
Interview: Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

British circles close to Bush want to warn Clinton he is not liked

What follows is an edited transcript of the Sept. 14, 1994 hour-long radio interview on "EIR Talks," conducted by Mel Klenetsky.

EIR: Welcome to "Executive Intelligence Review Talks." I'm Mel Klenetsky. We're on the line with Lyndon LaRouche from Virginia.

How are you, Mr. LaRouche?

LaRouche: Well, I'm rather happy about the Tuesday evening event, the election (virtually) of Marion Barry to be the next mayor of Washington. It's a striking event that has many political ramifications, not only for the D.C. area, but for national policy. I find it most interesting.

EIR: Mr. LaRouche, I'd like to talk about a recent development that occurred, which created quite a stir in Washington. This was the crash of this single-engine Cessna plane on the South Lawn of the White House. It seems to me that it raises two questions: first, the security issue, and second, the context, in terms of the continual attacks on the presidency and those who would even make of this issue a sign of disarray in the Clinton camp.

How do you view this security threat, and the continual attacks against the Clinton administration?

LaRouche: Well, first of all, let me just say what we heard from some fellows who are well connected in Europe.

The European establishment (and I'm talking about fairly high levels in the European establishment), views this as a warning to Clinton that he is not much liked; and that is, implicitly, by circles which are close to the Bush group, if not to Bush himself—which, of course, means the British. That means the Hollinger Corporation, Henry Kissinger, et al. That crowd.

While all the bases appear to be covered from the standpoint of the Secret Service and so forth on that, that is, they have a good reason for everything they report, there are certain aspects of this which, from my experience as a rather successful analyst in anti-terrorist operations and related assassination operations, are very clearly of that character [cf. Chronology, pp. 62-64].

Whatever was going on in the pilot's mind, his actions have been used and registered to the kind of effect that these Europeans say is the case. I tend to agree with them. There is a hate level against the President as President, coming out of London, and out of circles close to George Bush, which is beyond belief. So, I'm not surprised at this kind of threat pattern; nor am I surprised, naturally, that we have the Hinckley pattern continuing.

Remember, Hinckley was a member of a family which was very close to the Bush family. Hinckley's father was fairly high level in British private covert intelligence in Africa, this WorldVision organization. They had been neighbors of the Bushes in Houston, until they moved to Colorado. Neil Bush, the fellow who was working with the Humphrey machine for "funny money" laundering in that period, was to have had a meeting with the brother of Hinckley, which was to have occurred the day *after* the assassination attack on President Reagan. Naturally, they called it off.

But then Hinckley turns up, and someone says, "Well, Hinckley is only a nut case." Well, we investigated the Hinckley case. Hinckley was a nut. There's no question about it. He was a druggie. He had a drug history as long as your arm, and a drug treatment history, including institutions which have the capability of producing a "Manchurian candidate" type by searching through the rubbish pile, and finding something like that.

So, the Hinckley case is still hanging out there, and it was *never properly investigated*, and we know, because we were involved in part of the investigation, and we were there when the investigation was shut down, when it should *not* have been shut down. And, there are many things about this *pattern* which have been published in various publications, including, in part, the *Washington Post* and, more fully, in the *Washington Times*. This *pattern*, plus the statements which are official from the Secret Service, and statements from experts with whom we are acquainted, indicate that the European perception of this event, is a very accurate one. That is, whatever was the case, the event is being *used* to signal the President that, perhaps there are certain circles out there who are watching too many Rush Limbaugh broad-

casts, who may be a little bit nutty, as Rush Limbaugh enthusiasts might tend to be; and, they might decide to act on their nuttiness—at least, that's the cover story.

EIR: More than ten assassination threats have been identified against Clinton, and this certainly is a very, very large number, compared to other presidencies, and, as we were discussing earlier, there is a *cui bono?* involved. Who benefits if there is no such thing as a "lone assassin" operation, or if it's very unlikely, then we have to get into the issue of "who benefits?" Can you please address that?

LaRouche: Well, you're not going to see much of it on the domestic policy side. It's very obvious the President has *not* been able to get any of his major agenda through the Congress. NAFTA was not his, he was forced to run with it. The crime bill was not his, that was already there, it was a Bush bill, but he was also forced to run with that; in both cases, he was forced to run with these bills to maintain his credibility.

