

## LaRouche on Whitewater: 'We are not a banana republic'

by Edward Spannaus

As news media hysteria around the contrived "Whitewater" scandal has intensified, presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche has pinpointed the British crowd orchestrating the operation, as well as the policy issues which are really at stake. What is actually behind the fight around the Clinton presidency has nothing to do with the stories which the gullible U.S. population is fed every night on television, or every day on the radio talk show circuit.

In his interview with *EIR* on March 9, LaRouche said that the British operation, centered around the London *Daily Telegraph*, goes back to last November-December, and that they are using the same apparatus which is behind the more recent Hebron massacre.

The primary issue, LaRouche said, "is the Russian policy question, [and] the relationship of the Russian policy question to the derivatives swindle, the big bubble swindle." And then what you have, LaRouche continued, are "the forces behind the Russian policy, that is, the so-called shock therapy or IMF [International Monetary Fund] conditionalities policy, saying don't touch it."

But, LaRouche warned, "the important thing is this: Americans have to wake up, including some foolish Republicans who are behaving opportunistically and *not* patriotically. When a foreign government's intelligence services set out to destabilize the institution of the U.S. presidency—a constitutional institution—we *don't go along with that*. We don't let anyone in Britain destabilize our government. We are not a banana republic, and we ought to stop it."

### Brits set the timetable

It is precisely because this is being run from abroad, that many of the President's opportunistic Republican opponents in the United States can't seem to get their signals straight. For weeks, they demanded that Clinton and Attorney General

Janet Reno appoint an impartial special prosecutor. On Jan. 20, Reno did appoint an independent counsel, a Republican of impeccable credentials, former federal prosecutor Robert Fiske. Fiske appears to have launched an aggressive and thorough investigation of all Whitewater-related matters, but he has said that his investigation will take at least 18 months to complete.

But this isn't fast enough for the gang that wants to bring down Clinton by the end of this year. Thus, many of those who first demanded the appointment of a special prosecutor, are now trying to orchestrate congressional hearings on Whitewater—over Fiske's opposition—in order to bring Clinton down sooner.

Who wants Clinton out during 1994? Let's start with the London *Sunday Telegraph*, which on Jan. 23 announced its intention to force Clinton out of office "before the year is out." On the U.S. side, the campaign is being spearheaded by Emmett Tyrrell, editor of the *American Spectator*, the little-known neo-conservative magazine which boosted its circulation significantly with its January issue featuring the Clinton "Troopergate" story, which was quickly picked up by the national news media starting with Cable News Network. In the Feb. 11 *Washington Times*, Tyrrell praised the British media for their coverage of Whitewater, and he praised the *Daily Telegraph's* Washington correspondent, Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, who, he said, "has been particularly tireless in examining those scandals."

Two days later, the *Sunday Telegraph* returned the favor, and ran a feature boosting Tyrrell. "There has always been a strong British connection" to the *American Spectator*, said the *Sunday Telegraph*, noting that its Washington bureau chief, Tom Bethell, is English, and that Sir Peregrine Worsthorne, the flagship columnist for the *Sunday Telegraph*, is an active member of the editorial board. Then,



*Georgian President Shevardnadze with President Clinton at the White House March 7, where media behavior made the aims of the scandal all too clear. Shevardnadze came to warn of the danger of a "whole chain of wars" extending from the Balkans through the Caucasus and into Central Asia. At the National Press Club, he said that continued instability and war in former Soviet republics, especially in the Transcaucasus, could have serious repercussions in Russia, and that the policy of the West will be crucial in deciding whether this nightmare can be averted. At this joint press conference, the first question was about Whitewater, and English-speaking media failed to ask a single question about U.S.-Georgian relations.*

Worsthorne devoted much of his Feb. 13 column to praise of his friend "Bob" Tyrrell, whom he identified as "masterminding the campaign which is beginning to look like it might do for Clinton what the *Washington Post* did for Nixon."

"There's no question that the campaign against Clinton is being orchestrated from Britain," a well-placed Israeli source said to *EIR* recently. He emphasized the role of the *Daily Telegraph*, finding this of particular interest, because it is owned by the same Hollinger chain which backs the Ariel Sharon interests in Israel, and which has been trying to undermine the Israel-Palestine Liberation Organization accord.

### Special counsel versus Congress

On March 4, subpoenas were served on White House staffers, to the delight of Clinton's detractors. In reality, the subpoenas have little significance—except in the "perception" game which governs politics in Washington. They compel six top Clinton aides, including then White House Counsel Bernard Nussbaum, to appear before a federal grand jury, and they order the White House to produce all documents and records related to Whitewater. Three Treasury officials were also subpoenaed.

The next morning, Nussbaum resigned. In his letter to Clinton, Nussbaum said he had acted at all times "in an absolutely legal and ethical manner." But, he added, "as a result of controversy generated by those who do not understand, nor wish to understand the role and obligations of a lawyer, even one acting as White House Counsel, I now

believe I can best serve you by returning to private life."

Nussbaum had recently come under fire for meeting federal officials who were overseeing the investigation of Arkansas business deals involving the Clintons and their friends. Despite the hypocritical howls of the media and congressional Republicans, it is completely routine and proper for lawyers to meet with prosecutors or regulatory agency officials who are investigating their clients, and everybody in Washington knows this.

