

## House Republicans commit treason in impeachment vote

by Jeffrey Steinberg

By a nearly strictly party-line vote on Oct. 8, House Republicans rammed through an open-ended impeachment investigation of President William Jefferson Clinton, despite the fact that the tainted Starr report to Congress falls far short of any constitutionally sound threshold of evidence of “high crimes and misdemeanors.”

The vote came at precisely the moment that stock markets around the world were crashing, major world currencies were going through wild fluctuations, and finance ministers and central bankers from 182 countries were racing home from Washington, D.C. and the just-concluded International Monetary Fund-World Bank session, with little to show for their efforts to solve the gravest financial and monetary crisis in modern history.

At no time in living memory has American Presidential leadership been more urgently required, if the financial oligarchy is to be stopped from triggering a worldwide New Dark Age of untold suffering. As *EIR* has documented since 1993, it was this London-centered financial oligarchy—working through agencies like the Hollinger Corp. media cartel, the Netanyahu Likud apparatus in Israel and its “amen corner” of American right-wing Zionists and clinically insane Armageddonist Christian evangelicals, and corrupt and ambitious Congressional Republicans—that launched the assault on the U.S. Presidency long before the world knew of Monica Lewinsky, Paula Jones, Whitewater, Filegate, and so on.

Five years and \$40 million later, independent counsel Kenneth Starr handed Congress a report that focussed solely on a private act of personal misconduct, that Starr was first alerted to in January 1998.

Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich’s flagrant effort to squelch open debate on the most profound issue to come before the Congress in decades, failed to silence a number of voices of sanity from the other side of the aisle. Even though

the total length of the House floor debate was restricted to just two hours, and toward the end, Democrats were given 20-second speaking slots, an element of the treachery of the GOP leadership did come out.

Rep. Robert Wexler (D-Fla.) singled out Gingrich: “Mr. Speaker, God help this nation if today we become a Congress of endless investigation, accomplices to this un-American inquisition that would destroy the Presidency over an extramarital affair. The global economy is crumbling, and we’re talking about Monica Lewinsky.”

Rep. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.) elaborated: “Today the world economy is in crisis and cries out for American leadership, without which worldwide turmoil is a grave possibility. The American people cry out for us to solve the problems facing them. This investigation, now in its fifth year, has run its course. It’s time to move on.”

District of Columbia Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton (D) drew the distinction between the U.S. constitutional system and Britain’s parliamentary system, a distinction that Gingrich and his allies wished to ignore altogether. She reminded the House, “We are a constitutional democracy, not a parliamentary republic. A vote of no confidence in Great Britain requires no standard, but calls forth a new election. A vote for an impeachment inquiry in the United States requires a high standard, because it could nullify an election.”

Rep. Bob Filner (D-Calif.) returned to the issue of the global economic crisis: “Mr. Speaker, it is this Congress that is subverting the Constitution by trivializing the impeachment process. . . . And we are going to embark on an open-ended investigation while the world economy is collapsing, the health care system needs reform, our whole financial system is corrupt, and we’ll be talking for months about who touched who where.”

Rep. Bob Clement (D-Tenn.) summed up the GOP treason

eloquently: “Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has the toughest job on the face of the earth. We cannot indefinitely keep this open and keep it going into next year. The economy is at stake—we know that. The economy is unraveling now—we know that. And how can we neglect it?”

### **The President’s dilemma**

A sizable portion of the nation’s media has questioned, and, in some cases, outrightly denounced the Gingrich mob’s action against the President. The American public has weighed in, demanding an end to what one House Democrat equated to the Salem witch trials. Kenneth Starr, Linda Tripp, and Newt Gingrich remain the three most hated personalities in American life today.

Despite this, House Republicans, backed by the most rabid elements of the misnamed Christian Right, have pursued a berserk course of action, that leaves no doubt that they are committed to the destruction of the Clinton Presidency, no matter what the consequences for the well-being of the United States and the rest of the world.

