a hostage holding up a baby in front of him."**

That poor girl

The Washington Times 8/25/98

Rumors of "unusual practices" -- to use NBC's Lisa Myers' phrase -- between President Clinton and Monica Lewinsky caused the Rev. Jerry Falwell to describe the Canoodler-in-Chief as "animal-like."

"No husband should be allowed to live the animal-like life that he has lived, denigrating his wife, his daughter and now, as the president of the United States, the values of all American people," Mr. Falwell said on CNN's "Both Sides With Jesse Jackson" on Sunday. "Well, I mean, if you read the paper this morning ... of what he made that poor girl do."

For the family's sake

The Washington Times 8/25/98

The tawdry details of Oval Office sexcapades that will be contained in independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr's report to Congress are the best argument for President Clinton's

resignation, Mary Matalin said Sunday on NBC's "Meet the Press."

"We all know inside the Beltway what's in that report," said the former Bush campaign operative, who is also Mrs. James Carville. "And I don't think [Mr. Clinton] wants his family to know any more about what's in that report, or the country needs to hear any more about tissue, dresses, cigars, ties, anything else. And for the sake of his family, he should resign before that report goes to Congress and he should never have to face impeachment."

Media Apologies Owed After Clinton Admits Lies: A Chronology of Embarrassing Error

Faced with the prospect of a President perjuring himself before a federal grand jury, media pundits sensed danger, and began wondering how to get Clinton out of it, composing drafts of a confessional speech to the country. But the President's August 17 admission that he lied for seven months only underscored the need for a bucket of media mea culpas. From the day the Lewinsky story first broke in The Washington Post on January 21, some in the media chose to defend the President at all costs to their reputations for accuracy * or reverence for the truth.

-- By 5 p.m. Eastern time on January 21, Newsweek's Eleanor Clift had staked out the so-what defense on MSNBC: "Well, he's been elected twice with people knowing he has had affairs. Now is the fact that this woman is 21. I mean, she's still of age, I suppose. You know, I think that the distaste that people may feel for this will also be because of the fact that the probing into this person's private life has occurred. I think past Presidents, Lyndon Johnson for one, certainly Jack Kennedy, these things went on, you know, libido and leadership are linked."

-- That night, Bryant Gumbel tried a bolder attack, asking Scott Pelley on CBS's Public Eye: "Scott, as you and I both know, a popular move these days is to make a titillating charge and then have the media create the frenzy. Given Kenneth Starr's track record, should we suspect that he's trying to do with innuendo that which he has been unable to do with evidence?"

-- On January 25, weekend Today co-host Jodi Applegate took on Gennifer Flowers just days after The Washington Post revealed that Clinton admitted having sex with Flowers in his Paula Jones deposition. Applegate insisted the audio tapes Flowers played in

1992 were doctored: "Given that all of these are still only allegations against the President, why should people believe you now, even still?" Flowers replied: "Well, in the first place, he admits the relationship took place, so I mean the truth is out." Applegate snapped: "According to The Washington Post."

-- As CNN's Impact concluded that night, Bernard Shaw warned that Clinton could be wrongly accused: "A final thought on what you have seen and heard in this edition of Impact. A breaking news story is never the full picture. Remember speculation that Middle Eastern terrorists bombed the Oklahoma City Federal Building? In fact, Americans did it. Remember first reports that Princess Diana was hounded to death by the paparazzi? In fact, we learned that the man driving her speeding limousine was drunk. And that investigation is not over. Remember Richard Jewell highly suspected in the Olympic park bombing? In fact, the FBI apologized for targeting the wrong man. And now we are in the middle of another breaking story; the President and his accusers. All the facts are not in."

-- Morning show interviews with Hillary Clinton hesitantly skimmed the surface of Lewinsky's allegations, but also suggested an innocent President. On January 27, Today co-host Matt Lauer asked: "So if what you have heard is something you can believe, and if what the President has told the nation is the whole truth and nothing but the truth, then you'd have to agree that this is the worst and most damaging smear of the twentieth century." On the 28th, ABC Good Morning America co-host Lisa McRee inquired: "What is it about your husband, Mrs. Clinton, that seems to make him a lightning rod for these types of allegations?... You've also talked about your husband's generosity and his warmth, and his, you know, his warmth with people even, you know, people he hardly knows."

-- That evening, Bryant Gumbel tossed James Carville the very definition of a softball on Public Eye: "Where does Lewinsky fit into this conspiracy theory? Is she victimizing the President or is she too a victim?"

-- NPR anchor and former weekend Today co-host Scott Simon laid another pompous commentary on Today viewers on February 1: "So over the next few weeks President Clinton's most delicate relations may not be with an independent counsel who stonewalls every turn of his life or an old intern spinning astounding stories, but with millions of Americans who've come to like and admire Bill Clinton and don't want to feel foolish for believing in him. And to be sure prosecutor Kenneth Starr has also put himself on trial."

If after all of the agony over these past few weeks it doesn't produce a single plausible actual charge against President Clinton, and probably soon, it may be the independent prosecutor who could be dismissed by the American public."

-- On the February 27 Dateline NBC, Josh Mankiewicz (son of McGovern campaign manager Frank Mankiewicz) deplored asking the Secret Service to testify: "But ever since agents began guarding Presidents after the assassination of William McKinley, the Secret Service has kept its secrets. Now the man investigating the President may want to ask agents in the White House what they know about Bill Clinton and Monica Lewinsky. And that's made a lot of current and former agents wonder who they're supposed to protect the President from * an assassin, or a character assassination?"

-- CBS Sunday Morning host Charles Osgood took out his poet's pen on February 28: "The jokes, the snickers, and the flippery/ The slope we're on is long and slippery/ And there is something in the air which this country best beware/ for there is danger in the dirt and lots of people could get hurt/ And what we sow, we someday reap/ Last night as I laid down to sleep/ I dreamed an apparition swarthy/ the unshaved ghost of Joe McCarthy."

-- On March 10, Newsweek's Jonathan Alter declared on Today: "I do think there is some value in [ex-conservative writer David Brock's] apology because it does illuminate some larger facts about our times. I think when historians look back on all this, they're gonna be less concerned about all the legal details of who said what to whom when, and more concerned about the way we drove this truck into the muck. And if David Brock, who helped drive the truck into the muck, wants to help push it out now, great."

-- CNN's Bruce Morton deplored what Monicagate was doing to the profession of politics on The World Today April 1: "Has anybody in the history of America, any President certainly, had his character so trashed, so publicly, for so long? I think the answer is no and I think Mr. Clinton is probably personally damaged by that and I think, if you were a young state representative, 28 years old, you're sitting with your wife and kids thinking: do I want to run for President someday? What are you going to say? You're going to say good grief no, look what they do to them."

-- On April 11, Eleanor Clift was still spinning for Clinton on The McLaughlin Group: "We don't live in Salem and I think the country is sick of the witch hunt. The Paula Jones case was the gateway to Miss Lewinsky. Now that the Jones case has been thrown out, I think it's going to be very difficult to go after a young

woman and try to force her to answer questions about intimate matters."

-- Bryant Gumbel took his latest shot at the scandal on the July 1 Public Eye, waving the white flag of European decadence: "Over five months have passed now since those first over-hyped reports alleged a sexual relationship between President Clinton and Monica Lewinsky. Although Mr. Clinton has denied it and nothing has been proven, the mere suspicion seems to have obsessed a good number of media people and other Americans. What some view as high scandal in our country, is barely cause for concern elsewhere. Richard Schlesinger takes a look at the French connections."

Monicagate didn't even rise to the level of a real scandal, the networks implied. On February 12, Tom Brokaw introduced: "In Depth tonight. More on the alleged White House scandal." On May 3, CNN Late Edition host Wolf Blitzer asked: "What is the White House strategy right now in dealing with all of these late breaking developments involving this so-called scandal?" The President's admission should put any of that so-called analysis to rest.

Impeachment

Clinton Not Shamed by Impeachment
3/31/99

WASHINGTON (AP) -- President Clinton said Wednesday he does not consider his impeachment ``some great badge of shame" and that he believes historians will fairly explain the political motives behind Congress' action toward him.

In an interview with CBS News, Clinton said he felt ``honored" that the impeachment gave him a chance to defend the Constitution. He said the American people clearly saw that driving the impeachment was an attempt by Republican congressional leaders to undermine the good works of his presidency.

``Those that did not agree with what I had done and were furious that it had worked and that the country was doing well, and attempted to use what should have been a constitutional and legal process for political ends, did not prevail," Clinton said.
``That's the way I saw it...."

“But I do not regard this impeachment vote as some great badge of shame. I do not,” Clinton said. “I do not believe it was warranted and I don't think it was right.”

The interview, conducted Wednesday at the White House by CBS anchor Dan Rather, yielded Clinton's most detailed assessment yet of his impeachment on charges stemming from his relationship with Monica Lewinsky. He was acquitted by the Senate in February.

The president said he never thought about resigning.

“I would never have legitimized what I believe is horribly wrong with what has occurred here over the last four or five years. So it never crossed my mind,” he said. “...I just, I prayed about it.”

He also said he has no lingering animosities toward political enemies who fed the impeachment frenzy. “I don't wake up every day mad at those people,” Clinton said.

“Any moment I spend full of anger and bitterness is a moment I am robbing from my wife or from my daughter or from my country or from my friends,” he said. “I just think that it's past us and we need to put it behind us, and we need to go on.”

“We owe that to the American people, to let it go. ... All the great players here, they need to let it go,” he said.

While the interview focused largely on the crisis in Kosovo, Clinton also discussed how first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton's ruminations on running for a Senate seat in New York and how his family is faring the wake of the Lewinsky scandal.