Now, we have the Haiti issue coming up, which is essentially a domestic issue, not a foreign policy issue. It's a horrible thing for Haitians, but there is a domestic lobby which is tied to the Quantico side of the ADL, FBI, and similar organizations, which has control of some of the Congressional Black Caucus and, presumably, Jesse Jackson or similar types. Jesse's position on Nigeria, for example, is a straight abomination. If you want to talk about "Uncle Toms," that's what Jesse's doing, as he did against Farrakhan and against Ben Chavis in the first summit meet, trying to sabotage it, then turning up and trying to sabotage it by his agenda.

So, you have this kind of phenomenon. It's really a domestic issue, not a foreign policy issue. It's a funny thing. But on this point, the President, even on the Haiti issue, was pushed to going back to the George Bush policy of 1991, and Bush was the original proponent of this invasion, this military operation against Haiti. Now that domestic pressures have pushed the President into taking a posture (which tends to be in favor of letting the invasion go. It's like the crime bill, it's an animal which nobody can seem to stop), Bush pretends to be against it.

So, don't look on the domestic side for the President's real enemies, even though his wife has made enemies of the insurance companies, who think she's threatening their ripoff, but look, rather, in foreign policy. Then it becomes clear.

Look at Kissinger's recent op-ed in the *New York Post* and elsewhere. It's a complete piece of drivel on the subject of the so-called summit of the people of the Americas on trade agreements, and so forth. But this is, again, Kissinger, Hollinger Corp., or my enemy John Train, from New York City, that complete British asset of that circle. Like Kissinger, he's also part of Hollinger Corp. The George Bush/Oliver North profile; again, that's the same thing. That's British.

These are *foreign policy issues*. Now, on foreign policy,

the President has been, apart from the Haiti glitch, somewhat effective. He has worked with the Vatican in a diplomatic understanding on *common* views on the Cairo conference, despite the differences; and that common view approach has, in a sense, prevailed. While there was a lot of *talk* that came out of the Cairo Conference, nothing *enforceable*, in line with the original intention, has resulted. So, it is a kind of a turning point, a reversal, a setback, and that makes some people very angry.

Then, in general, the President has gone after British domination, through British assets like George Bush and the Bush Leaguers, within U.S. policy. So therefore, the President is *clearly* an enemy of the Anglo-American, or, shall we say, Anglo-American-Canadian establishment, of the liberal establishment. And Bush, of course, is a *part* of the liberal establishment, and so is Ollie North. Ollie North lies a lot, so when he says he's not a liberal, that's just another Ollie North lie.

What do you expect from a drug pusher?

So, that's the size up of it, and that's where the issue lies. It's the issue between London and Clinton, and the fact that George Bush, Henry Kissinger, John Train, et al. are, essentially, London assets; and when London coughs, George Bush gets pneumonia. That kind of thing.

EIR: Denis Healey, the former Exchequer of England, gave a speech at the Swiss Commodities Futures Option Association. He lambasted liberalization. He described the crash of '87 and the 1992-93 European currency upheavals as a result of these deregulatory trends, and he called for a tax on speculative transactions. What do you think is the significance of such a figure as Healey making these types of assertions?

LaRouche: Well, I would say that, in one sense, I have won on this issue. Not just the tax on derivatives, a policy recommendation which I revived a couple of years ago, but what's happening globally, is a recognition which Denis Healey reflects. Now, the recognition may be partly opportunistic, partly sincere, but it's there. It's the issue raised by Maurice Allais, as well as by me, earlier.

There are two things to be considered here. First of all is the very specific issue of derivatives, and I think people should look closely at the paper I put out on the subject of the so-called Ninth Forecast of mine. But, at the same time, everyone in these circles, except self-blinded fanatics on the monetarist side, recognize that the entire international banking and monetary system is going through not only a process of collapse, through reverse leverage; but we are also headed toward a potential disintegration of the leading monetary and financial institutions of the world.

That is, not a collapse of the institutions, but their actual disintegration. That's what's in process. The problem is that in general, both sides on this issue, Denis Healey, others who share his views, and their opponents, and the monetarists, have no agreed alternative to collapse. Therefore, they're

playing games.

The Healey crowd is right, but, in a sense, they're opportunists. They recognize that the derivatives mess is going to collapse, the derivatives bubble is going to collapse. It's happening all over the world. We see reflections of this process in the collapse of the Banco Latino, and other banks in Venezuela; there are reflections of that in Mexico. Markets all over the world: the evidence is there. It's clear that it's going to collapse. So therefore, they're going to come out on the top side, or they and the people they advise, in terms of the fight over derivatives as such.