Nevertheless, Nussbaum was driven out, and on March 8, Clinton appointed veteran establishment lawyer Lloyd Cutler as "special counsel to the President" for a period of three to four months, while Clinton finds a permanent replacement for Nussbaum.

One effect of the Fiske subpoenas, which became immediately clear, is that they make it more difficult for Republicans in Congress to carry out their Whitewater witchhunt. Republicans on both the Senate and House Banking Committees have made known their intention to hold hearings on the Madison/Whitewater affair. (Although, as Sen. John Kerry [D-Mass.] has pointed out, these same Republicans have been quite apathetic about the larger issues of the S&L bailout, or about the failure of much larger institutions than Madison, such as those in Texas, which cost taxpayers billions of dollars.)

Rep. Jim Leach (R-Iowa), the ranking Republican on the House Banking Committee, has requested 40 witnesses for questioning on Whitewater at a hearing scheduled for March

24. The list, submitted to committee chairman Henry Gonzalez (D-Tex.), includes seven White House officials, including Nussbaum and Chief of Staff Mack McLarty, and potential witnesses from Little Rock, including James McDougal and his wife Susan.

Fiske has urged Congress not to hold hearings on Whitewater, warning that such hearings could "pose a severe risk" to the integrity of his probe. Both Republicans and Democrats have now agreed that witnesses will not be given immunity (i.e., compelled to testify, with a promise that their testimony cannot be used against them in any subsequent criminal proceeding). But one of the consequences of this will be that many witnesses are likely to be given the standard lawyer's advice to refuse to testify unless they are given immunity.

In various interviews, Sen. Alfonse "Mr. Ethics" D'Amato (R-N.Y.) has made it clear that he hopes this is what will happen, forcing administration witnesses to publicly take the Fifth Amendment, à la the Joe McCarthy tactic of the 1950s.

Fiske met with Senate Republican leaders on March 9, but D'Amato and William Cohen (R-Me.) made it clear afterwards that they are determined to go ahead with hearings, even at the risk of impairing Fiske's investigation. The only concessions they made to Fiske were that they would not grant immunity to witnesses, and that they might be willing to delay their hearings until Fiske has completed the first phase of his investigation. On the House side, Leach refused to even meet with Fiske. "I did not want to compromise his work, and I did not want him to compromise mine," he said. Leach is still insisting on the March 24 hearings. The White House, anxious to avoid the appearance of stonewalling, will apparently not discourage officials from appearing before the committees.

### Wall Street Journal accuses Fiske

Meanwhile, the *Wall Street Journal* has already accused Fiske of a coverup. In a lead editorial entitled "The Fiske Coverup," the *Journal* on March 9 accused Fiske of blocking the release of information on the death of White House aide Vincent Foster, and made it clear that it wants congressional hearings for the purpose of driving the President and the Democrats out of office. Accusing White House aides of sitting on the Foster records, *Journal* editors charged that Fiske's actions "will continue their coverup beyond the congressional election and with luck beyond the presidential one."

The *Journal* editors urged congressional leaders to insist to Fiske that they are going ahead with an investigation, even if it undercuts the independent counsel's investigation. "They should tell Mr. Fiske that they ultimately don't care whether someone goes to jail. . . . The more important responsibility is to give the public the facts it needs to judge the performance of its government; deciding whether to indict is less important than deciding to throw the rascals out."

By the end of the year, gentlemen?

# Cooper health plan in the hands of the

by Linda Everett

Rep. Jim Cooper (D-Tenn.), a Rhodes Scholar who studied at Oxford, England, likes to characterize himself as a "New Democrat" who, as he told the Democratic Leadership Conference, is proud to be part of the new policy shift "away from the philosophy of entitlement and toward the philosophy of empowerment—the New Covenant." The *New Republic*, in its December endorsement of Cooper's health care reform proposal, called it a true "New Democrat alternative" to President Clinton's Health Security Act. The magazine wrote that Cooper regards medical coverage as a matter of personal responsibility, not a new entitlement. The "New Democrat," it explained, "says that once government removes the barriers that prevent its citizens from taking care of themselves, it's up to individuals to act on their own behalf."

Of course, helping millions of Americans who are wracked by the AIDS virus, or virulent, unresponsive strains of tuberculosis, or catastrophic medical conditions, is a major public health issue, not a matter of people acting "on their own behalf." And maybe you're finding it hard to discern how the free market that Cooper crowns about, will "empower" millions of our wretchedly impoverished families and millions more of our mentally and/or physically ill homeless people to solve their own health care problems. Yet, Cooper wants to swap the traditional, historic, but admittedly tattered covenant that this nation once proudly held in meeting the health care needs of its people on the most advanced medical levels possible, with his post-industrial "New Covenant."

### Supported by Business Roundtable

Cooper's Managed Competition Act received national scrutiny in February when the Business Roundtable, an influential group of executives representing 200 of the country's largest companies, voted to support it.

Cooper claims that H.R. 3222, co-sponsored by Rep. Fred Grandy (R-Iowa), would guarantee universal access to health care (not universal coverage). The bill, sponsored in the Senate (S. 1579) by John Breaux (D-La.) and David Durenberger (R-Minn.), shares plenty of common ground