“Given what we've been through, we're doing reasonably well,” he said. “We're not a large family. We do love each other very much, and we work hard to support one another.”

He said he had no idea what Mrs. Clinton would decide, but that it still struck him that having a first lady run for office was “a highly unusual thing.”

“And I can imagine that many voters in New York would wonder,” he said. “And that would be a burden she would have to carry in the campaign.”

But, Clinton said, “I think if she could win an election like that, she would be magnificent.” He said he would be supportive --

although he doesn't know what the duties of a senator's husband are.

``But I'm willing to fulfill them," Clinton said.

Just an Act

The Washington Times 2/8/99

President Clinton shows no remorse for the conduct that got him impeached, according to several people who have spoken with the president recently. New York Daily News columnist Tom DeFrank wrote yesterday: "This was much to do about nothing, President Clinton recently assured an old pal, dismissing the impeachment process as a partisan cabal choreographed by his political foes.

"I beat the odds,' the president has also happily told well-wishers. According to several well-placed sources who recently have spoken with Clinton, his private demeanor is notably lacking in remorse. Privately, some of these presidential intimates worry that in his understandable relief that the impeachment ordeal is almost over, he still doesn't get it.

"There's no contrition for what he's done,' echoes another dismayed counselor who regularly speaks with the president. "That's all just an act. He's only sorry he got caught."

Byrd Believes Clinton is Guilty

WASHINGTON (AllPolitics, February 8) -- A White House spokesman responded to critical comments by Sen. Robert Byrd (D-West Virginia) on Sunday, saying President Clinton's "strong case" in his impeachment trial showed he had committed neither perjury nor obstruction of justice. Spokesman Barry Toiv's comments followed an interview broadcast Sunday in which Byrd said he had "no doubt that (the president) had given false testimony under oath and that he has misled the American people."

Byrd's comments were broadcast on ABC's "This Week" as the impeachment trial entered what could be its final week. House managers and White House lawyers are scheduled to give final arguments before the Senate beginning Monday afternoon.

"It will be very difficult to stand and say 'not guilty'. Very difficult," Byrd said. "Who's kidding whom here? I have to live with myself. I have to live with my conscience. And I have to live with the Constitution.

"I have no doubt that he has given false testimony under oath and that he has misled the American people," Byrd said. "There are indications that he did indeed obstruct justice."

But Byrd said that because conviction carries with it automatic removal from office, he also has to take into consideration "what's in the best interests of the nation."

Democrats' Unity Shows Evidence of Weakening

The Washington Times 1/7/99

The first major cracks appeared yesterday in what had seemed a united Democratic front on impeachment, with three senators leaving open the possibility they would vote to remove the president.

"I could go either way based on the evidence as I've seen it or heard it," Sen. Robert C. Byrd, West Virginia Democrat, told C-SPAN.

Sen. Bob Kerrey, a Nebraska Democrat who has been harshly critical of Mr. Clinton, told reporters that he "could vote for removal," but would prefer the Senate consider a censure motion criticizing the president.

He quickly added that he does not now believe that the charges against the president warrant removing him from office.

Another critic of the president, Sen. Bob Graham, Florida Democrat, hinted he might vote against Mr. Clinton.

Despite Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle's assertion that Democrats are "unanimous" in opposition to calling witnesses, Mr. Graham told Scripps Howard News Service that he would like a thorough trial of the president -- possibly including witnesses -- so he can weigh the charges against him of perjury and obstruction of justice.

"Impeachable offenses require there to be an abuse of the institution of government," Mr. Graham said. "To me, it is in the area of obstruction of justice that gets closest to that definition."

Mr. Byrd also differed from his colleagues in harshly attacking the president's handling of the impeachment so far. Other Democrats have criticized the president's behavior during the scandal but have been silent on his actions since being impeached.

Mr. Byrd said yesterday that the president's behavior has been tinged with "arrogance."

Holding a public rally outside the Oval Office with House Democrats just hours after being impeached "was an egregious display of shameless arrogance the like of which I don't think I have seen," Mr. Byrd said.

Rank-and-file Republicans still want Clinton to be tried

The Washington Times 12/4/98

The Republican Party's core voters across the country favor House Judiciary Committee Chairman Henry J. Hyde's tough stand in favor of a vote to impeach President Clinton.

"A substantial majority of Republican voters favor
impeaching the president," said independent pollster John
Zogby. "Likely Republican voters have always been for

impeachment."

Lydia Saad, managing editor of the Gallup Poll, notes that only "a third of the general public but a majority of rank-and-file Republicans support impeachment."

Almost all Democrats and a handful of Republicans in Congress have indicated that they favor a lesser punishment, such as censure.

Mr. Zogby noted, however, that "Republicans on the Judiciary Committee and in the full House who were re-elected [on Nov. 3] know they have a mandate for something stronger than simply censuring the president, at the very least."

Much of the media's emphasis on the general public's view of the impeachment issue is misplaced, in the view of Jay Severin, a GOP media consultant and MSNBC political analyst.

Mr. Severin is also critical of pundits and editorialists who suggest that it is in the best interests of Republicans to abandon their impeachment quest.

"The Hyde committee is doing the right thing," said Mr. Severin. "There are Republicans who

-- Continued from Front Page --

constitute an 'impeachment cult' that actually subscribes to that antique document called the Constitution. They are serving the Constitution and by doing so, they are serving their Republican base."

He said that the "mathematics of that position is a loser among the general public, but a big winner among core Republicans. If Republicans give up and let Clinton walk away with 'censure light,' Republican voters will abandon their party in 2000."

State Republican officials reveal a wide spectrum of views on the issue.

"My impression is that Kansas core Republicans want to see him impeached by the House and go to trial [in the Senate] and see if there is evidence for a guilty verdict," Kansas GOP Chairman Steve Abrams said.

Delaware GOP Chairman Basil Battaglia, however, said he sees "mixed feelings" in his state.

"Some Republicans feel you should get this thing behind us and move forward," Mr. Battaglia said. "Others feel if you can establish that the president did commit perjury, that is impeachable and the Judiciary Committee should vote articles of impeachment."

Although Louisiana GOP Chairman Mike Francis said he is "definitely for impeachment," he is "kind of disappointed" with some other Republicans in his state.

"I don't have any polling data, but my impression is you

have two groups of Republicans in Louisiana," Mr. Francis said. "Half of them, the more conservative ones, didn't vote last time [Nov. 3] because Republicans didn't have a message."

Mr. Francis described the other half of Republicans in his state as "on the moderate side, and they did vote. The half that didn't vote wants impeachment and the other half wants some other sort of punishment that doesn't go as far as impeachment."

Idaho GOP Chairman Ron McMurray said Republicans in his state "never have liked Clinton but there is not a lot of talk about impeachment. They talk more about agenda -- about intrusive government regulations, tax relief, getting Medicare and Social Security cleaned up and fixed."

When Mr. McMurray does raise the impeachment issue with core GOP voters in his state, he said they tell him that the president "ought to resign and if he won't, he ought to be impeached for perjury."

Many Republicans in Congress tend to read the polls as buttressing their view that impeachment is preferable to censure, Miss Saad said.

"Republican legislators can deal with the polls on the impeachment issue in three ways," she said. "They can look at the two-thirds of all votes who are not for impeachment and say, 'That's interesting, but I have a [constitutional] duty.'"

Or they may feel the need to be "strictly responsive to the people who live in their districts," she said, "and many Republicans may correctly see their constituents as being for impeachment."

A third way to deal with the polls is available to those House Republicans from districts with a high proportion of Democrats and independents.

These Republicans can choose to focus more on the third of the national electorate, which is Republican and tends to favor impeachment, Miss Saad said.

The Democrats' Double Standard

www.insightmag.com 10/16/98 By Jerry Zeifman

Money, the mother's milk of politics, also is the root of evil in the Democratic Party/Clinton-Gore campaign-finance labyrinth, according to a report just released by the House.

As a lifelong Democrat, I am saddened by the position being taken by my own party. I am especially concerned that President Clinton and his defenders are promulgating disinformation about Watergate, the law and the meaning of the phrase "high crimes and misdemeanors."

. . . . Democratic politicians, attorneys and law professors now openly acknowledge that the president has:

. . . . * lied to the American people for more than seven months;

. . . . * lied under oath in the Paula Jones sexual-harassment lawsuit and before a criminal grand jury;

. . . . * and apparently even lied to his own lawyer.

. . . . Clinton's defenders now argue correctly that a "high crime or misdemeanor" need not be a felony -- and that there may be some felonies that are not impeachable offenses. As a scholar of the Constitution's impeachment clause for the last 25 years I also agree with that. But in my view many of my fellow Democrats now are sullyng the Constitution by arguing that the commission of perjury by the president -- even if proved beyond a reasonable doubt -- does not rise to the level of an impeachable high crime or misdemeanor.

. . . . The current argument of Clinton's defenders is that even if

the president is a felon who committed perjury and lied about oral sex in the oval office, it is not impeachable because he perjured himself only to cover up purely personal sexual matters. In support of this argument -- using what is the most effective federally funded political-propaganda machine in our history -- some Democrats now are promulgating outright lies about the true history of the House Judiciary Committee's impeachment proceedings in 1974.

. . . . Attempting to rewrite the history of the Rep. Peter Rodino panel (to which I was chief counsel) defenders of President Clinton now cite the fact that in 1974 a majority of the House Judiciary Committee voted down an article of impeachment charging Nixon with tax evasion (a criminal offense). Democrats now are dissembling the truth by arguing that the committee concluded that his income-tax return was completely a "personal" matter and therefore was not impeachable.