But the problem is, that both they, and their opposition among the monetarists; *neither* have a clear view of the alternative. But, in the meantime, there are people behind the scenes from various parts of the world, who are telling me, and who are demonstrating what they say by actions, that they share my view on what the alternatives are, and predict that, very rapidly, my proposals will become hegemonic worldwide on global reorganization.

The general estimate is, and I can add my own endorsement of this, that the weakening of the monetarist faction, that is, of the financier oligarchy behind the present policy which is collapsing, the weakening of those financial and monetary institutions, will lead to a weakening of the political power of the oligarchy, and, thus, ideas such as mine are coming rapidly into prominent position. I would say that, within the next year or so, my views will be more or less openly endorsed and supported worldwide by some very prominent circles.

EIR: I know it's difficult to quickly characterize these views, but what are the fundamental differences between your position, your views on economic directions compared to what we've seen by the monetarists?

LaRouche: Well, on the one side, it's really a very simple thing, isn't it? On the one side, what I'm proposing is to put a bankrupt global monetary central banking financial system into financial bankruptcy reorganization.

For example, if you have the word that the bank down on the corner is going to go bankrupt, belly up, then what you scream for, is for a legal process to take place for a legal financial bankruptcy reorganization to proceed, to attempt to prevent chaos, to protect certain prime interests, and to sort things out generally.

We should be doing the same thing with a monetary and financial system which, in point of fact, is going belly up. It's already bankrupt, if a real audit were conducted.

Now, that's obvious; and, as things become worse, you're going to see more and more people talking about more re-regulation, as Denis Healey was, with a tax proposal; more in terms of government intervention. You're going to find an increase in protectionist impulses, not merely from South and Central America, as Henry Kissinger fears, but from around the world. . . .

Essentially, the point is that leading governments of the world will be faced with the issue of putting what are obviously collapsing, bankrupt monetary as well as financial institutions, major ones, all financial markets, into bankruptcy reorganization, very much like the bankruptcy reorganization that would be done with a local troubled bank in your neighborhood.

But the question is, once that's done, and that should be done, otherwise there's complete chaos, the question is, how do we grow? How do we come back as an economy after the bankruptcy?

Now, a bankruptcy reorganization per se cannot cause a recovery. It just stops chaos and turns chaos into a kind of slow erosion if nothing else is added. So, what's needed, in order to get the economy moving again, is obvious economic growth, *physical-economic growth*. The question is, how do you start it?

Well, there are two ways we've started growth in the past. One is with a war economy, which the case of World War II or the Korean War period or the Cold War period during the early 50s or the early 1960s prior to the Vietnam War and space programs, also; they were good economic stimulants. But essentially, historically, basic economic infrastructure.

Basic economic infrastructure has to be funded by credit created by governments. It cannot go on a large scale simply by private banking or central banking. It never has. Central banking, or that kind of banking on its own steam, has never been able to get a genuine economic recovery going.

So, that means that the state, the federal government, under Article I of the U.S. Constitution, for example, would have to go back to national banking, issue U.S. currency notes by act of Congress; loan those notes through a national banking system, either directly to state, federal, and local authorities, or through the private banking system to authorities, and, also, to private contractors or other suppliers, who will be stimulated to issue bids for participation in these infrastructure projects.

That's the only way you're going to get an economic recovery. That is the issue on which a lot of people are opposed to me, particularly those who have been indoctrinated with Adam Smith or free trade, or von Hayek, or any of these other funny, poisonous dwarves who run around the academic community these days.

So, you have two oppositions: one, the financial oligarchy does not want financial bankruptcy reorganization, because that means that they would come under U.S. and other governments' audit, and they do not wish to be accountable to government, they never did; they think governments ought to be accountable to them.

Secondly, in addition to the financial oligarchy, who have been indoctrinated with this free trade garbage, think that somehow this is big government, this is socialism or something, that is, if governments (as all successful capitalist

governments have always done) stimulate the growth of the private sector, through government's use of its responsibility in its sector of the economy, the so-called public sector, or general infrastructure sector.

Now, there's where the opposition is.

