

To:

Brian Lamb, Pres.

C-Span

Washington, D.C.

FAX: 202-737-3323

Pages: 9

Guest suggestions

for

Washington Journal

Dear Brian,

Thank you for the tremendous work you are doing via C-Span to help our country solve the crisis it is in. And thank you for bringing the Truth to the surface.

I'm including an ad in the Washington Times, run by your recent guest Larry Klayman, which shows his partisan Agenda + willingness to lie. I hope you don't promote him anymore, by having him on "Washington Journal".

Also am including Fred Barnes' Impeachment article from the Weekly Standard describing the Republican Strategy.

Thank you so much for Gene Lyons, he gave very valuable information.

Could you have:

1. Joe Conason, Political Editor, NY Observer, he has very valuable information.

I'm including one of his articles.

S.W.R

2. May Brentley, Editor, Arkansas Times.
He says people in the North have no idea of what Ken Starr did in Arkansas.
He left a trail of fear + anger.
3. David Pryor, former Gov. of Arkansas.
He said (on TV) that Kenneth Starr totally devastated Tim Guy Tucker - financially, emotionally + otherwise.
4. Wm. H. Jeffries, Jr., a Wash. DC attorney who filed a complaint against Kenneth Starr with the Am. Bar Assoc. Ethics Committee. His phone: 202-833-5120.
5. Lawrence Walsh, Indep. Counsel, Iran-Contra. He is deeply disturbed by Kenneth Starr's investigation.

Personally, I think there should be a Congressional Investigation into Starr's abuses of power in order to heal the deep wounds he has inflicted on our Democracy.

Gratefully yours,



Bill Clinton



Larry Klayman

Page 1



WHY DID CLINTON OFFER ME \$2 MILLION HUSH MONEY?

My name is Larry Klayman and three years ago I founded Judicial Watch to fight government corruption and to be the Conservative movement's response to the ACLU. I am a trial lawyer and so are our attorney volunteers. Only through court action to force respect for ethics, the law and morality will our country survive.

When we received information that the Clinton administration was selling out our country for political contributions; we filed lawsuit after lawsuit to get to the bottom of this criminal corruption. No one lifted a hand, not even Congress, as Judicial Watch prosecuted its cases, at great personal expense to me. In so doing we uncovered scandal after scandal including shredding of documents, obstruction of justice, illegal campaign contributions, money laundering and possible espionage. It was Judicial Watch who found and deposed John Huang, which sparked the ongoing hearings. Now as we prepare to depose John Huang again and other Clinton officials, the Clinton administration has offered to pay us an immediate \$2 million bribe in attorneys fees if we will agree to stop before we uncover all of the truth. This money could finance our other causes, but we can't accept it now. To continue, we must look to you for help.

He is also threatening to investigate the people who donate to the President's legal fund.

AND WHY I WON'T ACCEPT CLINTON'S BRIBE TO STOP NOW

Page 2

This incredible and outrageous offer to muzzle the American people's only hope of getting to the truth in the ongoing Clinton Administration scandals is made even more horrible by the fact that they want to use your money, not their own, to pay the bribe! Those guilty of these high crimes should pay the legal fees themselves, but the Clinton officials want to bribe us with taxpayer money to stop the investigation. But I won't be bribed and stopped now! We plan to take the testimony under oath of Bernard Nussbaum, Craig Livingstone, Anthony Marcesá and others involved in the Clinton Administration scandals. But each of these depositions costs at least \$10,000. This is money that we just don't have. That is why I must turn to you, the American people, to help us with the funds needed to find the truth and bring the perpetrators to justice.

☐ **YES** Larry, I am an American who believes that high Clinton officials shouldn't get away with shredding of documents, obstruction of justice, illegal campaign contributions, money laundering and possible espionage.

I'm glad you didn't take the hush money. To help you continue your fight against corrupt government officials I am enclosing my contribution of:

☐ \$1,000 ☐ \$500 ☐ \$250 ☐ \$100 ☐ \$50 ☐ Other _____

NAME _____

☐ MY CHECK IS ENCLOSED

ADDRESS _____

CHARGE MY:

☐ VISA ☐ MASTERCARD

☐ AMEX ☐ DISCOVER

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

ACCOUNT #: ____/____/____/____ EXP ____/____

SIGNATURE: _____

Larry Klayman
JUDICIAL WATCH: 501 School Street, SW #725 • Washington DC • 20024 • (888) JW-ETHIC • jwatch@erols.com

Judicial Watch is a 501 (c) (3) non-profit organization.

<http://www.judicialwatch.org>

Contributions received from individuals, foundations and corporations are tax-deductible to the extent allowed by law.

The Republican Agenda for Impeaching the President.