. . . . The truth is that before our vote the House Ways and Means Committee had audited Nixon's tax return and reported that the return showed Nixon had improperly taken a tax deduction for donating his personal papers. But they found no evidence that Nixon had knowingly, under penalty of perjury, failed to file an honest tax return.

. . . . It simply is not true that the vote to reject the income-tax article was based on a determination that the filing of a false income-tax return was purely a "personal" matter, and therefore not impeachable. The truth is that neither the House Judiciary Committee members nor my staff had found any substantial evidence that President Nixon had committed income-tax evasion, which is a felony. If he had in fact knowingly committed tax fraud, a crime against the state, there would be no basis for considering it a purely personal matter.

. . . . As for the question of the personal accountability of the president, his defenders -- including even some Democrats

who participated in the Nixon impeachment proceedings -- now are intentionally misleading the present generation of Americans with still other disinformation regarding the true history of the Rodino committee's Nixon-impeachment proceedings.

. . . . In the summer of 1972 a group of burglars was arrested for breaking into the Watergate headquarters of the Democratic National Committee. Their presumed purpose was to gather political intelligence of value to the reelection campaign of President Nixon. All had ties either to the Nixon White House, the CIA or FBI. We were later to learn that most of the burglars, including Howard Hunt, had a history of illegal CIA-sponsored activities that dated back to prior presidencies and were committed in the name of national security -- a fact that was not made known to the public until after Nixon resigned from office rather than face impeachment by the full House of Representatives.

. . . . In the summer of 1974, preparing for the televised impeachment proceedings of the House Judiciary Committee, then-Chairman Rodino asked me to write a statement for him to open the debate. The statement that I wrote was a reflection of a political and legal strategy that was agreed upon at meetings of the committee's Democratic caucus -- which were held in my office.

. . . . In framing the issues to be resolved by Congress, the statement that I drafted -- and which Rodino eloquently delivered -- drew on a quotation from the British conservative Edmund Burke. In the House of Commons Burke successfully impeached mad King George III's minister, Warren Hastings, the governor-general of the East India Co. Burke had not impeached Hastings for the commission of a statutory crime but for acts of political corruption that offended the "morality" standards of England.

. . . . With the Hastings impeachment still pending in the House of Lords, while our founders were drafting the impeachment clause of our Constitution, Burke's morality standard was translated into American jurisprudence in the form of the "Madisonian" standard -- which does not require proof of a statutory crime.

. . . . In opening the impeachment proceedings against Nixon, Rodino invoked the words of Burke: "It is by [impeachment process] that statesmen who abuse their power are accused by statesmen, and tried by statesmen, not upon the niceties of a narrow jurisprudence, but upon the enlarged and solid principles of state morality."

. . . . Thus, Rodino made it clear that the core of the Democrats' impeachment charge against Nixon was that Nixon

had failed to meet the moral standards that are expected of those who hold high office in a democratic society.

. . . . In the summer of 1974, the Rodino committee adopted three articles of impeachment (which I had helped committee members to draft.) The core of all of Nixon's impeachable offenses was not that he had personally committed a felony. Instead, we charged him with violating his oath of office by failing to execute the laws of the United States. We also charged him with lying to the American people -- even though he had never lied under oath before a court. Similarly, prior to President Clinton, no president in our history had been charged with lying under oath.

. . . . The truth is that none of the articles charged Nixon personally with any advanced knowledge of either the Watergate break-in or with either directing or having advance knowledge of any of the illegal activities of the FBI, CIA or IRS. Indeed, we then had no evidence that President Nixon had directed or had advance knowledge of any felonies committed by any of his subordinates. Instead, we charged Nixon with being accountable for acts of his subordinates that he had not even known about when they were committed.

. . . . Contrary to the disinformation currently being promulgated by Clinton's defenders, it was not until after we voted out articles of impeachment that we learned for the first time that there was "smoking-gun" evidence that President Nixon had in fact personally committed a felony. This occurred after our impeachment vote when, in *United States v. Nixon*, the Supreme Court ordered Nixon to turn over the subpoenaed White House tapes, including the so-called "smoking gun" tape.

. . . . The tape revealed that Nixon personally had directed his chief of staff, Bob Haldeman, to press the FBI and CIA to help in the cover-up of Watergate. After the disclosure even the president's most stalwart Republican defenders agreed to change their votes and support an article of impeachment.

. . . . There now are striking differences between Watergate and the current crisis. The cancer on the Nixon presidency began in the Justice Department and the CIA and spread upward toward the Oval Office. Today there already is substantial evidence that Clinton is a felon who has committed perjury.

. . . . The Clinton cancer on the presidency began in the Oval Office when the president had sex with an intern. He then used the powers of his office to cover it up for seven months. The Clinton cancer has spread from the head down. It now is endangering both the nation and the Democratic Party.

. . . . The moral authority of the presidency is now lower than

at the time of Watergate. Many Democrats now have a double standard -- refusing to apply the same constitutional principles to Clinton that we applied to Nixon in 1974.

. . . . At the same time Clinton's defenders are charging the Republicans with unfairness and prejudgment. Yet the truth is that even before we began any impeachment inquiry in 1973, 84 Democrats introduced actual im-peachment resolutions on the House floor. In contrast, to date no Republican has introduced such a resolution. Instead the Republicans simply have called for an inquiry.

. . . . None of us can be certain how history will regard the present crisis. Yet, it seems likely to me that our descendants will regard President Clinton as the most morally flawed president in our history -- and our Democratic Party of 1998 as afflicted by the deadly sin of hypocrisy.

. . . .

Jerry Zeifman was chief counsel of the House Judiciary Committee at the time of the Nixon impeachment proceedings and is a former professor of law at the University of Santa Clara.

"Don't tamper with this jury, Mr. President"

<http://www.salonmagazine.com>

Robert Byrd's warning to back off on anti-impeachment lobbying sends the White House spin machine into gear, denying Clinton's role in the controversy.

BY MURRAY WAAS | President Clinton himself was the source of a controversial proposal to recruit at least 34 Democratic senators to declare that they would not vote to convict Clinton of any impeachment charges lodged by the House, according to congressional and administration sources. The account by these sources directly contradicts White House assertions that the proposal originated on Capitol Hill.

The White House has attempted to distance the president from the proposal in recent days, after influential Sen. Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., strongly questioned the political and constitutional propriety of any such action. But congressional and administration sources have told Salon that it was Clinton himself who put forth the proposal in a conversation with Senate Democratic Leader Thomas Daschle, D-S.D., two weeks ago.

Daschle spokeswoman Ranit Schmelzer declined to comment on any private conversations between the senator and the president. A White House spokesman did not return telephone calls.

If the House of Representatives were to vote articles of impeachment against Clinton, members of the Senate would then serve as a jury in considering those charges. At least two thirds, or 67 of the 100 senators, would have to vote for the conviction of Clinton for him to be removed from office. By recruiting 34 senators to back him against any future impeachment vote, Clinton was apparently hoping to short-circuit the impeachment process entirely, sending a message to the House that no matter what its findings, ultimately they would be disregarded.

Last Wednesday, Byrd denounced the proposal from the Senate floor, likening the White House lobbying of senators to "jury tampering":

"Senators may at some point have to sit as jurors in this matter, and will be required to take an oath before they do so," Byrd said. "This oath will be incumbent upon every senator should Articles of Impeachment come to this chamber. Here it is: 'I solemnly swear that in all things appertaining to the trial of the impeachment now pending I will do impartial Justice according to the Constitution and laws: So help me God.'"

Then Byrd forcefully added: "I would suggest by way of friendly advice to the White House: Don't tamper with this jury. Don't tamper with this jury.

"[And] my friendly words of advice to my colleagues are these: We may have to sit as jurors. Don't let it be said that we allowed ourselves to be tampered with, no matter who attempts the tampering."

There is no specific legal prohibition against a president lobbying senators who might serve as a jury in an impeachment inquiry, and White House officials point out that impeachment is a unique process, one that is both political and legal. Legal

experts question the ethical and constitutional propriety of any such activity, however.

Even though Byrd's comments received little media attention, they generated great concern at an already besieged White House, administration officials said. As a 40-year veteran of the Senate, former Senate majority leader and current ranking minority member on the powerful Senate Appropriations Committee, Byrd is certain to play a formidable role in any trial of the president. Because of his influence on other members, his position regarding impeachment could prove to be decisive in any close vote to remove Clinton from office.

Last week, White House officials began damage control by claiming Clinton had never in fact put forth the proposal to recruit the 34 senators to short-circuit any impeachment before it began. Administration officials asserted that the proposal originated not with Clinton, but with an unidentified Democratic senator who first suggested the proposal in a conversation with the president. They also claimed that the proposal was never a serious one to begin with.

But congressional and administration officials told Salon that some White House officials had made misleading statements to the press and public about the proposal. Some officials suggested that Clinton might even have misled his own staff regarding conversations that he had with some on Capitol Hill about the proposal.

One senior administration official told Salon that the White House is planning to reach out to Byrd and show him that it is taking no steps to go forward with the controversial proposal. "He is right on point," said the official. "And we want to assure him that this is something that we are no longer going to do, and that there are some grown-ups around."

A second senior White House official said: "We're being very deferential to both the House and the Senate as this process goes forward."

Administration officials told Salon that Clinton did not consult with his senior staff, including political aides and legal counsel, before discussing the proposal with Daschle and others on Capitol Hill: "If the president had asked anyone, he would have been told that preempting the impeachment process this way might in and of itself constitute an article of impeachment. From a legal vantage point, it was not a smart move," said a senior administration official. As for the political consequences of the proposal, the same official said: "We've already seen what they are."