My view is that as the crash approaches, more and more people, particularly the increasing number of people in the have-not section of the population, *which turned out to support Marion Barry in the Washington, D.C. Democratic primary*; more of those people will *demand* not only bankruptcy reorganization of the financial system. They will also demand infrastructure projects which *stimulate* the growth of the private sector, and increase, from the standpoint of the man in the legislature, federal or state, or municipal, an increase in the tax revenue base of society, so that government will have the funds from tax revenues, to fulfill its responsibilities. That's where the issue lies.

EIR: The United Nations Population and Development Conference in Cairo just came to a close. A non-binding document has been produced after much heated debate. What do you think was accomplished there at Cairo, if anything?

LaRouche: Let me just step back a moment on this. The people behind the Cairo conference are what I have identified as the Venetian Party forces, typified by the Darwin-Huxley family in Britain, and typified by Prince Philip, the consort to the Queen, who is the head of what was called the World Wildlife Fund. It is now called the World Wide Fund for Nature. These two groups, which are closely associated, through, actually (don't laugh, it's true) the London Zoological Society, have conducted mass genocide in Africa. As a matter of fact, the British government, through the Overseas Development Minister, which is the new name for the Colonial Secretary, Lynda Chalker—actually Lady Lynda Chalker (she is a member of the House of Lords)—who was in the Thatcher regime, and is also in the Major regime now, is *personally responsible* for the genocide in Rwanda. She directly supervised and orchestrated it, through her puppet, who is the present dictator of Uganda, whose troops invaded Rwanda through a mountain gorilla game preserve set up by the World Wildlife Fund, and that's how the operation was run.

So, these are the people responsible. You have the Eugenics Society, which is the world population control group. These are the neo-malthusians. The other neo-malthusians are Prince Philip, and the World Wildlife Fund crowd, which runs these game parks, which was a key force, as a matter of fact a central force, in running the genocide in Black Africa.

These are the forces, combined through the United Nations' UNESCO, through those sections of the United Nations which were associated in an earlier period with two members of British intelligence: Julian Huxley (remember the Huxley family, which orchestrated much of this theory), and, also, Brig. Gen. John Rawlings Rees, who was the head of the Tavistock Clinic and, later, Tavistock Institute, who

headed up the World Federation of Mental Health, and whose influence runs most of the sociology and psychology professions in the United States, for example, today.

These forces were determined to get the power of world government established by a mandate to the United Nations, for self-enforcing legislation, using sanctions and so forth, coming out of the Cairo conference. That *they did not get*. What they got, was compromise language *which is not enforceable* . . .

It wasn't a crushing defeat there. But the point is, they were jammed up, and did not get their enforceable doctrine.

What has happened also, on the other side, was that a convergence of forces who are opposed to world government, and who are also opposed to other features of this population-control resolution, took initiatives in the Islamic world. Pope John Paul II mobilized a sometimes somewhat reluctant Catholic clergy and church as a whole into opposition to this operation. He used the example of Lazare Carnot: He got the bishops and cardinals out of the barracks, and across the river, to the other side, tonight, not waiting until morning; and that kind of leadership by His Holiness got the church moving, despite the fact that many people on their own, even among the clergy, would *not* have moved against this in that way.

Then you had also many evangelicals in the United States, for example, who were stoutly opposed to these kinds of monkeyshines; you had Jewish groups, less prominently visible, but nonetheless there, who happened to share the same view, and others around the world who are opposed to world government.

So, this was enough to set back the conference's legal ambitions, if not its language. But the more significant developments occurred *outside* this immediate issue.

What has happened, is that there is a revulsion against what's happening in the Balkans, a revulsion against what the British royal family and its associates have done in Rwanda, Uganda, for example. This *stink* is motivating a *change* in values, back toward the kind of values which would have been accepted, generally, during the Kennedy administration in the United States, *less* than the kind of values which came to the fore under Henry Kissinger's reorganization of the U.S. intelligence community over the 1968-76 period. And so, that's the good part.

There is a change which coincides with the revulsion against the derivatives speculation, the speculative bubble, including even the opportunist remarks of Denis Healey at the Swiss meeting. All of these things indicate that there's a change back to what Harding would have called "normalcy," that the insanity of the past 30 years, of counterculture, post-industrial society, one-world lunacy: these kinds of things are now somewhat, if not on the wane, at least they're under heavier counterattack than they've been in the past 10-15 years.

EIR: Well, as we look at the picture that you're painting,

we also see that political developments in many parts of the world are *very* intense. In France, Italy, and Germany, the situations have really heated up.

