

## Clinton's Cave-In to Hillary, Gore Wrecked Mideast Peace

by Edward Spannaus

Every sane observer of the breakdown of the Middle East peace process recognizes that the United States has, in the past few months, abandoned its role as an honest broker, and has displayed a bias toward Israel and against the Palestinians, which has contributed enormously toward the breakdown of the peace talks, and to the outbreak of violence which was triggered by Ariel Sharon's provocative invasion of the Temple Mount holy site on Sept. 28.

President's Clinton's unconscionable blaming of Yasser Arafat for the breakdown of the Camp David talks in July, was the most visible manifestation of this capitulation of his Administration to the Israeli war-hawk faction.

What may be less obvious, is the insidious role that the election campaigns of First Lady Hillary Clinton, and of Vice President Al Gore, have played in causing the President to lose his bearings on Middle East policy, and to abandon seven years of efforts to bring a lasting peace to the Middle East: Gore, because of his close dependence on his foreign policy mentor and top adviser, Leon Fuerth—who is suspected by many to be "Mega," the high-level Israeli mole in the Clinton Administration—now exacerbated even more by Gore's belief that he needs to win Florida in order to win the election; Hillary, because of her shameless pandering to the right-wing Zionist mafia in New York, in the misguided belief that this will win her the New York Jewish vote in her U.S. Senate race.

A few weeks before the opening of the Israeli-Palestinian talks at Camp David this Summer, it was reported that President Clinton had warned Arafat that he could not be expected to put pressure on Israel to meet Palestinian demands in the final-status negotiations, during an election year in the United States. When Clinton met with Arafat on June 15, it was

reported, the President reminded the Palestinian leader that his wife was running for office, as well as his vice president, and that he could not afford to do anything which would cost them votes.

Let us look first at the pressures that have been created for President Clinton around his wife's campaign for the U.S. Senate in New York, and then examine the longer-range problems around Gore and his adviser Fuerth.

### Hillary and the New York Elections

In May 1998, Hillary Rodham Clinton supported the creation of an independent Palestinian state, provoking howls of outrage from the New York City-centered right-wing Zionist mafia in the United States.

"It would be in the long-term interest of peace in the Middle East for there to be a State of Palestine . . . a functioning modern state that is on the same footing as other states," the First Lady said in a satellite address to the Seeds of Peace Mideast Youth Summit. For some time after this, President and Mrs. Clinton continued to display a relatively even-handed approach toward the Middle East; they visited the Palestinian National Council in December, and were very well-received.

Almost a year later, in November 1999, Mrs. Clinton again visited Israel and the Palestinian territories. It was then that she made her famous embrace of Arafat's wife Suha, after Mrs. Arafat had made a comment about Israelis poisoning Palestinian children—for which Yasser Arafat later publicly rebuked her. This incident set off even more protests among the hard-line pro-Zionist Jewish spokesmen in New York. For example, the *New York Post* ran a screaming front-page

headline: “First Lady Silent in Face of ‘Blood Libel’ on Israel: Shame on Hillary.”

But up to this point, Hillary remained firm in her support of the peace process. Many of her top advisers in New York were strong advocates of the peace process as well. “The First Lady’s strong support of the peace process is completely in tune with the views of the majority of the New York Jewish community,” said Victor Kovner, a board member of Americans for Peace Now.

But all the while, there was a steady drumbeat of commentary claiming that Hillary had to temper her views in order to win the Jewish vote. At the time of her November visit to the Middle East, for example, the *Jerusalem Post* reported that “winning the Jewish vote big is a must,” and that the First Lady “cannot take Jewish support for granted.”

But, after the Suha Arafat incident, Hillary began to back off. The first sign was in a private December meeting with members of the Orthodox Union. Under intense questioning, Hillary said that financial aid to the Palestinian Authority should be restricted because of anti-Israel textbooks used by Palestinians.