The official also added, almost as an afterthought: "We shouldn't have lied about it. We should have just admitted that we made a mistake so that we could move on ... Now back to the chaos."
SALON | Oct. 13, 1998

White House might seek a Shutdown
The Washington Times 10/5/98

White House officials are prepared to force a government shutdown if it will distract from the president's impeachment woes, Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott says.

"They basically have told me, 'We'll wait and see. If it's to our advantage to shut down the government, we will. If it's not, we won't,'" the Republican leader said yesterday on ABC's "This Week."

Mr. Lott declined to identify the person who told him that. "I'd rather not mention a particular name because he still has to work with us next week," the Mississippi Republican said.

"I think it's a very serious allegation, and I'm very disturbed about the ability to work with this White House. It's a matter of trust, and I'm not sure that, you know, as majority leader now, I can trust their actions."

There's much uncertainty about whether Congress will be able to adjourn for the year Friday, as it wants to do, because the House and Senate have completed work on only four of the 13 bills needed to fund government programs in fiscal 1999. Legislation in effect would keep the government operating through Friday.

President Clinton has threatened to veto seven of the nine appropriations bills that remain outstanding, which include

controversial language on such issues as abortion, the environment and statistical sampling in the census for 2000.

Linda Ricci, spokeswoman for the White House budget office, said of Mr. Lott's comments: "The administration has been very clear we do not seek or advocate a shutdown. A shutdown is not necessary and can be avoided if the Republicans will respond appropriately to our concerns about key issues that matter to the American people, like education and the environment."

Sid's fingerprints

The Washington Times 9/18/98

Scarcely had Salon magazine exposed Illinois Republican Rep. Henry Hyde's extramarital affair of 30 years ago than ABC News reported: "Two reporters have told ABC news that a senior White House official has peddled a story to them that Mr. Hyde once had a girlfriend.

"Another reporter said the official was offering stories about sexual escapades by Republican House members."

On Wednesday, ABC News didn't name the "senior White House official" who was supposed to be peddling that story, but last week the Weekly Standard identified a leading suspect.

Reporting on smears against Rep. Paul McHale, Pennsylvania Democrat, and Rep. Dan Burton, Indiana Republican, the Weekly Standard's David Tell wrote in the Sept. 8 issue that "a reporter we know got a telephone call from a high-level White House official who suggested that the reporter take a look at the sexual practices of still another prominent congressional Republican.

"Paul McHale, for his part, thinks he knows who's running this disgusting operation. 'I suspect this individual is a nationally known figure very close to the president,' he says. 'I have a very good idea who it is.'

"So do we. The man who called our reporter acquaintance was Sidney Blumenthal."

Small World

The Washington Times 9/17/98

John Whitehead, president of the Rutherford Institute and co-counsel in the Paula Jones sexual harassment suit against President Clinton, says he and Mr. Clinton go way back -- to February 1974, when Mr. Whitehead was a student at the University of Arkansas School of Law in Fayetteville and Mr. Clinton was an associate professor there.

In fact, Mr. Whitehead conducted what he believes to be Mr. Clinton's first press interview, for an article in a leftist local newspaper.

"At the time, Mr. Clinton was preparing to challenge the incumbent Republican congressman, though he had not officially announced his candidacy. We met several times over a few weeks and discussed his views -- sometimes in a bar and once at his home, where he made dinner for me and my wife," Mr. Whitehead said in an opinion piece in the New York Times.

President Nixon was in dire straits at the time, and Mr. Whitehead asked the young Mr. Clinton what he thought the definition of impeachment should be.

"I think that the definition should include any criminal acts plus a willful failure of the president to fulfill his duty to uphold and execute the laws of the United States," Mr. Clinton replied. "[Another] factor that I think constitutes an impeachable offense would be willful, reckless behavior in office; just totally incompetent conduct of the office and the disregard of the necessities that the office demands. Law and order, for example."

Clinton Denial Cost Taxpayers \$4.4M

USA Today 9/15/98

President Clinton's denial in January of a sexual relationship with Monica Lewinsky cost taxpayers at least \$4.4 million, according to independent counsel Kenneth Starr. The figure is Starr's preliminary estimate of what his office spent over the past eight months investigating the Lewinsky affair and alleged cover-up. The figure may haunt Clinton in the future. Some Republicans are considering a possible demand by Congress that the president pay restitution to cover some of the costs of the investigation as a form of punishment that might also include a vote of censure.

Lawmakers Tell Clinton Not to Split Legal Hairs

The Washington Times 9/14/98

Congressional Democrats urged President Clinton yesterday to drop his legalistic denial of perjury and instead try to reach some kind of a plea agreement with the House Judiciary Committee to avoid impeachment.

"If you come and say that to the American people -- that 'I'm legally correct, I didn't have sexual relations with Monica Lewinsky,' --you're going to lose," Sen. Bob Kerrey, Nebraska Democrat, said on CBS' "Face the Nation" yesterday.

Rep. Barney Frank, Massachusetts Democrat, complained that Mr. Clinton "lies by being technically accurate. I wish he would stop it. I wish he would have learned that 'I didn't inhale' ... is just not worthy of him and everybody sees through it.

"He's not 14 anymore trying to outsmart the principal."

Starr Continues Whitewater Investigation

The Washington Times 9/14/98

Kenneth W. Starr's case for impeaching President Clinton is only the first public accounting in a massive ongoing investigation --contrary to White House claims that the Whitewater probe is dead.

"All phases of the investigation are now nearing completion," the 445-page report says.

The independent counsel "will soon make final decisions about what steps to take, if any, with respect to the other information it has gathered."

While it was Mr. Starr's "strong desire" to complete the entire Whitewater inquiry before giving any information to Congress, the report said, it "became apparent" there was "substantial and credible information" of impeachable offenses and he was required under the law to refer the information to Congress as soon as possible.

"It also became apparent that a delay of this referral until the evidence from all phases of the investigation had been evaluated would be unwise," the report said.

Mr. Starr will soon make decisions on final reports to a three-judge panel of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit and possible indictments, the report added.

Mr. Clinton's personal attorney, David E. Kendall, attacked the Monica Lewinsky report this week as a "hit-and-run smear campaign," saying it was nothing but an attempt to damage the president with "irrelevant and unnecessary graphic and salacious allegations." He asked, "Where's Whitewater?"

But the report's introduction notes that Mr. Starr's four-year Whitewater probe, all but forgotten in the crush of sordid public revelations of Mr. Clinton's sexual dalliances with the former White House intern, continues to target a number of areas:

Legal representation of a failed Arkansas thrift, Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan Association, and a real estate project, Castle Grande, by first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton and former Rose Law Firm partner Webster L. Hubbell, the ex-associate attorney general who resigned in disgrace.

The firing of seven White House travel office employees to make room for Clinton cronies, and the role Mrs. Clinton may have played in the decision.

The delivery to the White House of more than 1,000 secret FBI files on Reagan and Bush administration aides, and efforts to shield White House officials, including Mrs. Clinton, from a public accounting on how the files were obtained and used.

The misuse of personnel records of Pentagon employee Linda R. Tripp, whose secret recordings of conversations with Miss Lewinsky began the grand jury investigation.

Possible perjury and obstruction of justice concerning an incident involving former White House volunteer Kathleen E. Willey. Mrs. Willey said in August 1997 that Mr. Clinton made sexual advances in the Oval Office in November 1993.

The Starr report to Congress said Miss Lewinsky told the president Newsweek was working on an article about Mrs. Willey. Mr. Clinton dismissed the accusations as "ludicrous, because he would never approach a small-breasted woman like Mrs. Willey." Later he asked Miss Lewinsky if she had heard about the Newsweek inquiry from Mrs. Tripp, to which she replied "yes."

The former intern said Mr. Clinton asked if Mrs. Tripp

could be trusted and then told her to persuade Mrs. Tripp to call White House Deputy Counsel Bruce R. Lindsey about the matter. Newsweek published the Willey story on Aug. 11, 1997. In his Jan. 17 deposition in the Paula Jones case, Mr. Clinton denied the Willey accusation.

The Starr probe also is looking into accusations that efforts were made to silence Mrs. Willey. Among those drawing attention is Democratic fund-raiser Nathan Landow. Investigators want to know if he urged Mrs. Willey to deny she was groped by the president. Mrs. Willey has since testified before the Lewinsky grand jury as a cooperating witness.

Mr. Landow testified before the grand jury, later telling reporters he took the Fifth Amendment. His daughter, former White House volunteer Harolyn Cardozo, who worked with Mrs. Willey, also testified.

In "Travelgate" and "Filegate," papers filed earlier this month in federal court in Washington show the investigations "are continuing and in extremely sensitive stages." Deputy independent counsel Robert Bittman told the court the probes had reached to the "highest level of the federal government" and involved "issues of singular constitutional and historic importance."

The Whitewater probe also is examining whether Mr. Hubbell hid his involvement and that of Mrs. Clinton with Castle Grande, a real estate project south of Little Rock, Ark.

In September 1996, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. said Mrs. Clinton and Mr. Hubbell drafted legal papers that Madison used to deceive bank examiners and divert \$300,000 to Mr. Hubbell's father-in-law, Seth Ward. The report said the papers "facilitated the payment of substantial commissions to Mr. Ward, who acted as a straw buyer" in Castle Grande. A straw buyer is one who owns property in name only, having never put up any money or assumed any risk.

The FDIC said the Ward payments were in violation of

federal regulations. The report did not accuse Mrs. Clinton or Mr. Hubbell of criminal wrongdoing, although it raised serious questions about their involvement in a deal that ultimately cost taxpayers \$3.8 million when Castle Grande failed.

