determined that the expanded NSC was too large an entity to work things through. It was better to work through smaller groups with the relevant agencies involved. By contrast, Soderberg noted, in other administrations, there have been 60-70 NSC meetings per year.

Soderberg said that the Principals Committee is where "the broad policy is hammered out, such as our China and Russia policies," as well as key decisions, such as imposing sanctions on Serbia. Sometimes the Principals Committee can resolve the issues, and sometimes not, Soderberg said; if not, the National Security Adviser will take the matter to the President with a split recommendation, so the President can decide. Some issues are so important, i.e., military deployment, that they must go to the President even if there is agreement.

Soderberg described the Deputies Committee as "the workhorse" of the national security process. Here the tough issues are hashed out.

When *EIR* recently inquired about this, NSC spokesman P.J. Crowley confirmed much of what Soderberg had described in 1996. Crowley repeatedly emphasized to this reporter that this should be looked at as "a process, not as a structure."

Crowley confirmed that "the NSC, as the NSC, in a formal way, has met only once"—which involves certain legal requirements, such as the keeping of minutes. But, Crowley took pains to point out that this could be "misleading," since its members meet in a number of different ways, and often with the President. Crowley also pointed to the "Foreign Policy Team" which meets with the President and the Vice President. Or, he said, the President and the Vice President can drop in on meetings of the Foreign Policy Team or the Principals Committee. For example, Crowley said, this is how the go-ahead was given for Operation Desert Fox (the December air strikes on Iraq).

Crowley also confirmed that Leon Fuerth plays a prominent role on both the Principals Committee and the Deputies Committee.

The unmistakeable conclusion is that the President of the United States has been cut out of significant areas of national security decision-making. While the NSC structure (oops, "process") may have been created as a reflection of the Baby Boomer's love of endless discussions and consensus decision-making, it has now evolved into an insurrectionary mechanism for by-passing the President altogether, under certain circumstances, e.g., when he is distracted and besieged by contrived scandals and the impeachment assault.

Impeachment trial launched, but Starr is pulling the strings

by Edward Spannaus

As the House Managers commenced their fraudulent and unconstitutional impeachment trial against President Clinton in the U.S. Senate, they immediately began to beat the drums for calling witnesses to bolster their case. But the witnesses they want are not the ones they claim to want: Monica Lewinsky, Vernon Jordan, Betty Currie, and so on. What the House Managers want to do, is to introduce evidence concerning the so-called "Jane Does"—women who surfaced in the Paula Jones civil lawsuit, who were alleged to have had sexual encounters with Bill Clinton at some point over the past 20 years.

Jones's lawyers conducted a nationwide dragnet looking for such women, as did Kenneth Starr's prosecutors. And this is what they believe to be their trump card, in what otherwise has begun as a predictable, repetitive, and boring presentation of the "evidence" already paraded in front of the public by independent counsel Starr.

And make no mistake: Despite the fact that the Constitution assigns the responsibility for the impeachment and removal of a President solely to the Congress, Starr is the real prosecutor in the Senate trial.

Who are the 'Jane Does'?

With the help of the spooky literary agent Lucianne Goldberg and a circle of lawyers associated with Starr, Linda Tripp made her way to Starr's office with the Monica Lewinsky tapes in early January 1998—although there are strong indications that Starr's office was aware of the Tripp tapes long before the date Starr acknowledges. The Tripp tapes provided Starr with his long-sought pretext to take over the Paula Jones "sexual harassment" case, under the guise of investigating possible obstruction of justice by the President and others.

After the Jones suit was filed, at the instigation of British intelligence stringer Ambrose Evans-Pritchard (a correspondent for the London *Sunday Telegraph*), investigators working for Jones's lawyers had launched a dragnet to find other women who could corroborate Jones's bogus claim of sexual

harassment or assault by Bill Clinton. On Jan. 29, 1998, almost four years after he had convinced Jones and her family to file the lawsuit against Clinton, Evans-Pritchard claimed in the London *Daily Telegraph* that Jones's lawyers had a witness list which included "more than 100 women who allegedly had sexual encounters with the President in circumstances that are relevant to the [Paula Jones] case." This was a wild and fanciful boast, but Jones's lawyers attempted to publicize some of the incidents by dumping affidavits and other documents into the public record.

