

[REDACTED]
Marion, S.C. 29571
[REDACTED]

February 19, 1998

To Whom it May Concern:

Many members of the media are implying that the President should be explaining to the American people his role in this issue of the allegations made against him *by the media*, and because he has not explained, then he must be guilty: Guilty of what? He has not been accused by anyone of doing anything wrong. Do educated people seriously expect him to try to guess what the accusations are against him and respond? Shouldn't he wait until he has been officially accused/charged before answering those charges?

I have tried very hard to avoid listening to the endless debates about the President and Monica Lewensky. These debates have been taken all the way to questions of impeachment hearings. The total insanity is that we don't have an allegation from the party with whom he was supposed to be involved. What possible explanation can there be for the fact that there are so many people who feel they have the right to trash the man who holds the highest office in the Nation? I am sitting here as an American citizen who was raised in a Democracy and who becomes tearful when I hear the *Star Spangled Banner* and I am wondering who are these people who are spitting out venom against the President of the United States and basing it all on hearsay? Do we no longer subscribe to the value of "**Innocent Until Proven Guilty**"?

I do not find the theory that is behind the allegations believable. **Simply making that statement sends the anti-Clinton Administration people into gasps of annoyance and ridicule.** Those who are perpetrating the scandal have set up some very rigid rules with regard to discussing it: It seems that you either buy their version in its entirety, or, there's something wrong with you: "You have no morals", or; "All you care about is that the economy is good", or; "You aren't dealing with reality". And I think my favorite admonishment for mentioning other possibilities is, "All you want to do is denigrate these innocent women who have been hurt by the President". These "poor women" are either lying through their teeth at worst, or kissing and telling at best: Why?: for fun and profit? Why is it alright for them to denigrate our President, but we must speak with reverence when speaking of them?

Who came up with the rules of what we must believe? Aren't there other explanations for the tapes and the visits to the White House and Vernon Jones' assistance to Monica Lewensky? Why isn't the media investigating other possibilities? Someone has suggested that the media is angry with the President, therefore, that is why they are having this "feeding frenzy". Why do the American people have to suffer through the media's anger issues? First, I don't believe that President Clinton would ever think it safe to have a relationship with a star-struck post-adolescent intern whose mother has written a book devoted to divulging the extramarital sex lives of the opera tenors: I just can't make that leap in logic. **I do have a theory about what happened that I believe answers every question** and I think that people who are really interested in investigating will at least find other theories worthy of discussion. Please take the time to look at my enclosed possible explanations for what has happened. This is no longer a partisan issue: It is an American issue. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely, [REDACTED]

B. C. Lew

Enclosures

In light of the fact that Linda Tripp and Lucy Ann Goldberg have proven themselves not to be objective and at least Goldberg has admitted to one lie (the semen stained dress) I find them not believable. Frankly, I do not find any of it believable. Also, because Monica Lewensky has not "shouted from the rooftop" her innocence and the innocence of the President as sworn in her original testimony, I find her role in all of this as less than innocent. No, I do not believe that on one hand she is sharp enough to make her way to the Oval Office, but on the other hand she is naive enough to mistake Linda Tripp as someone she could "safely" confide in with regard to a relationship with the President. Unfortunately for the Country, I believe that she and her mother (author of the book on the sex lives of the tenors) and Linda Tripp and Lucy Ann Goldberg are key players in a deception that has proven very detrimental to the Nation as a whole. I won't pretend to know the names of others involved, but I believe there are others. **Monica Lewensky may very well be the victim of a misguided parent (her mother) who believes that publicly humiliating prominent men is a good way to find fame and fortune.**

I believe it is possible that Monica Lewensky has played both sides of the coin in that she has presented herself to the White House as a naive, but adoring admirer of the President. She bought him a tie and possibly some other trinkets. She showed up early enough at a few events so she could be in line at the ropes and be video-taped while being greeted by the President. (I especially find the one where she is wearing a black hat and black outfit against a backdrop of people all wearing white sweatshirts as most interesting). Was it a "clutch" that she was referred to by the staff? I believe that she made up a relationship with a "high ranking official" and confided in Betty Currie and other White House upper echelon aides that she was in a situation that she did not know how to handle in order to gain further attention and, possibly, sympathy.