Prosecutors, the report to Congress said, immediately recognized parallels between the job help provided to Miss Lewinsky by Washington lawyer Vernon E. Jordan Jr., a longtime Clinton friend, and "his earlier relationship" with Mr. Hubbell, sentenced in 1994 to prison for stealing \$420,000 from his Rose Law Firm partners. By late 1997, Mr. Starr had evidence Mr. Jordan helped Mr. Hubbell obtain consulting contracts after he agreed to cooperate in the Whitewater probe.

In 1994, Mr. Hubbell was paid \$450,010 by 17 different persons or entities as a consultant and \$91,750 in 1995, despite beginning a 28-month prison term in August of that year. He has yet to explain what work he did for the cash.

Some of the payments came from MacAndrews & Forbes Holding Co. in New York after he was introduced to the firm's executives by Mr. Jordan, a director of Revlon Inc. The cosmetics firm, controlled by MacAndrews & Forbes, also offered a job to Miss Lewinsky based on Mr. Jordan's recommendations.

With regard to Mrs. Tripp's personnel records, Mr. Starr has been investigating if they were illegally released in an effort to tarnish her reputation in the Lewinsky probe. Assistant Defense Secretary Kenneth Bacon approved the release to a reporter for the New Yorker magazine. The records show Mrs. Tripp was detained by police as a teen-ager 29 years ago and had not noted the arrest in her 1987 security clearance form.

The arrest later was shown to have been a teen-age prank, in which she pleaded guilty to a reduced charge of loitering.

Former White House Deputy Chief of Staff Harold Ickes was questioned about the documents by the grand jury. Mr. Bacon also testified in the case.

Graphic Report Describes Sex Encounters

USA Today 9/11/98

WASHINGTON - Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr told Congress there are 11 grounds for impeaching President Clinton, including perjury and obstruction of justice, for his effort to conceal his affair with Monica Lewinsky. In a dramatic report to Congress released today, Starr said Clinton "pursued a strategy of deceiving the American people and

Congress" for seven months.

The report, made public by a House vote, specifically accused Clinton of obstruction of justice, witness tampering, abuse of his presidential powers and perjury - both in his grand jury appearance last month and in his sworn deposition last January in the Paula Jones lawsuit.

The White House countered even before the report was released, sending a rebuttal to Congress that declared Starr's document represented prosecutors' conclusions only and that Clinton's conduct did not warrant impeachment. It denied each charge the prosecutors were expected to lodge against the president.

The release of Starr's report marks the start of a dramatic and likely lengthy impeachment battle in Congress, one Clinton vowed to fight vigorously at a morning prayer breakfast today.

"The president has pursued a strategy of deceiving the American people and Congress since January 1998, delaying and impeding the criminal investigation for seven months and deceiving the American people and Congress in August 1998," the report said.

The report's introduction lays out the prosecutors' case against the president: "President Clinton lied under oath at a civil deposition while he was a defendant in a sexual harassment lawsuit; lied under oath to a grand jury attempted to obstruct justice by facilitating a witness' plan to refuse to comply with a subpoena ... lied to potential grand jury witnesses knowing that they would repeat those lies before the grand jury; and engaged in a pattern of conduct that was inconsistent with his constitutional duty to faithfully execute the laws."

It alleges that Clinton and Ms. Lewinsky had an understanding that they would lie under oath in the Jones case about their relationship and that Clinton tried to obstruct justice by suggesting that Ms. Lewinsky file an affidavit so that "she would not be deposed, she would not contradict his testimony and he could attempt to avoid questions."

In its 73-page rebuttal, the White House countered: "We do not believe the OIC (Office of Independent Counsel) can identify any conduct remotely approaching" the impeachment standard.

"Instead from press reports, if true, it appears that the OIC has dangerously overreached to describe in the most dramatic of terms conduct that not only is not criminal but is actually proper and lawful," the White House rebuttal added. It was written by Clinton attorney David Kendall and White House Counsel Charles Ruff and their associates.

The Starr report discloses for the first time that DNA tests conducted by the FBI almost indisputably determined that semen found on one of Ms. Lewinsky's dresses matched a DNA sample provided by Clinton, placing astronomical odds that it could have been anyone else.

And it lays out in graphic terms several sexual episodes between Ms. Lewinsky and the president, alleging from Ms. Lewinsky's account that they had oral sex as he talked several times on the telephone to members of Congress, and that in one encounter an unlit cigar was used as a prop.

Prosecutors said they were providing such graphic detail to prove their case that Clinton lied before the grand jury when he insisted he gave "legally accurate" testimony in January when he claimed he did not have "sexual relations" with Ms. Lewinsky.

Clinton's argument was based on the fact that the two never engaged in intercourse and that the definition he was given did not include oral sex. Prosecutors declare in the report the definition was clearly meant to encompass numerous types of sexual contacts - such as those he engaged in with Ms. Lewinsky.

Prosecutors also sought to prove that Clinton intended to lie from the beginning when the Lewinsky story erupted, citing testimony from political adviser Dick Morris.

Morris testified that Clinton summoned him the night the controversy erupted and asked him to do an instant poll to see if he could tell the truth about an affair. When Morris told the president the polls showed he couldn't tell the truth and survive, Morris claims the president told him "well we'll just have to win."

It also argues the president intentionally gave false information to his aides knowing that it would then be passed on to the grand jury. As one example, it says Clinton told deputy chief of staff John Podesta he specifically did not have oral sex with Ms. Lewinsky.

The report accuses Clinton of violating the public trust.

"In view of the enormous trust and responsibility attendant to his high office, the president has a manifest duty to ensure that his conduct at all times complies with the law of the land," it said. "In sum, perjury and acts that obstruct justice by any citizen - whether in a criminal case, a grand jury investigation, a congressional hearing, a civil trial, or civil discovery - are profoundly serious matters. When such acts are committed by the president of the United States, we believe those acts 'may constitute grounds for an impeachment.'"

Watergate, Clinton Scandal Similar

CNN Interactive 9/10/98

The last time Congress considered whether to move toward impeaching a president, it acted on its own.

There was no "Starr report" or even anyone playing the role of Kenneth Starr, providing lawmakers with 36 boxes of "substantial and credible" evidence of possible impeachable offenses.

The year was 1974, the president was Richard M. Nixon and the charges grew out of a political act an election year break-in at the offices of the opposition party. Twenty-four years later, the triggering act was personal and sexual the liaison between Bill Clinton and an intern.

Some other differences:

Nixon refused to accept that he had done anything wrong, blamed aides and ruled out an apology. This time, President Clinton has moved from seven months of denial to admitting a relationship "that was not appropriate" to Wednesday's abject confession, "I let you down. I let my family down. I let this country down."

Nixon was unpopular, with an approval rating of 25 percent, and overseeing a sour economy, with inflation and unemployment both up. Clinton, with a job approval rating holding steady around 60 percent, has been presiding over a robust economy. In the spring of 1974, 48 percent in a poll favored Nixon's removal from office; late last month, 24 percent of those polled supported the impeachment of Clinton.

But at this stage the big difference is procedural. In 1974, Congress had to investigate Nixon by itself and decide whether "high crimes and misdemeanors" had been committed. An independent counsel, Texas lawyer Leon Jaworski, was investigating Nixon, but he functioned as an arm of the Justice Department and his charge was to catch criminals and put them on trial. He decided he couldn't indict a sitting president.

Unlike Starr today, Jaworski refused to share his grand jury findings with Congress. "We are bound by the rules of secrecy," he said.

Starr is a special prosecutor, independent of the Justice Department, required by law to provide what he learns to Congress about acts that could justify impeachment. His job was created in 1978, an outgrowth of Watergate.

Congress, under Democratic control and investigating a Republican president, dug into Watergate over two summers. In 1973, Sen. Sam Ervin's Senate Watergate Committee conducted hearings that absorbed a nation. Its chief contribution was to uncover the existence of Nixon's 3,700 hours of secretly tape-recorded conversations.

The following year, the House Judiciary Committee, having received proposed impeachment resolutions, had to decide whether to act.

Then and now, lawmakers vowed bipartisanship. On Wednesday, House Speaker Newt Gingrich said the process is "a constitutional crisis that requires judgment that is based in fact," not politics. The Democratic leader, Dick Gephardt, said, "We have to do it objectively, fairly and in a nonpartisan way."

In Nixon's day, bipartisanship was pledged too. The committee allowed Nixon's personal lawyer, James St. Clair, to argue his case behind closed doors. House Judiciary Committee Chairman Peter Rodino, D-N.J., determined to show a watching nation that the undertaking was not a witch hunt, allowed each member to have 15 minutes to speak his heart.

"I am one who has agonized over this particular inquiry," said Rep. Tom Railsback, R-Ill.

Said Rep. Walter Flowers, D-Ala., "I wake up nights ... wondering if this could not be some sordid dream."

Said Rep. M. Caldwell Butler, R-Va., "It is a sad chapter in American history, but I cannot condone what I have heard, I cannot excuse it, and I cannot and will not stand for it."

But bipartisanship vanished when the congressmen started voting on proposed articles of impeachment. Three were approved with almost all the Democrats in support, almost all the Republicans in opposition.

The most serious, charging Nixon with misusing the Internal Revenue Service, wiretapping, authorizing a privately financed investigative unit in the White House ("the plumbers") and interfering with the FBI, CIA, Justice Department and special prosecutor, was approved 28-10. Seven Republicans joined 21 Democrats in supporting it. No Democrats opposed it.

Little more than a week later, none of that mattered. The Supreme Court ruled that Nixon had to give up one last batch of 64 tapes. Certain of being removed from office if he defied the high court, he complied.

One tape the "smoking gun" showed him to be a cover-up conspirator. Even the Republicans who had defended Nixon broke with him and, one by one, announced they would support impeachment. Four days later, in the final chapter, Nixon resigned. The end of Clinton's saga awaits.