### **Kissing Hikind’s Rear**

But the most insidious operation against Hillary was, and still is, being run by the would-be kingmaker of the Orthodox Jewish community in Brooklyn, New York Assemblyman Dov Hikind—a nominal Democrat. Hikind began working on Hillary already in the Summer of 1999, suggesting that Mrs. Clinton was beginning to distance herself from some “Clintonesque” policies, but he said that the surest way “to confirm her reversals” would be for her to use her influence to get her husband to grant a pardon for the imprisoned Israeli spy Jonathan Pollard. Hikind kept up the pressure, and in April of this year, Hillary decided it was time for her to go to Hikind.

A hard-hitting exposé of Hillary’s sucking-up to Hikind is contained in an article by David Grann in the Oct. 16 issue of the *New Republic*, entitled simply “The Courtship.”

“Hikind occupies a subterranean political world,” wrote Grann. “It is, by all accounts, a grubby, grimy, unedifying, petty little place. But it is there that all New York politicians must eventually go, and where Hillary Clinton . . . has been spending a remarkable amount of her time.”

Hikind had called Hillary “the enemy,” Grann notes. “As a former disciple of the extreme right-wing Rabbi Meir Kahane, Hikind had one litmus test every candidate had to pass: unwavering, unconditional support for Israel.” Hikind had called Hillary “the foremost supporter of a Palestinian state in the United States,” and Yasser Arafat’s “number-one advocate.”

“As the election neared . . . the First Lady became convinced, like so many candidates before her, that she needed Hikind.” In April, over the vehement opposition of many of

her aides and advisers, she went to Brooklyn, where Hikind was sitting *shiva* for his late father, and she spent half an hour on her knees in front of Hikind’s mother. A few days later, Hikind told reporters: “She is a nice lady. She’s not anti-Israel by any means. She just has a point of view that’s on the extreme left.”

Hillary tried to arrange a sit-down meeting, but Hikind stalled, Grann reports. Then, on Aug. 23, she arranged a private meeting with Hikind. “We hit it off,” Hikind later said. “I thought she was mesmerized,” said one of Hikind’s top aides.

What Hikind says he asked for, was that do something dramatic “to get across that she is not an enemy—that she is in fact a friend.” The best way to do that, Hikind told her, would be to persuade her husband to grant clemency to Pollard. The day after the meeting, Hikind learned that Pollard was being transferred to a more dangerous prison compound. He alerted Hillary, who contacted the White House, and within 24 hours, the prison decided not to move Pollard. “The bottom line of this is that she is clearly moving in the right direction,” Hikind says.

Grann closes by describing a recent conversation between Hikind and Hikind’s wife, in which his wife demands to know, “Why are you even talking to her?”

Hikind answers: “I’m just not making it easy for [Republican candidate for U.S. Senate Rick] Lazio. . . . And I’ll tell you something else. Depending on what happens in the next few weeks . . . Hillary Clinton could turn out to be a very good candidate.” After his wife badgers him some more, he protests: “I know exactly what I’m doing.”

“But why do you want to help her?” his wife persists.

“Let’s give them a problem here,” Hikind explains. “Let them be concerned about us. . . . And by the way. After meeting with me, I can hurt Hillary more than ever before. What is her campaign going to do if I endorse Rick Lazio?”

### **Camp David**

If the effects of Hillary’s pandering to the extremists in New York’s Jewish community were restricted to New York, that would be one thing. But there is every indication that Bill Clinton’s abandonment of his role as an “honest broker” in the Middle East peace process is, in part, a direct consequence of his misguided efforts to get Hillary, and Gore, elected in November.

A few days after the Camp David talks began on July 11, Hillary was hit with a scandal about an anti-Semitic statement that she had supposedly uttered 25 years earlier. The scandal was promoted by the *New York Post* starting on July 15, under the front-page headline “Furor over Claim that Clinton Used Anti-Semitic Slur: Hillary Book Brouhaha.” The *Post* interviewed the wife of Paul Fray, a former campaign worker in Arkansas, who said that Hillary had called Fray a “f—king Jew bastard” in 1974. At the same time, the *Post* ran an editorial on “Hillary’s Jewish Problem,” bringing up Hillary’s em-

brace of Suha Arafat last year; plus it ran a commentary by John Podhoretz, saying that the controversy “may have doomed Hillary Clinton’s chances as a Senate candidate,” and urging all of New York’s Jews to tell Hillary to “go back to Arkansas—and rot.”