I suspect that when Linda Tripp was ready to present the tapes to Ken Starr, that was Monica's cue to tell the White House staff that she was dismayed (hysterical?) because the woman she "thought was her friend" (Tripp) whom she had been confiding in about the "high ranking official" had been secretly taping those conversations and was going to lie and say that she (Lewensky) had been talking about the President. Thus, the explanation for the immediate attention by Vernon Jones as they tried to help her (led her to an attorney) in her desire to tell the truth that her relationship with the President was absolutely above-board. I believe this was also a signal to the White House that Monica Lewensky was not just the troublesome, naive "clutch" they thought her to be: And that there was an explosion on the horizon.

I believe that the White House Staff and the President are the victims of a "double-cross" with Monica Lewensky as the star (no pun intended) actress in a plot written by people who are extremely devious. I will be surprised if Monica ever refers to her "significant other" by name in any of the dialogue carried on between she and Tripp on any of the tapes. All I have ever seen him referred to is "The Creep", and other derogatory terms when she is not referring to him in simple pronouns such as "him", or "he"(seen on televised excerpts from tapes): I find that unusual. Monica was most likely not supposed to ever name him in the tapes in case the whole thing fell through because she could then be charged and so could others involved. I think if I were involved with a man I would have a hard time avoiding the use of his surname on occasion unless I was following a script of some sort and knew that I was being taped. I think the rest of it; the supposed pressure on Monica's mother and the supposed pain that the mother and Monica is suffering over this will lead nicely at some point where the innocent and tender little Monica will be pressured to change her testimony from the original and implicate the President to save herself from the wicked Ken Starr and a possible jail sentence for "obstruction of Justice". Oh, yes and she'll probably be forced to say that the President told her to lie.

A second possibility is that Monica Lewensky, in her need to gain attention, and possibly to compete with her mother, did make the whole thing up. This theory is not unthinkable given some of the testimony by people who have known her. On one hand she supposedly referred to the President as "the creep" on the tapes to Linda Tripp. If she thought so little of him then logic tells me she is not happy with him (sounds like an angry term) so are we to believe that getting a job at Revlon made her feel better? I've searched for logical bridges from one point to another in this and they are not to be found. If the answer is that she made all of this up,, then I do feel sorry for her, but she must come forward to the press and state that her original testimony is correct and offer public apologies to the the President, his family and the American people. I think everyone would just be grateful to get past this and would admire her for finally telling the truth.

What will be the end result if we do not resolve to find healing for this wound to our country? What do we have?: Well, maybe we'll bring down a President and that of, course, makes all of those who wanted this a huge success. And Monica will be remembered as the poor thing who was forced to testify. And Linda Tripp was not a very good friend, but, after all she just had to "do the right thing". Ken Starr's tactics will go down as being too aggressive, but he had a job to do and he did it. They all will get off nicely: Monica's mother has a hot new book; Linda Tripp can feel vindicated after Vernon Jones referred to her as a liar in the Willey deal. Monica goes down in history as the intern who brought down a President which should get her endless talk show bookings and maybe even a screen test. All of the Republicans get things back where they want them and get to point to President Clinton as the great mistake that the people made the last time they voted for a Democrat.

What about the rest of us? We can remain shocked and hurt for the loss of a President whom we admire and respect. We will no longer believe in Democracy which promises that the majority of people will decide who shall be the President for a four-year term. This is not a partisan issue. This issue is about the Office of The Presidency and how willing we are as Americans to honor and protect it. It is the cornerstone of our Democracy and there are people in our midst who are willing to trash it in order to have their way. The fact that they have gone this far causes me to be frightened. I feel that I am beginning to understand the stress that people in police states must endure. How do we get our country back?

[REDACTED]
An American Citizen