Minority Vote

The Washington times 9/11/98

Scott Grimm, an Inside the Beltway reader from Jacksonville, Fla., has followed with interest our references in

this column to President Clinton's poll numbers and whether they can be relied on.

"I would like to recall to you a phone call I received several weeks ago," he writes. "It was early evening, about 6:30 p.m. A lady identified herself as a pollster for NBC and another news agency whose name I can't remember.

"She asked if I approved of the president's domestic policy. I replied no, I didn't. She then asked if I approved of the president's foreign policy. I refrained from asking what foreign policy? I again replied no, I didn't.

"She then asked if I approved of the way the president was running the country, and I also replied no, I didn't. She hesitated for a moment, then said oh, she had all the responses she needed from men and wouldn't need any more from me.

"I told her that my wife was nearby if she would care to ask her the same questions. She said no, she'd have to call another household. It was very obvious from her reaction to my non-approval of Clinton that my answers were unacceptable.

...

"I don't believe for one minute the polls showing Clinton having high approval numbers. My experience tells me they aren't looking for the real mood of the public, they're grasping for straws to cushion Clinton's fall."

Grovel factor

The Washington Times 9/11/98

"The world is a very weird place, indeed -- rather like Oprah-land or Jerry Springerville -- when allies suggest the president's hold on power depends on how much he grovels, how close he comes to tears and whether the American people pity him," writes Deborah Orin of the New York Post.

"More ominously, even the ultra-loyalist Dems who met with Clinton sounded hesitant and sad as they insisted he can survive. It was a red-alert warning for Clinton that none of the hand-picked Democrats who met with him [Wednesday] would say one word against [independent counsel Kenneth W.] Starr," Miss Orrin said.

"In Watergate, Nixon was a goner when Republicans began refusing to defend him. One senior Democrat [Wednesday] predicted that more than half the House Democrats are now likely to vote to impeach the president."

Impeachable Offenses Spelled Out

The Washington Times 9/11/98

Kenneth W. Starr's report to Congress documents a dozen impeachable offenses by President Clinton, including evidence he lied in the Paula Jones case and before a Washington grand jury concerning his affair with Monica Lewinsky.

As details of Mr. Starr's report emerged, the Lewinsky grand jury met and focused on suspected co-conspirators in what prosecutors believe was a White House plan to help conceal the Lewinsky affair. The continuing probe, according to sources close to the case, could lead to the indictment of White House officials and others suspected of taking part in efforts to obstruct justice, suborn perjury or tamper with witnesses.

Lawyers familiar with the investigation said the 445-page report, delivered on Wednesday by the independent counsel's office to Speaker Newt Gingrich, lists "substantial and credible" evidence that could bolster possible impeachment hearings against the president before the House Judiciary Committee.

The closely guarded report, whose release was debated on Capitol Hill Thursday, lays out a case against the president on charges he committed perjury, suborned perjury from others, tampered with grand jury witnesses, obstructed justice and abused the power of the presidency by using White House lawyers and others in an attempt to cover up the affair.

The report concludes, among other things, that Mr. Clinton perjured himself when he testified under oath Jan. 17 in the Jones sexual misconduct lawsuit that he never had a sexual relationship with Miss Lewinsky and when he said he did not recall ever being alone with her in the White House. He also is said to have lied to the Lewinsky grand jury concerning his relationship with the former intern.

In the Jones deposition, Mr. Clinton was asked if he had an extramarital affair with Miss Lewinsky, to which he replied, "No." Asked if it would be a lie if the former White House intern had told someone she had sexual relations with the president beginning in November 1995, he said, "It's certainly not the truth. It would not be the truth."

"I have never had sexual relations with Monica Lewinsky. I've never had an affair with her," he testified. Mr. Starr's report, which is to be released Friday, also said Mr. Clinton did not tell the truth when he testified in the Jones case he had "no specific recollection" of ever being alone with Miss Lewinsky in the White House.

The report, written as a narrative, also says Mr. Clinton perjured himself when he testified in the Jones case that he did not remember ever giving gifts to Miss Lewinsky.

The exchange of gifts and their later retrieval has figured prominently in Mr. Starr's probe. Miss Lewinsky has testified that Mr. Clinton's personal secretary, Betty Currie, showed up at her Watergate apartment to collect the gifts after the former intern had been subpoenaed to testify in the Jones case.

The report describes numerous conversations Mr. Clinton had with Mrs. Currie after Miss Lewinsky had been subpoenaed in the Jones case, including a talk the president had with his secretary after his deposition.

At that meeting, he is said to have given Mrs. Currie a friendly reminder that he was never alone with the former intern in the White House. That would be in conflict with Mr. Clinton's acknowledgment seven months later that he had been involved sexually with Miss Lewinsky.

The report also addresses several meetings Miss Lewinsky had with the president at the White House, beginning as early as July 1997, when accusations first began to surface that White House volunteer Kathleen E. Willey would charge that Mr. Clinton improperly touched her during a White House meeting.

Mrs. Willey had been identified as a potential witness in the Jones case.

The Washington grand jury has been investigating a number of explicit sexual encounters Miss Lewinsky said she had with Mr. Clinton over an 18-month period after she joined the White House staff in 1995 as a 21-year-old unpaid intern. She testified that the relationship included oral sex and instances when the president is said to have caressed the young woman's breasts.

The investigation has centered on accusations by Miss Lewinsky that Mr. Clinton and others told her to lie about the affair in the Jones case.

Mr. Clinton has denied the accusation. His personal attorney, David E. Kendall, has said Mr. Starr's report "represents only the prosecutor's allegations, which we have been denied an opportunity to review. We do know this: There is no basis for an impeachment."

The grand jury investigation into suspected co-conspirators is said to have focused on:

White House Deputy Counsel Bruce R. Lindsey, the president's closest adviser, who is believed to have been actively involved in damage-control efforts in the Lewinsky matter. Mr. Lindsey refused to answer grand jury questions about conversations he had with Mr. Clinton about Miss Lewinsky but has since been ordered by a federal appeals court to testify.

Washington lawyer Vernon E. Jordan Jr., who has acknowledged helping Miss Lewinsky find a job in New York after she had been subpoenaed to testify in the Jones suit. Mr. Jordan has denied any wrongdoing in connection with his job search and has said he never told anyone to lie in the Jones case.

Mr. Starr was given permission in January by Attorney General Janet Reno and a three-judge federal appeals court panel to expand his Whitewater investigation to include accusations by Miss Lewinsky on 20 hours of secretly-recorded audiotapes that she had an affair with Mr. Clinton and that he and others told her to lie about it in the Jones case.

The court, in a Jan. 16 order, said Mr. Starr could target for indictment "any person or entity who has engaged in unlawful conspiracy or has aided or abetted any federal offense" in the Lewinsky matter. His report contains an introduction, a narrative and a listing of the grounds for impeachment.

Mr. Starr noted in a cover letter to Mr. Gingrich and House Minority Leader Richard A. Gephardt

that the report included grand jury information and material that could be sexually explicit in its content.

"Many of the supporting materials contain information of a personal nature that I respectfully urge the House to treat as confidential," wrote Mr. Starr.

Clinton Apologizes, Plans to Repent

USA Today 9/11/98

President Clinton offered a solemn apology before dozens of religious leaders at the White House Friday. In his thoughts, he included Monica Lewinsky and her family, noting that he regretted having an improper relationship and lying about it. "I don't think there is a fancy way to say that I have sinned," he said. "It is important to me that everybody who has been hurt know that the sorrow that I feel is genuine - first and most important my family, also my friends, my staff my cabinet, Monica Lewinsky and her family and the American people." The president also noted that he has a broken spirit and hopes that genuine repentance and a strong heart will help him and his family through this ordeal.

In Closing

The Washington Times 9/14/98

Exhibit 1:"The president has pursued a strategy of deceiving the American people and Congress since January 1998, delaying and impeding the criminal investigation for seven months and deceiving the American people and Congress in August 1998."

--Independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr, in a report to Congress accusing President Clinton of obstruction of justice, witness tampering, abuse of his presidential powers and perjury -- evidence that may constitute grounds for an impeachment.

Exhibit 2:"Impeachment should apply to those offenses which proceed from the misconduct of public men or, in other words, from the abuse or violation of some public trust. They are of a nature which may with peculiar propriety be

denominated political, as they relate chiefly to injuries done immediately to society itself."

--Hillary Rodham and the Democratic staff of the House Judiciary Committee, 1974, quoting from Alexander Hamilton in one of the Federalist Papers.

Part-time president

The Washington Times 10/7/98

While President Clinton continues to lambaste the "do-nothing Republican Congress," the GOP is firing back, calling Mr. Clinton "the part-time president.

As of Oct. 5, Mr. Clinton had spent all or part of 152 of the 278 days this year at fund-raising events, overseas, on vacation or at scenic "photo opportunities" outside Washington, the Republican National Committee charges.

"Come home, Mr. President," said Republican Chairman Jim Nicholson. "You criticize Congress for not doing its work when you're the one who's been AWOL. You relentlessly criticized President Bush for his overseas travels, then proceeded to break his travel record. You accuse the Republican Congress of something which you are guilty of. It only highlights your lack of work on the people's business."

USA Today Survey

This page was last updated on Thursday, March 04, 1999, at 11:22AM. It is dynamically updated every minute, reload often for the latest tally of votes.

1. Did this interview change your thoughts about Lewinsky?

33% 909 No, I still feel the same about her.
32% 867 Yes, I am more sympathetic for her.
29% 785 Yes, I am less sympathetic for her.
6% 153 I didn't watch the interview.

