

## British-instigated Jones case thrown out

by Edward Spannaus

With the April 1 dismissal of Paula Jones's lawsuit against President Clinton, the nation, hopefully, has come to the end of a sorry episode of treason and foreign intrigue, which should never have been permitted to go as far as it did. The Jones case was never about sexual harassment—as was once again convincingly affirmed by Judge Susan Webber Wright's decision, which found that Jones never had enough evidence to merit taking her case to trial.

As *EIR* has uniquely shown, again and again, the Jones suit was instigated and orchestrated from its inception by British intelligence stringer Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, who acknowledged having extensive discussions with Jones and her lawyers prior to the filing of the suit in May 1994.

Shortly after Jones's attorneys filed the suit, *EIR* Founding Editor Lyndon LaRouche was asked to comment on it, and on suggestions that civil lawsuits should not be pursued against a sitting President. LaRouche said that, generally, "I do not wish to have the Presidency tied up with a scurrilous lawsuit of this type." But, LaRouche added, one should take into account the rights of a litigant who might have an honest case. So, he therefore suggested some special procedures which should be applied in the Paula Jones case against the President—which, it is now obvious, would have saved the nation from the orgy of degradation which has afflicted it since independent counsel Kenneth "Porn" Starr jumped publicly into the Jones case in January of this year.

LaRouche proposed four years ago, that the first thing that should be done, was to require that Jones submit to a preliminary deposition.

"First of all, she should be compelled to show that her collaboration with Ambrose Evans-Pritchard did not produce a lawsuit which is clearly politically motivated to destabilize

the Presidency (which is what Mr. Pritchard said the purpose of this operation is)," LaRouche said.

If it turns out to be the case that she wouldn't have filed the suit without the instigation of Evans-Pritchard, a British intelligence-controlled agent, LaRouche said, "there are grounds for a summary dismissal or suspension of the suit, and I don't think the woman has any claims coming to her. . . . If she's got a claim, she can wait until the President is through with his business in office. Because she would not have made the suit at this time, but for foreign intelligence instigation."

### Ambrose confesses

The evidence of Ambrose Evans-Pritchard's instigation of the Paula Jones suit, and his orchestration of the strategy which her lawyers, up through their last public court filing on March 28—in which they submitted a scurrilous, unsworn document accusing Bill Clinton of having forcibly raped a woman in 1978—comes straight from Pritchard's own poison pen.

Even before the filing of the Jones suit on May 6, 1994, Evans-Pritchard had written a number of articles describing his discussions with Jones and her lawyers. Then, on May 8, Evans-Pritchard acknowledged that he had had "a dozen conversations with Mrs. Jones over the past two months." He furthermore admitted that "I happened to be present at a strategy meeting last month on a boat on the Arkansas River" at which Jones's attorney "was weighing the pros and cons of legal action."

A week later, Evans-Pritchard admitted the actual motivation and purpose of the Jones suit. It doesn't "matter all that much whether Mrs. Jones ultimately wins or loses her case,"

he wrote on May 15, 1994. "The ticking time bomb in the lawsuit lies elsewhere, in the testimony of other witnesses."

"Put plainly," Evans-Pritchard confessed, "the political purpose of the Jones lawsuit is to reconstruct the inner history of the Arkansas Governor's Mansion, using the legal power of discovery. . . . Testimony would be available to the public as court documents."

He also made another disclosure, during a discussion with a journalist in late May 1994, the significance of which is much clearer today, in light of the disclosures which have been published in recent issues of *EIR* (see, for example, "Secret Operation vs. Clinton Is Run by Olson-Starr Salon," March 13, 1998). *EIR* reported that regular attendees at the "Olson-Starr Salon" include not only Ken Starr, but present and former Federal appeals court judges Laurence Silberman and Robert Bork, the *Wall Street Journal's* Robert Bartley, and *American Spectator* editor Emmett Tyrrell.

In that May 1994 discussion, Pritchard revealed that he had just recently attended a dinner party during which he discussed the Jones case with Judge Silberman. Whether the discussion took place at one of the regular gatherings at the Olsons' house is not known, but Pritchard did describe how Silberman was analyzing the Jones case, and the question of whether the suit might be delayed until after the 1996 elections. At the same time, another "Olson salon" attendee, Kenneth Starr himself, was getting ready to work on an *amicus curiae* legal brief to be filed on behalf of Paula Jones, arguing against Presidential immunity from a civil suit.

In his book *The Secret Life of Bill Clinton*, published last year, Evans-Pritchard gave further details, although sanitized, about his own involvement in the creation of the Jones case. He described a meeting on a houseboat on the Arkansas River, in which he recommended a lawyer of "national stature" to Jones's local lawyer. Pritchard acknowledges, "For a few minutes, I suppose, it could be said that I had become a consultant to the embryonic legal team of Paula Jones." More important, Pritchard describes numerous discussions with Jones and her husband, in his efforts to convince them to file the lawsuit.

Belatedly, but with good effect, President Clinton's lawyers took up the issue of Evans-Pritchard's role in the Jones case just a few weeks ago. After Jones's lawyers had filed 700 pages of salacious documents in their opposition to President Clinton's summary judgment motion, Clinton's lawyers filed a motion to strike much of those materials. Clinton's lawyer Robert Bennett introduced the motion by explicitly citing Evans-Pritchard's *The Secret Life of Bill Clinton* as showing "the genesis of this material."