The controversy continued prominently in the *Post* for a week, with, for example, another column saying that the problem was not what Hillary had said in 1974, but her “position on ‘peace’ today,” and adding, “no politician holding statewide office in New York can be anything other than a stong advocate of Israel if she hopes to keep that job.”

Joe Conason, writing about the controversy in the *New York Observer* on July 18, called it “a typical Rupert Murdoch smear operation.”

“A dubiously sourced anti-Semitic slur, supposedly uttered by Hillary Rodham Clinton in 1974, has been transformed by the *New York Post* almost overnight into the hottest issue of the Senate campaign,” Conason wrote, noting that Murdoch owns the *New York Post*, and HarperCollins, which is publishing the book in question; plus, the story was first picked up by Matt Drudge, who has a show on Murdoch’s Fox TV.

On July 21, the lead story in the Jewish publication *Forward* was headlined: “Put on Defensive by Slur Allegation, First Lady Gropes for Jewish Strategy.” It reported on the alleged anti-Semitic slur, and raised questions about Hillary’s embrace of Suha Arafat, etc., saying that Mrs. Clinton has a “continuing weakness among Jewish voters,” and “an inability to develop a clear strategy for bolstering Jewish support.”

Four days later, on July 25, the Camp David talks ended in failure, and President Clinton put all the blame on Yasser Arafat for the breakdown of the negotiations, saying that the Israelis were willing to move forward, but Arafat was not.

## Hillary Goes Overboard

In recent weeks, Mrs. Clinton has outright expressed much stronger pro-Israel positions than previously, some even at variance with her husband’s Administration. On Oct. 7, immediately after the United States had abstained from voting on a UN Security Council resolution which condemned the “excessive use of force” by Israel, Hillary condemned the U.S. abstention, saying that the U.S. should have instead vetoed the resolution. The next day, she described Arafat’s responsibility for the violence as “clear” and “total”—in terms even stronger than those used by Administration officials such as Secretary of State Madeleine Albright.

During the next week, indicating the concern among some U.S. and European institutions that President Clinton had gone too far in caving in to his wife’s electoral ambitions, articles exposing Hillary’s shameless kissing-up to the right-wing Zionist lobby in New York appeared almost simultaneously in the *New Republic*, the *New York Observer*, and the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* in Germany.

## Gore, Fuerth, and ‘Mega’

This is not Clinton’s first problem with the Israeli war-hawks, and their agents and supporters in the United States. Indeed, much of the scandal-mongering and the impeachment campaign against the President was driven by so-called Christian evangelicals and fundamentalists in the United States who make up part of the fanatical coalition pushing a new Armageddon in the Middle East. Notable among these are televangelists Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson, both rabid Clinton-haters who hosted then-Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu just as the Monica Lewinsky scandal was breaking in January 1998.

In June 1998, the *Washington Post* ran one of the first profiles to appear in print, of Gore’s National Security Adviser Leon Fuerth. In the middle of the article, it was mentioned that some State Department officials “believe he is the conduit by which inside information is passed to Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu”—a reference that would evoke recollection of the story of the Israeli mole “Mega,” which had broken into the light about a year earlier.

In May 1997, the *Washington Post* reported that during January 1997, U.S. intelligence agencies had opened an investigation to determine if a senior Administration official was passing information to the Israeli government. This came after the National Security Agency had intercepted an Israeli Mossad message referring to “Mega,” regarding an Israeli intelligence effort to obtain a secret Jan. 16, 1997 letter from former Secretary of State Warren Christopher to Arafat. The *Post* noted that this could turn out to be more serious than the Pollard espionage case.

*EIR* was later told that, immediately after the “Mega” intercept, a Mossad special communications unit had been dispatched to Washington; the team tapped Lewinsky’s phone, among others, and obtained at least 30 X-rated conversations between Clinton and Lewinsky. The threat to expose the tapes was used to get the U.S. government to drop the “Mega” investigation.

According to reports published last year, an Israeli-owned telecommunications company was involved, as a subcontractor, with the installation of a new White House phone system in early 1997; it was reported that an officer of the subcontracting company was able to intercept calls from White House and other government offices, and transmit them directly to Tel Aviv.