2. Did this interview change your thoughts about President Clinton?

52% 1403 No, I still feel the same about him.
37% 991 Yes, I am less sympathetic for him.
6% 164 Yes, I am more sympathetic for him.
5% 139 I didn't watch the interview.

3. How did this interview affect your thinking on President Clinton's impeachment trial?

44% 1180 I'm convinced more than ever that he should have been removed from office.
29% 772 It had no impact on my thinking.
14% 384 I'm convinced more than ever that he should remain in office.
9% 239 I lean a little more toward removal from office.
4% 107 I lean a little more toward supporting the decision to not remove him from office.

Total votes cast: 2714

Cooking up a verdict down in Arkansas

The Washington Times 4/15/99

Bill Clinton and his friends came through yesterday for Susan McDougal. She got a mistrial on two counts in Little Rock, and an acquittal on a lesser charge.

The verdict, and how it came about, would stink up the courthouse anywhere else, but in Arkansas all the funny stuff -- intimidation of federal judges, tampering with the jury -- is regarded only as innocent coincidences.

Mzz McDougal was charged with obstruction and criminal contempt for refusing to testify to the Whitewater grand juries. She said she refused because she was afraid Ken Starr would charge her with perjury unless she implicated her old friends Bill and Hillary. The logic of this reasoning is not clear, since Mr. Starr then charged her with contempt and obstruction, and put her on trial, anyway.

Most people assumed that her loyalty to the state's most celebrated boar was the price of a presidential pardon, and maybe they were right. If so, the verdict yesterday makes it moot. But others said no, Mzz McDougal was merely paying a spurned woman's tribute to the remembrance of flings past. Her late husband, Jim McDougal, thought Susan was ol' Bill's sometimes doxy.

The known facts are clear enough. Mzz McDougal testified at her latest trial that she just didn't remember much about what she did as an officer of Madison Savings and Loan, which financed the Clintons' real-estate scam. The president said he never borrowed money from the McDougals' S&L, but this was said under oath, so he may not have intended for anyone to take him seriously. But then prosecutors produced a cashier's check from the S&L payable to "Bill Clinton," and handwritten notes from Madison S&L files make references to a loan to "Bill Clinton." Mzz McDougal helped pay off the Clinton loan, writing a \$5,081 check in 1983. She testified that she didn't remember that, either.

Mzz McDougal couldn't have been surprised by yesterday's verdict. The courts in Arkansas have been very nice to her. U.S. District Judge George Howard, who presided over the trial, had released her from an earlier conviction because her back hurt.

Her trial strategy, which appears to have been worked out with the Arkansas political establishment, was to distract the jury from the germane facts by putting Mr. Starr, his office and the "guv-a-mint" of the hated yankees on trial. When Judge Howard allowed this, he doomed the government's case. At one point, Hick Ewing, the deputy prosecutor, the son of an old Arkansas family who now lives in nearby Memphis, asked that the record show that he is not a yankee.

The jurors had been softened up for months before they were called as jurors. Mr. Clinton's friends demonized Ken Starr, even calling him a yankee. (He was raised in Texas and educated in Arkansas.) David Pryor, who retired three years ago after faithful service as Mr. Clinton's bagman in the U.S. Senate, returned to Arkansas for further duties as a special pleader. He got caught pleading Susan McDougal's case in a private meeting -- unethical and maybe illegal -- with U.S. District Judge Susan Webber Wright. Explanations, and then sheepish apologies but no inquiry by the bar association, followed.

The McDougal trial took a turn that would be bizarre in most places but it hardly lifted an eyebrow in Little Rock. One of the jurors reported for deliberations one morning with a law book citing how and when, underlined for emphasis, a jury

could disregard evidence -- a book written by John Purtle, a former member of the state Supreme Court, a contributor to Clinton campaigns and a public defender of Webb Hubbell. Judge Purtle's card was in the book.

Judge Purtle, who stood trial for fraud a decade ago, at first said he didn't know the juror. Later in the day he said, well, yes, actually he had sold his house to him several years ago. (There's something in the water down there that dissolves memory.) The law book must have been left there. That's how the juror got it. Judge Howard ruled it another Arkansas coincidence.

Not all Arkansas juries are rigged, but the downtown establishment has, in fact, been caught cooking verdicts. Years ago several white segregationists were charged with planting dynamite bombs at one of the silk-stocking law firms, and under the city-owned car of a fire chief who had turned fire hoses on white demonstrators. A relative of the fire chief was put on the jury. Quick convictions followed. Public outrage ran so deep that two years later, when a bomb was planted at an abandoned building at a black college, the father of one of the Little Rock Nine was convicted of putting it there to foment trouble. White segregationists sent word to the appeals court judges that an innocent man had been framed and they should look for a way to overturn the convictions. And so they did. What a wee, wee world.

Left without a villain
The Washington Times 4/15/99

Judge Susan Webber Wright's decision to hold President Clinton in contempt of court "strips away some of the tarnished veneer Clinton tried to apply during his impeachment defense," USA Today says.

"There is no villain out to attack the president here. No Ken Starr suspected of carrying out a vendetta. No Republicans eager to destroy Clinton. No right-wing conspiracy. No crowd of [Paula] Jones attorneys with dubious motives," the newspaper said in an editorial yesterday.

"Just Wright, a former law student of Clinton who conscientiously took the minimum action possible under the circumstances. ..."

At the end of the editorial was this italicized note: "The Clinton administration declined an offer to write an Opposing View."

No sugarcoating for 'First

Partner' who helped with the
'lies'

By Jennifer Harper

4/20/99

THE WASHINGTON TIMES

ographies have followed Hillary Rodham Clinton around for years. There are 25 of them out there, ranging from crabby political tomes to prim accounts for young ladies.

Now comes one more. "The First Partner: Hillary Rodham Clinton" by historian Joyce Milton will be in bookstores tomorrow.

It has arresting moments. Miss Milton contends that the first lady hired detectives to tail her husband as early as the 1980s and later banned Barbra Streisand from overnight White House stays upon hearing that the chanteuse had dallied with the president.

The author names a dozen other presidential paramours and calls Mrs. Clinton a "connection" for

-- Continued from Front Page --

various questionable campaign donations.

"I was surprised the entire time I was writing this book," Miss Milton said from her Brooklyn home yesterday. "Whenever something surfaced which I thought was merely some canard set forth by the Clintons' enemies, it turned out to be true."

The book sets the pace for Hillary bios to come.

Neither gush nor bash, it approaches the first lady as a canny media entity who gained insight even through the death of Princess Diana.

It "crystallized Hillary's appreciation of the power of celebrity. It was Diana's face on the cover of a thousand magazines, not her resume, that had been the source of her power."

"Mrs. Clinton is a practical kind of celebrity. She is a survivor," Miss Milton said.

The timing of this book -- called "a revealing and withering portrait" by Publisher's Weekly -- is beautiful. Mrs. Clinton is a valuable commodity these days: She's got buzz.

Only yesterday, she flirted with the great state of New York and affirmed her interest in its Senate race. Lists of potential campaign workers are already being crafted.

"I love New York," she told one happy audience.

The public likes her, the polls shine upon her -- there is Hillary hunger in the air.

Miss Milton is already in the fast lane. Tomorrow, she'll be on NBC's "Today" show. William Morrow, her publisher, said they were "swamped" with interview requests.

The book itself is a complex and scrupulously documented odyssey, with 13 pages of footnotes.

Campaign finance gets a thorough going over. The author calls longtime Clinton ally John Huang "a spy" for either the Riady family or China; says his job at the Department of Commerce was courtesy of Mrs. Clinton herself.

The book offers detailed connections between Mrs. Clinton and Mark Jimenez, a campaign contributor now under indictment, the Riady family, Johnny Chung and government officials in Guam, among other places.

There is a cavalcade of excruciating details about life with Bill. Hillary Clinton swears a lot.

Miss Milton said she was most disturbed by early accounts of Mrs. Clinton "role playing" with daughter Chelsea, to prepare the child for "the rigors of political life."

All is not negative, though. There is young Hillary Rodham courting Bill in his purple Gremlin; later she is an anguished daughter, tending her father, Hugh, on his deathbed.

Miss Milton offers some blasts out of the past.

"The established facts were shocking enough," she wrote of White House aide and longtime friend Vincent W. Foster Jr., who committed suicide in 1993.

"A presidential counselor, one who apparently had a romantic attachment to the First Lady, had worked in the White House for six months without an FBI background check or a permanent pass."

Miss Milton fires up the Monica Lewinsky matter by calling Jan. 7, 1998 -- when the first couple announced a new day care initiative -- "Hillary Rodham Clinton's last truly happy day in the White House," later concluding that the first lady "must be held accountable for her bad judgment" in believing her husband's private flaws did not impact on his office.

"I can't get over the fact that Hillary Clinton's greatest public feat was to help her husband lie to the rest of us," Miss Milton said.

The 448-page biography unfolds in 16 chapters, beginning with "The First Victim" and ending up with "The Making of an Icon." It covers events all the way up to Feb. 24 of this year.

Ironically, this is Miss Milton's second biography of Mrs. Clinton. The first, published in 1994, was for children, billed as the inspiring story of "wife, mother, First Lady and lawyer."

The book more or less dismantles Mrs. Clinton as a feminist role model. Though Mrs. Clinton works hard for just causes, the author writes, "she has also been a victim of that great delusion of the 1960s -- namely, that it's possible to continually reinvent oneself, rewriting the rules to suit whatever role one happens to be playing at the moment."

But in the end, Hillary wins.

"Whatever her shortcomings, no one can deny that Hillary Rodham Clinton is resilient. Doubtless she will be with us, testing some new role or other, long after Bill Clinton has faded from the scene."