The "Jane Does" at issue in the "secret evidence" being promoted by the House Managers, are precisely the "Jane Does" from the Jones case. Included in 700 pages of documents filed last March by Jones's lawyers, was a document alleging that Clinton had committed a "brutal rape" in 1978—involving "Jane Doe No. 5." Jones's lawyers also argued that Clinton was guilty of obstruction of justice in connection with various women. But on April 1, 1998, Jones's case was thrown out of court.

But no matter. The day after the Lewinsky story hit the press, Ambrose Evans-Pritchard wrote in the Jan. 22, 1998 *Daily Telegraph:* "Paula Jones has now achieved her object of inflicting massive damage on Bill Clinton, with shortening odds that she may ultimately destroy his Presidency." Proving Evans-Pritchard's point, Starr then subpoenaed the "Jane Doe" files from Jones's lawyers—which was probably redundant, since his own investigators had long been digging up the same information. FBI agents working for Starr interviewed a number of these women. These FBI records and other raw, unsubstantiated material were then given to the House Judiciary Committee, and subsequently, David Schippers, the chief counsel to Republicans on the House Judiciary Committee, interviewed some of them. This is what now constitutes the "secret evidence" which Rep. Tom DeLay (R-Tex.) and many of the managers have been touting.

A few days after the House voted up the Articles of Impeachment, DeLay said that the 67 votes needed to convict the President in the Senate could materialize "out of thin air," if the Senators were to "spend plenty of time in the evidence room." DeLay boasted of "reams of evidence that have not been publicly aired."

Rep. Chris Cannon (R-Utah), one of the House managers, has especially been promoting the "secret evidence." Appearing on CNN on Sunday, Jan. 10, Cannon argued that the "Jane Doe" witnesses are important to show "the continuing pattern of how this President has obstructed justice over time."

Responding to Cannon, former White House special counsel Lanny Davis attacked the idea of using this hidden evidence in the Senate trial. "It's McCarthyism at its worst," Davis said. "This is slimy tactics, that they should not be allowed to get away with."

In their opening presentations on Jan. 14-15, a number of the House managers referred to a "pattern of obstruction of justice," in the same terms as Paula Jones's lawyer had done almost a year ago.

It is a dirty, filthy trail from Richard Mellon Scaife's "Arkansas Project" and Troopergate, to Ambrose Evans-Pritchard and the Paula Jones case, to Kenneth Starr's sex-obsessed inquisition, and finally to the House and the Senate. But this is the desperate game that is now being played out to drive President Clinton from office.

Documentation

Clinton lawyers warn of threat to Constitution

The following are excerpts from the Trial Memorandum of President Clinton, submitted to the United States Senate on Jan. 13:

Twenty-six months ago, more than 90 million Americans left their homes and work places to travel to schools, church halls and other civic centers to elect a President of the United States. And on January 20, 1997, William Jefferson Clinton was sworn in to serve a second term of office for four years.

The Senate, in receipt of Articles of Impeachment from the House of Representatives, is now gathered in trial to consider whether that decision should be set aside for the remaining two years of the President's term. It is a power contemplated and authorized by the Framers of the Constitution, but never before employed in our nation's history. The gravity of what is at stake—the democratic choice of the American people—and the solemnity of the proceedings dictate that a decision to remove the President from office should follow only from the most serious of circumstances and should be done in conformity with Constitutional standards and in the interest of the Nation and its people. . . .

On October 28, 1998, more than 400 historians issued a joint statement warning that because impeachment had traditionally been reserved for high crimes and misdemeanors in the exercise of executive power, impeachment of the President based on the facts alleged in the OIC Referral would set a dangerous precedent. "If carried forward, they will leave the Presidency permanently disfigured and diminished, at the mercy as never before of caprices of any Congress. The Presidency, historically the center of leadership during our great national ordeals, will be crippled in meeting the inevitable challenges of the future.". . .

Ours is a Constitution of separated powers. In that Consti-