THE IMPEACHMENT SCENARIO

by Fred Barnes

THERE'S GROWING IMPATIENCE among Republican partisans and conservative activists with the seeming timidity of their congressmen in going after President Clinton. But GOP leaders are far closer to moving forcefully against the president than is widely realized. Indeed, planning is underway to subject Clinton to weeks, maybe months, of impeachment hearings in the House Judiciary Committee—whether Democrats approve or not.

Few Republican leaders are willing to be quoted by name. But here's their scenario for a full-scale inquiry into charges that Clinton broke the law in his dealings with Monica Lewinsky, in campaign fund-raising, and possibly in other activities. They assume that evidence against the president to be handed over to Congress by independent counsel Kenneth Starr will be strong enough to justify an impeachment probe. If it is, they're ready to authorize hearings as early as this summer on a straight party-line vote, with no Democrats voting in favor of hearings. And Republicans won't give Democratic members of the Judiciary Committee any veto over subpoenas either. Judiciary chairman Henry Hyde will merely consult with Democrats over the witness list, then decide on his own who should be subpoenaed.

It's true Hyde usually shies away from uttering the word "impeachment." The reason:

He believes hearings at this stage would have little credibility with the public and could easily be tagged as partisan. He wants his

inquest to be taken far more seriously by the press and public than were the hearings into Clinton wrongdoing by Sens. Al D'Amato and Fred Thompson and Rep. Dan Burton. Those three sets of hearings were concerned with matters less weighty than impeachment, so the bar will be even higher for Hyde. That's why Hyde will wait until Starr finishes his investigation and hands over his evidence.

"I am being pressured, both inside and outside the House, to begin impeachment hearings now," Hyde

says, choosing his words carefully. (For one, Republican Bob Barr of Georgia, a Judiciary Committee member, has called for hearings to start quickly.) "But it is my judgment that we should wait until Judge Starr, as he is required by law, turns over to the House of Representatives whatever evidence he's developed, if any, that is substantive and credible relating to any impeachable offense. Once that occurs, I expect the material from Judge Starr to be referred to the Judiciary Committee, at which time an intense analysis of it will be undertaken with bipartisan participation. Once that's completed, a judgment will be made, in which I would anticipate leadership participation, concerning the next step."

Actually, the next step is clear. Unless the evidence from Starr is unexpectedly weak, Hyde himself would introduce a bill of impeachment, which would quickly be referred to his committee. Then, Hyde would hire staff—the Judiciary Committee added 90 staffers when it took up President Nixon's impeachment in 1974—and schedule hearings. Lewinsky and many others would be called to testify. The committee would not conduct its own field investigation, duplicating Starr's work. But it might go beyond the evidence accumulated by Starr and take up campaign-finance abuses uncovered in last year's hearings by Thompson, along with other matters.

Hyde is eager for his hearings to be regarded as believable and fair. If the only compelling evidence against Clinton is that he lied in denying a sexual relationship with Lewinsky, the committee might not hold hearings at all. But if there's evidence of possible perjury, suborning of perjury, tampering with witness-

es, or obstruction of justice—and Hyde and other GOP leaders expect there will be—the committee will move ahead with a public inquiry. Hyde has not talked to Starr about the evidence the independent counsel is gathering or about anything else.

While Republicans are willing to proceed with hearings with only GOP votes, Hyde doesn't intend to seek approval of any impeachment counts against the president unless some Democrats vote for them. Any effort to remove a president from office must be bipartisan, Hyde feels.

HYDE DOESN'T INTEND TO SEEK APPROVAL OF ANY IMPEACHMENT COUNTS AGAINST CLINTON UNLESS SOME DEMOCRATS VOTE FOR THEM

And Democrats will turn against Clinton only if the hearings are perceived as credible and thus persuade the public to turn against the president. Hyde says: "You won't get bipartisan support [for impeachment] until the people move in that direction. And the people won't move in that direction unless the hearings are credible and not partisan." Impeachment counts

approved by the committee would be voted in the House. If passed, they would be sent to the Senate, where a two-thirds majority is required to remove a president from office.

Neither Hyde nor House speaker Newt Gingrich has any intention of dragging out the impeachment process to keep Clinton in office and deny Vice President Al Gore the opportunity to run for election in 2000 as an incumbent. "We'll take care of Gore when we get to him," insists a GOP leader. The problem now is Clinton. And the GOP plan is to move cautiously against the president—but definitely to move.

Fred Barnes is executive editor of THE WEEKLY STANDARD.

THE NEW YORK OBSERVER

NEW YORK FEBRUARY 9, 1998

RICHARD SCAIFE PAID FOR DIRT ON CLINTON IN 'ARKANSAS PROJECT'

Bill's Billionaire Foe
Funneled Loads of Money
To *American Spectator*

CAN YOU SAY 'RIGHT-WING CONSPIRACY'?

BY JOE CONASON
WITH MURRAY WAAS

President Bill Clinton's most implacable and wealthiest critic, Pittsburgh billionaire Richard Mellon Scaife, has funneled as much as \$600,000 a year from his tax-exempt foundations to the *American Spectator* for a secretive operation known as the "Arkansas Project" over the past four years, according to sources at the conservative magazine.