As I was making my daily journey to the post office the other day, I patiently waited for a car to vacate a parking space near the door. As the rear of the vehicle came toward me, I noticed a bumper sticker which read, in big, bold letters, "THANK ME, I VOTED CLINTON-GORE." Of course, the bumper sticker was printed in response to an earlier sticker which adorned some automobiles some six years ago.

Back then, as Presidents Bill and Hillary were attempting to nationalize health care and play havoc with the discipline and fiber of the military, "DON'T BLAME ME. I VOTED FOR BUSH" was the message on many bumpers. Hence the "Thank Me..." message came in response.

Pondering the message of the brave, stubborn soul in the car ahead of me, I considered all the things I could be thankful for as a result of the Clinton-Gore regime. Indeed, I discovered the list was long and varied. So, to the stranger in the car before me, Thank You!!!!

Thank you for reminding us that the government that gave us the IRS and welfare also lusts for control of the greatest healthcare system in the world.

Thank you for reminding us that the FBI, who has files on millions of Americans, including myself, can give those files to people powerful enough to demand them.

Thank you for giving us a president who supports partial-birth abortions.

Thank you for introducing us to Gennifer Flowers, Paula Jones, Monica Lewinsky, and about two dozen other names we might not have met and known otherwise.

Thank you for allowing a war hero and author of one of the most successful military campaigns in military history to leave the presidency because, no matter how successful he was, we, in all our moral outrage, just wouldn't tolerate someone who would lie to the American people by promising "no new taxes" and then going back on his word. We certainly can't have a liar in the White House, now can we?

Thank you for giving us a president who discusses his choice of underwear with teenagers. We always wondered if presidents wore boxers or briefs.

Thank you for installing a man who reminds us of those good old days of pot smoking (without inhaling, of course) and war protesting.

Thank you for showing us that the ridiculous plot of the movie, "Wag the Dog", could really be plausible after all.

Thank you for showing us the truly horrifying dangers of cloning someone's DNA. (After this is all over, burn the blue dress..... Please!)

Thank you for showing all the men and women in America that sexual harassment in the workplace, and on the job, is okay as long as it involves powerful middle-age executives and the young women half their age under their power. It is, after all, a "private matter."

Thank you for revealing that the agenda of the National Organization of Women only includes some women. Women like Anita Hill, and not women like Paula Jones, Monica Lewinsky, etc.

Thank you for allowing us to come to the realization that "sexual relations" is not clearly defined after all. And all these years I thought "oral sex" really had something to do with sex. Imagine my surprise!

Thank you for re-introducing the concept of "impeachment" to a new generation that missed the discussion surrounding it the last time it was brought up.

Thank you for curing me of my addiction to the evening news.

Thank you for reminding us that, when all is said and done, character really does matter.

And in comparison to recent days:

Thank you for making Dan Quayle look like a Rhodes Scholar.

Thank you for making Jimmy Carter look competent.

Thank you for making Gerald Ford look graceful.

Thank you for making Richard Nixon look honest.

Thank you for making Lyndon Johnson look truthful.

Thank you for making John Kennedy look moral.

Thank you for making Al Gore look positively presidential.

Thank you for reminding us of the importance of term limits.

And really, thank you twice! If not for you, instead of the current, interesting discussion all over the networks and newspapers, we would be focused on trivial matters such as global defense, the economy, nukes in North Korea, genocide in Africa, the containment of terrorism, and all those other boring topics.

So, thank you, thank you, thank you!!!

Since Bill Clinton took office, here are some of the good things that have happened:

- 72 House and Senate witnesses have pled the

fifth;

- 17 witnesses have fled the country to avoid testifying;
- 19 foreign witnesses have refused to be interviewed by U.S. investigative bodies;
- 19 charges from Whitewater investigations;
- 14 convictions from Whitewater investigations;
- 8 imprisonments from Whitewater investigation;
- 55 total charges in all Clinton scandals;
- 32 total convictions (so far) in all Clinton scandals;
- 14 total imprisonments (so far) in all Clinton scandals;
- 938 overnight stays in the Whitehouse for Clinton supporters;
- \$40 million - cost of Clinton's trip to China;
- 62 House of Representative seats that have changed from Democrat to Republican;
- 12 Senate seats that have changed from Democrat to Republican;
- 13 Governorships that have changed from Democrat to Republican;
- 1200 state legislative seats that have changed from Democrat to Republican;
- 353 elected Democrats who have switched parties since Clinton took office.

Yes, it's been an interesting six years for the "most ethical administration in the history of the Republic".

But then...everybody knows it's all the fault of the "Vast right-wing conspiracy"!

Go figure!!!!

JEFF JACOBY: 40 more reasons to fire Bill Clinton

Copyright © 1996 Nando.net

Copyright © 1996 The Boston Globe

(Oct 1, 1996 1:18 p.m. EDT) -- Last month I listed 40 reasons to make Bill Clinton a one-term president, and invited your suggestions for 40 more. Suggest you did, thousands of you, by e-mail, snail mail, fax and phone. My thanks to all who wrote -- and especially to Rush Limbaugh, who generated amazing enthusiasm for this little civics project.

And now, as promised, Reasons 41-80 to send the Clintons packing:

41. A top private school for Chelsea, but no vouchers for poor kids who want the same break.

42. Clinton blamed radio talk-show hosts for the terrorist bombing in Oklahoma City.

43. Vice President Al Gore on Russian President Boris Yeltsin, July 16, 1996: "To me, he looks good. On every score, President Yeltsin was actively engaged and seemed in very good shape." In fact, Yeltsin had just suffered a heart attack and remains gravely ill.

44. Ira Magaziner.

45. The candidate: "American politics is being held hostage by big money interests.... (C)liques of \$100,000 donors buy access to Congress and the White House."

The president: Sold private White House dinners to donors who gave at least \$100,000 to the Democratic National Committee -- plus "private impromptu meetings" with senior officials, a "personal DNC staff contact" to cut through federal red tape, and seats on foreign trade missions.

46. Deval Patrick, quota king.

47. The Clintons donate their used underwear to charity and deduct it on their tax returns.

48. But they never bothered to report their profits from Hillary's 1980 commodities trading -- until they were exposed in 1994.

49. When Chicago housewife Judy Mendoza told Clinton, "You suck," he had her arrested, fingerprinted, interrogated and jailed.

50. Supreme Court Justice John Paul Stevens is 77 years old.

51. An historic first: The First Lady is called before a grand jury.

52. Another historic first: White House reporters ask if the president has a sexually transmitted disease.

53. Why won't he release his medical records?

54. Number of White House aides with a history of serious drug abuse, according to the Secret Service: more than 40.

55. Cuba blows four unarmed Americans out of the sky, killing them in cold blood -- and Clinton does nothing to punish Fidel Castro.

56. Doesn't do anything when Capt. Scott O'Grady is blown out of the sky by Bosnian Serbs, either.

57. Or when five Americans in Saudi Arabia are killed by a car bomb. Or when 19 more Americans are killed by a second bomb.

58. Does, however, shut down Pennsylvania Avenue.

59. Shameless exploitation I: "I have vivid and painful memories of black churches being burned in my own state when I was a child." (No black churches were burned in Arkansas when Clinton was a child.)

60. Shameless exploitation II: Christopher Reeve in a wheelchair.

61. Shameless exploitation III: Vote for Al Gore because his sister died of lung cancer in 1984.
62. "Throughout most of my life, I raised tobacco. I want you to know that with my own hands, all of my life, I put it in the plant beds and transferred it. I've hoed it. I've chopped it. I've shredded it, spiked it, ... sold it" -- Al Gore, campaigning in North Carolina in 1988.
63. Normalized relations with Vietnam, one of the planet's nastiest dictatorships.
64. In a "completely honest bureaucratic snafu," Clinton aides rifled the private FBI files of more than 900 Republican opponents.
65. Triangulation.
66. The huge 1993 Clinton tax increase hiked taxes retroactively.
67. The candidate: "Serbian aggression against Bosnia ... must end. It is time for America ... to exert strong leadership in putting a halt to the Serbian-led aggression." The president: "Let me tell you something about Bosnia.... The United Nations controls what happens in Bosnia."
68. Missing files. Shredded files. Stonewalled files. Carted-out-of-Vince-Foster's-office-in-the-dead-of-night files.
69. Turned a blind eye to the Russian slaughter in Chechnya.
70. The defamation of Special Prosecutor Ken Starr.
71. In 50 years, he's never had a private-sector job. It's time.
72. "If I were a single man, I might ask that mummy out. That's a good-looking mummy. ... Really, you need to go see her" -- Clinton, on a 500-year-old Peruvian corpse.
73. Innocent Travel Office staff was fired on Hillary's orders.
74. "I am the only president who knew something about agriculture when I got (to the White House)." And to hell with Presidents Carter, Truman, Jefferson, and Washington.
75. Vetoed the bipartisan bill to ban late-term, partial-birth abortions, which Daniel Patrick Moynihan calls "close to infanticide."
76. Even Third World dictators laugh at Warren Christopher.
77. Percentage of Americans who believe one or both Clintons have broken the law: 53.
78. They don't call him "Slick Willie" for nothing.
79. He wants more money for the National Endowment for the Arts.

80. National debt, 1992: \$4.0 trillion. 1996: \$5.2 trillion. Clinton increase: 30 percent. The era of big government marches on.

I know, I know -- I've left out plenty. But newsprint is expensive, and 80 reasons should be enough. Four more years? Only if we're gluttons for punishment.

(Jeff Jacoby is a columnist for the Boston Globe. His e-mail address is jacoby@globe.com).

Copyright © 1996 Nando.net

http://www.nando.net/newsroom/ntn/voices/100196/voices6_25271.html