These circumstances demand extraordinary action on the part of President Clinton—beyond the legal counter-attacks and the harsh words of criticism for a Republican Congress gone mad with treason. And, the President has only one avenue of action available to him, that would place the harshest of penalties upon the oligarchs and their henchmen, who are waging the campaign to overturn the Constitution.

The only course of action that President Clinton could take was spelled out on Oct. 7 by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, founder of the Schiller Institute and wife of American political economist Lyndon LaRouche, in an open letter to the President (see the editorial in this issue for the full text of the Zepp-LaRouche letter). After describing the ongoing impeachment drive as “a coup d’état against the office of the President and against the American Constitution,” she called upon President Clinton “to appoint Lyndon LaRouche immediately as economic adviser to your administration.”

Such a bold public move would be read by governments and leading political circles around the world as a clear signal that President Clinton has determined to move aggressively ahead with the New Bretton Woods policy that LaRouche has been advocating, as the only viable remedy to the systemic collapse of the world financial and monetary system. By seizing the initiative forcefully, President Clinton would win the immediate support of the Chinese government, major political factions in Japan, and a healthy segment of the elites of India, Russia, and Brazil. It would shake continental Europe out of its “euro-fantasy” state.

At home, the President already enjoys the support of a majority of Americans, who are repulsed by the hooligan antics of Starr, Gingrich, et al. A move to bring in LaRouche would draw support from a large segment of those Americans who have stayed home for the last several national elections, out of disgust with the “politics as usual” profile of official Washington and the rampant police-state corruption of the

U.S. Department of Justice. For those Democrats fighting to revive the tradition of Franklin Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy, it would be a green light to clean the Democratic Party of its own treason faction.

### **The crimes of Kenneth Starr**

Even as the House Republicans were urinating on the Constitution, new evidence was coming to light that Starr is the appropriate target for Congressional impeachment proceedings, as have been already called for by Rep. Alcee Hastings (D-Fla.).

On Oct. 5, as the House Judiciary Committee was voting out the impeachment resolution, attorneys for President Clinton were filing a brief with the U.S. Supreme Court, arguing that White House deputy counsel Bruce Lindsey should have been able to invoke attorney-client privilege and not be forced to appear before the Starr grand jury. The Clinton brief revealed publicly, for the first time, that Starr had lied to the Appeals Court on June 29, 1998, during oral arguments about the Lindsey subpoena.

Starr had claimed that Lindsey had no right to assert privilege in a purely personal matter involving the President; however, he acknowledged that government lawyers could invoke privilege in the event of an impeachment process. But, “that’s not where we are,” Starr told the court. “It is premature for this court to look down the road and look at impeachment. It is beyond the compass of this case.”

Three days later, however, Starr secretly filed a motion with the three-judge appellate panel overseeing his Office of Independent Counsel (OIC), seeking permission to make an impeachment referral to the House. The permission was granted—secretly—on July 7.

In another case of outright fraud, the *New York Times* reported on Oct. 4 that Starr’s report to Congress contained a false account of the circumstances under which the OIC learned of President Clinton’s relationship with Monica Lewinsky. The report to Congress claimed that Starr’s office first was alerted to the Clinton-Lewinsky matter on Jan. 12, 1998 when Linda Tripp turned over 20 hours of audio tapes of her conversations with Lewinsky.

The *Times* reported that at least one week prior to the Tripp “walk-in,” a law partner of Starr was told details about the Clinton relationship to Lewinsky by Lucianne Goldberg, the ex-Nixon dirty tricks moll who steered Tripp’s tape-and-tell sting. The day after the publication of the *Times* article, President Clinton’s attorney David Kendall sent a letter to Attorney General Janet Reno, asking the Justice Department to release the documents filed by Starr in January 1998, requesting authorization to expand his probe to include the Lewinsky allegations.

On Oct. 3, Associated Press reported that Judge Norma Holloway Johnson, the Chief Judge of the District of Columbia U.S. District Court, had appointed a Special Master to gather evidence about grand jury leaks by Starr and his senior prosecutors.