In France, Mitterrand is coming under attack based on a new book which goes through his involvement with Vichy France during the war. In Italy, you have a social, political, and financial chaos that is so big, that Angelo Codevilla is calling for a Pinochet-style solution.

Of course, in Germany, you have the chancellorship elections coming up, and Kohl's coalition partners have just lost big in regional elections.

How do you see these different situations?

LaRouche: Well, in France, there is an institutional change in process, and there are two poles in there. One, you've got a pole in the tradition of Lord Gray and Théophile Delcassé, over the 1898-1904 period, as shown by the recent British agreement with General Morrillon to put together this joint British-French expeditionary force capability. So, there is an Entente Cordiale tendency, in which London is using its positivist assets, the Laplace-Saint-Simon tradition assets, in France, for its own purpose.

But, there is also another process in France, which is more nationalistic. Unfortunately, de Gaulle did *not* supply a leadership of ideas, but a personality, and therefore there is no real Gaullist movement in France today, no opposition in an organized form to this kind of tendency.

But nonetheless, there is an institutional resistance to capitulating to Britain, particularly centering around economic issues, and things of that sort.

So, France is in turmoil, obviously. Mitterrand is in bad health, he's coming to the end of his presidency in any case, and things are stirred up there.

Italy is more significant. Now, in Italy, Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi is in a very weak position. There is no one else on the scene who could replace him at present, and his opposition is quite interesting. The opposition to Berlusconi, including the Northern League crowd, is coming from Britain; but, in part, it's coming through British assets in Italy, including Carlo De Benedetti.

Now, Carlo De Benedetti is entangled with British foreign intelligence. He is not strictly Italian. If you look at his Swiss connections, you'll see he is British, a British intelligence asset. Then you've got oligarchs, like the Fiat mafia, which are also a factor in this thing, which are supporting the Northern League. So, obviously, Italy is at a point of crisis, and there is a clear split in Italy, and there are those who oppose the British destabilization of Italy, which is what has gone on in the recent period: pure British intelligence destabilization of the southern flank of Europe, which is continuing.

Now, in Germany, you've got a different situation. Kohl is very much under attack. This is coming from the circles of former Soviet dictator Gorbachov, who is the "grandfather" or the "godfather," together with Bob Strauss from Houston and the late Bob Maxwell, of a firm called Nordex, which

again cuts in to Carlo De Benedetti, an operation run out of Minneapolis through the Hubert Humphrey Institute, and out of London largely—the Maxwell crowd [see p. 35].

This crowd set up a looting operation which created Russian organized crime under Gorbachov, out of sections of the official Soviet apparatus. Most of that money was simply taken and stolen, most of that wealth; but a significant part of it was squirreled away in Swiss and other banks, to the advantage of Gorbachov and this section of the *nomenklatura* which is known today as Russian organized crime.

Involved in this, are the leadership of the former Stasi, the former communist party of Germany, which is now reflected in the leadership of the PDS party in Germany. The PDS has made a strong play to come back to power, exploiting the capitulation of Bonn to Mrs. Thatcher and Mr. Bush's demands that East Germany not be economically developed, but looted. The East German population has thus been trapped back into the grab-bag of the leadership of the PDS, which is a Gorbachov organized crime-linked political institution.

So now the landscape in Germany is changed by the emergence of this PDS in this form, with funding coming out of stolen funds from an earlier period. So, Kohl is going to have to reckon with this problem, which is this major threat, apart from himself and his do-nothing policy. But if Kohl continues the policies of Clinton, the policies which he apparently has adopted, with respect to Eastern Europe, he will probably find forces in Russia which are *not* Gorbachov, but forces in Russia and the United States, which will decide that Kohl is the man to keep in place, at least for the time being.

So, there's more to the Kohl election than might appear by simply reading the German press and commentaries. But otherwise, in France and Italy, the threat of chaos is great.

EIR: In the remaining few minutes that we have, I'd just like your comments on the potential developments in the Caribbean, Haiti on the one hand, where a military invasion is imminent, and Cuba, where Clinton seems to be moving in a very positive direction, and seems to have headed off a crisis. What would you like to say on these areas?