"In that book," Bennett stated, "plaintiff's husband announced a plan to abuse the compulsory processes of the court to put a veneer of credibility on all manner of gossip, rumor, and innuendo concerning President Clinton." Bennett then quoted the following passage from Evans-Pritchard's book:

"In a belligerent mood, Steve [Jones] warned that he was

going to use subpoena power to reconstruct the secret life of Bill Clinton. Every state trooper used by the governor to solicit women was going to be deposed under oath. 'We're going to get names; we're going to get dates; we're going to do the job that the press wouldn't do,' he said. 'We're going to go after Clinton's medical records, the raw documents, not just opinions from doctors, . . . we're going to find out everything.'"

Bennett then stated: "Plaintiff's recent filing is the culmination of that plan, which was executed with the help of the Rutherford Institute and plaintiff's other financial and political backers. . . . Plaintiff filed on the public record much of the irrelevant, unfounded, and inadmissible information that plaintiff collected in this case."

### Fading Starr

The dismissal of the Jones *civil* case also strikes a devastating blow to the other side of this strategy — the *criminal* case being pursued by special prosecutor Starr. These two proceedings have operated in tandem for some time; this covert collaboration spilled into the public view on Jan. 21, when the story of Linda Tripp and Monica Lewinsky broke in the news media.

A few days earlier, on Jan. 16, attorneys from Starr's office and from the Justice Department went to the special

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

—Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.



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

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

three-judge court which appoints independent counsels, and obtained authorization to expand Starr's investigation into allegations of perjury and obstruction of justice in the *Jones v. Clinton* case.

But already, three days before that, Starr's lawyers had wired up Linda Tripp, so that FBI agents could record discussions between Tripp and Monica Lewinsky in an effort to try to obtain evidence that Clinton was trying to get witnesses to commit perjury in the Jones case. Lewinsky had been subpoenaed by Jones's lawyers to give a deposition in the Jones case in November, after a series of anonymous calls came into the Rutherford Institute—which had just announced it would bankroll Paula Jones's case—tipping them off about Lewinsky.

Meanwhile, FBI agents and lawyers from Starr's office spent the day on Jan. 16 threatening and trying to intimidate Lewinsky into cooperating with Starr. And, having spent the day with those same FBI agents and Starr prosecutors, Linda Tripp then spent the evening briefing Paula Jones's lawyers about her discussions with Lewinsky and about Starr's investigation, so that Jones's lawyers could attempt to entrap President Clinton during his deposition scheduled for the next morning.

Starr's takeover of the Jones case is now *kaput*—along with the Jones case itself.

It is high time that the role of Ambrose Evans-Pritchard's orchestration, the Olson salon, and Starr's gross prosecutorial misconduct, become the subject of a real criminal investigation.

## Starr witness-tampering under investigation

by Edward Spannaus

Attorney General Janet Reno stated on April 2 that she is reviewing allegations “of monies paid to a witness” which were forwarded to her by the United States Attorney in western Arkansas, and possibly also by the FBI.

The U.S. Attorney in Fort Smith, Arkansas, P.K. Holmes III, has ordered the local FBI to investigate possible tampering with Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr's key witness in the Arkansas Whitewater investigation, involving monies paid by Richard Mellon Scaife through *American Spectator* magazine. The witness is David Hale, a former municipal judge in Little Rock, who became a protected government witness against Bill Clinton for Starr's office in 1994, in order to obtain a reduced sentence for his own crimes. Eyewitnesses have now come forward to say that they saw Hale receiving

cash payments from private parties while he was a federally protected witness in Starr's probe; and investigations by a number of news media organizations have shown that the cash originated with the “Daddy Warbucks” of the anti-Clinton propaganda crusade, Richard Mellon Scaife.

### Protected witness

While Hale was under investigation by Federal officials in 1994, he began changing his story in order to falsely implicate Clinton in a fraudulent loan scheme. Hale was put in the Federal Witness Protection Program by Starr's prosecutors, and never went anywhere without an FBI escort. Yet Hale managed to meet regularly with *private* anti-Clinton operatives and investigators, feeding them stories about Clinton and receiving cash payments in return. Most of the meetings took place at a Hot Springs, Arkansas bait shop run by Parker Dozhier—who would spend day after day debriefing Hale, typing up the notes and passing them on to the *American Spectator*. Dozhier received at least \$35,000 from the American Spectator Educational Foundation (ASEF), some of which he passed on as cash payments to Hale.

The monies originated with foundations controlled by Mellon Scaife. They were then transferred through ASEF into the “Arkansas Project,” with the funds administered by two longtime associates of Scaife, Virginia lawyer Stephen Boynton, and Thomas Henderson, who was vice president of the ASEF.

Theodore Olson, a longtime friend and former law partner of Starr, who hosts a regular “Get Clinton” salon at his Northern Virginia home, is also the attorney for ASEF, and sits on its Board of Directors. When Hale was subpoenaed to appear before the Senate Whitewater Committee in 1995, Olson represented Hale.

### More Troopergate money

At the same time, new information has emerged that another wealthy right-winger who provides major funding for both the Heritage Foundation (of which Scaife is the largest funder), and for Newt Gingrich's GOPAC campaign committee, was a source of funds for some of the Arkansas state troopers who became both sources of dirt for the news media, and also became witnesses in the now-defunct Paula Jones case against President Clinton. According to the New York *Observer* and the Chicago *Sun-Times*, Smith introduced author David Brock to the Arkansas state troopers, including Larry Patterson and Roger Perry. At the time that Brock got the anti-Clinton stories from the troopers which appeared in the January 1994 *American Spectator*, he received \$5,000 from Smith. The troopers admitted that they had each received \$6,700 from Smith. All told, Smith poured \$80,000 into the Arkansas dirt-digging effort in 1992-94. He admitted, in an interview with the Chicago *Sun Times*, that his first efforts, in 1992, were part of George Bush's re-election drive.