Other reports say that there had been an intensive FBI investigation of Israeli spying and hacking into secure telephone networks of the State Department, White House, and Pentagon—an investigation which was apparently subsequently shut down. One source was quoted as saying that “anything involving Israel on this particular matter is off-limits.”

The circumstances of Lewinsky, a known “serial stalker,” being deployed into the White House in 1995 are also a matter of concern. And it is notable that, in February 1997—right at

the point of the “Mega” investigation and the Israeli wiretap operation against Clinton—Lewinsky reestablished contact with the President after Clinton had broken off the relationship almost a full year earlier. On March 29, 1997, the President had his last sexual encounter with Lewinsky, at which point he told her of his suspicions that a foreign embassy was tapping his telephone conversations—a revelation which was contained in the report sent to Congress in September 1998, but which has received remarkably little attention.

### Yeltsin’s Tip-Off

It is also highly suggestive, that in his recently published memoirs, former Russian President Boris Yeltsin says that he received an intelligence report in late 1996, that President Clinton’s enemies intended to plant a young female provocateur in his entourage, to set off a major scandal against Clinton.

“In late 1996 after Clinton’s re-election, Russian intelligence sent me a coded report containing a prognosis of how the Republicans would resolve the major political problems emerging for them and noting that Clinton had a particular predilection for beautiful young women,” Yeltsin says. “In the near future, the report said, Clinton’s enemies planned to plant in his entourage a young provocateur who would spark a major scandal capable of ruining the President’s reputation.”

In fact, Lewinsky had been placed in the White House as an unpaid intern in the Summer of 1995, and the President’s dalliance with her is said to have begun during the government shutdown in mid-November 1995. But it was in November 1996, right after the elections, that independent counsel Kenneth Starr diverted his Whitewater investigation into a probe of Clinton’s sex life—which coheres with Yeltsin’s report. And at the same time, articles about the possible impeachment of Clinton appeared in the *Washington Times Insight* magazine and in the *American Spectator*.

All of which points to the broader blackmail pressures already operating on the President throughout his second Administration, even before the pressures coming from Hillary’s and Gore’s election campaigns sent Clinton “over the edge”—at least, for the time being—with regard to his personal role in the Middle East peace process, a role that must be put back on track if a horrific regional war is to be averted.

**Check Out This Website:**

**[www.larouchespeaks.com](http://www.larouchespeaks.com)**

## Atlanta Mayor Takes On DOJ’s ‘Operation Fruehmenschen’

by Debra Hanania Freeman

A naive citizen, relying on the stream of media reports that began appearing nationally sometime in late September, might conclude that Atlanta’s two-term Mayor Bill Campbell is suffering some kind of mental breakdown. Articles reported that he was “lashing out in a paranoid and vituperative fashion,” when he charged that a Federal probe into possible government corruption in his city was racially motivated. Some said he was “playing the race card” (Mayor Campbell is African-American), and threatening to incite a race riot if Federal investigators didn’t back off.



*Mayor Bill Campbell*

The Oct. 4 *Washington Post* went so far as to speculate that Campbell’s attitudes toward race were the result of childhood trauma caused when he was seven years old, and became the first black student to integrate the school system in his hometown of Raleigh, North Carolina. “Whites taunted the child with racial slurs as he entered the school, and his family, led by his late father, Ralph Sr., who headed the local NAACP [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People], received death threats.”

Mayor Campbell is not crazy, nor is he suffering a breakdown. In fact, Campbell is doing what few others have had the courage to do in the face of a long and sometimes overwhelming pattern of racially and politically motivated targeting of African-American elected officials by the Department of Justice. With a “take no prisoners” strategy, Campbell is fighting back, going directly to those he has sworn to serve, his constituents, with the full truth of the operation against him.

It is not clear just how long the Atlanta Mayor has been a target of Department of Justice investigators. Sources close to City Hall say the “probe” has been active for nine months. But, spokesmen for the Department of Justice have repeatedly refused to comment, and won’t even officially confirm or deny that Mayor Campbell is the target of their investigation,