LaRouche: First of all, Haiti is not a Clinton policy. The Haiti invasion, if people will look back in the newspaper files, was a President George Bush policy. Presently, it seems that George Bush is laughing up his sleeve, saying, "Clinton has now got to invade. He shouldn't do it (ha, ha, ha), and I am going to benefit when my cronies run for President against Clinton in 1996, or against the Democrats. We're going to win with the help of the Haiti issue in dividing the Democratic vote, with the sociological flashbacks which come from a U.S. invasion of Haiti."

Everyone observes, I think, that Clinton did his utmost to frustrate the Bush policy, which was for a U.S. invasion of Haiti. He spent most of the early part of his administration doing that. Then suddenly, certain forces who were tied to Bush, directly, and other forces, tied to old communist cir-

cles in the civil rights movement, for example, began to move to threaten the President that if he did *not* invade Haiti, bad things would happen to his *essential* Congressional Black Caucus constituency in the Congress.

Under these circumstances (and I have some dirty information on this, which I'll develop later, once we have the facts fully confirmed), a group around the FBI, that is, Jonathan Demme, the director of the "Silence of the Lambs," who was very close, very intimate, with the Quantico Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (the same Federal Bureau of Investigation which is running frameups against black political figures around the country), began to move, through his friend, whom he controlled, to stage this hunger strike, this Hollywood rebellion, and so forth, and *suddenly* he found a very powerful gutter faction, not black alone, but gutter faction around the country, which lined up for this operation.

The "EIR Talks" interview with Mr. LaRouche is put up on audio satellite three times each week. "EIR Talks" goes up twice on Thursday evenings—at 8 p.m. and 12 midnight Eastern Time on C-1, 137 degrees west. Reverse polarity. Audio programming mono, narrow band. 7.56 MHz audio. Transponder 15. "EIR Talks" also airs Fridays at 1 p.m. Eastern on Satcom C5, Transponder 15, Channel 16-0. Any radio station in the world can pull the satellite broadcast down for re-transmission.

EIR Audio Report

**Your weekly antidote
for New World Order 'news'**

Exclusive news reports and interviews
Audio statements by Lyndon LaRouche

Updates On:

- The Real Economy
- Science and Technology
- The Fight for Constitutional Law
- The Right to Life
- Food and Agriculture
- The Arts
- The Living History of the American Republic
- Essential Reports from around the Globe

\$500 for 50 Issues
An hour-long audio cassette sent by first-class mail each week. Includes cover letter with contents.

Make checks payable to:
EIR News Service
P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390
Phone: (703) 777-9451 Fax: (703) 771-9492

Cessna pilot makes attack on the White

by Scott Thompson

President Clinton was the target of what may have been an assassination attempt on Sept. 12, as a single-prop Cessna piloted by Frank Corder crashed into the White House lawn, skidded, and pieces of the wreckage hit the White House itself. According to the Sept. 13 *Washington Times*, "The number of threats on the President's life has surged." The Italian daily *Corriere della Sera* on the same day reported that the threat level against President Clinton is reminiscent of the period before President John F. Kennedy was assassinated. However, a spokesman for the Secret Service told *EIR*, one reason for the appearance of an increased threat level is the greater technological efficiency brought to bear in countering threats—an analysis that overlooks the fact that there has been a campaign to drive President Clinton out of office, inspired by the British royal family through the Hollinger Corp.-controlled press.

At least a dozen significant threats to the President's life were known to the public before the Cessna attack on the White House, and the Secret Service has confirmed to *EIR* that many incidents, which might open a multitude of cases, are being kept secret as a matter of policy. Among these incidents are the following:

A chronology of threats

Oct. 20, 1992: Gary Steven Foster, 41, a Chicago man on anti-psychotic medication, is arrested for threatening Clinton as the candidate campaigns in the city. (*Washington Times*)

Oct. 22, 1992: Edward Carroll, 43, of Nevada is indicted for threatening Clinton. The former Marine had a history of mental problems. (*Washington Times*)

Feb. 25, 1993: Michael Bernard Shields, 28, a Virginia Beach, Virginia gun dealer, is ordered to undergo a psychiatric evaluation for threatening to kill Clinton. He told Secret Service agents that Clinton "needed to be eliminated, by force if necessary." (*Washington Times*)

February 1993: Larry Peoples of Biloxi, Mississippi makes a threat in a letter to President Clinton after listening to populist television host Rush Limbaugh. (This case symptomizes a rash of threats following political attacks on the White House by Limbaugh and televangelist Jerry Falwell.) Peoples is arrested by the FBI in December 1993, but not