Theodore Olson, a prominent Washington attorney who represents the *Spectator* and sits on its board of directors, told *The Observer* that the magazine's board is now conducting its own "internal analysis" of the funds spent on the Arkansas Project.

The project, whose targets were the President, his wife and associates, was run by Stephen S. Boynton, a Virginia lawyer with close ties to the president of one of Mr. Scaife's foundations, as well as to David Hale, the former Arkansas judge and convicted Whitewater felon who is independent counsel Kenneth Starr's main witness against the President.

CONTINUED ON 5

Call Joe Conason, Political Editor
for more info. [REDACTED]

OBSERVER

PAGE 5

JOE CONASON

Scaife Money Financed Mag's 'Arkansas Project'

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

The expenditure of tax-exempt funds on the Arkansas Project, and the role played by Mr. Scaife's associates and Mr. Boynton, became so controversial within the *Spectator* last year that the magazine's founding publisher, Ronald E. Burr, demanded a "fraud audit" by an independent accounting firm, according to *Spectator* sources. Instead, Mr. Burr was abruptly fired in mid-October by R. Emmett Tyrrell, the *Spectator*'s editor in chief, and, according to his friends, was paid a settlement on the condition that he remain silent about the reasons for his departure.



According to sources familiar with the *Spectator*'s operations, it was Mr. Burr who signed the checks to Mr. Boynton. A person close to Mr. Burr said that the publisher had "acted as he was instructed to," but became concerned about how the money paid to Mr. Boynton was being used and sought an audit by Arthur Anderson, a major accounting firm. Mr. Burr refused to make any comment for this article.

When Hillary Rodham Clinton referred recently to a "vast right-wing conspiracy" against her husband and herself, many observers believed she was referring to Mr. Scaife, who has funded a wide variety of anti-Clinton legal and media efforts.

Mr. Boynton confirmed to *The Observer* that he worked on the Arkansas Project from sometime in late 1993 until last year, although he could give no specific dates. He refused to describe with any specificity what services he performed for the *Spectator*, which is itself owned by a tax-exempt foundation. But he did say generally that during that period there was "some work that I did for them on a legal basis, looking into various aspects of certain laws." He refused to discuss how much he was paid on retainer by the *Spectator* for the project, which other sources at the magazine have said amount to as much as \$50,000 per month.

Mr. Boynton also said that he "retained some consultants for work and legal research," although he denied that any of them were private investigators. As to whether he would term his work for the *Spectator* "investigatory," Mr. Boynton replied, "No, I would not, although some of my activity was involved in that."

Other sources within the *Spectator* told *The Observer* that money from



RICHARD MELLON SCAIFE

the project was used to pay former F.B.I. agents and private detectives, to unearth negative material on the Clintons and their associates.

Mr. Boynton did say that he had met with a former Arkansas state trooper, L.D. Brown, who has made a wide variety of charges against the President in the pages of the *Spectator* and elsewhere, ranging from adultery to knowledge of drug-running from a small airport in rural Menard, Ark. "I have talked to L.D. Brown and I have met with L.D. Brown," said Mr. Boynton, adding that he had never paid any money to the former trooper. But James Ring Adams, a writer for the *Spectator* who has authored numerous stories suggesting illegal activities by the Clintons and their associates, told *The Observer* that the *Spectator* had paid money to Mr. Brown "as a researcher" in recent years.

Daniel Wattenberg, a former *Spectator* writer who did a cover story based on Mr. Brown's early allegations about sexual misconduct by Mr. Clinton, said he "was not aware of any fees or moneys" that had ever been paid to Mr. Brown. "Had I known, I would have resigned."

Perhaps the strangest aspect of Mr. Boynton's role at the *Spectator*, however, is his relationship with Mr. Hale, the former Little Rock judge who has testified that Mr. Clinton, as Governor of Arkansas, pressured him to make an illegal \$300,000 loan to the Whitewater Development Company. Mr. Boynton said that he became "a friend" of Mr. Hale sometime in the late summer or early fall of 1993—around the time that Mr. Hale was under investigation for fraud by the Justice Department in involving his theft of \$1.5 million in Small Business Administration funds.

It was as a result of that investigation that Mr. Hale, seeking a plea bargain, began to make allegations about "pressure" from Mr. Clinton about the illegal and fraudulent \$300,000 loan to Clinton business partner Susan McDougal. Indeed, it was Mr. Hale's sensational allegations, widely publicized in November 1993, that led to the appointment of the Whitewater independent counsel the following January. The *Spectator* has boasted on more than one occasion of its special access to Mr. Hale, who gave the magazine "an extended series of exclusive interviews over a year ago," according to an article that appeared in its March 1995 edition.

Later, when Mr. Hale was facing the prospect of a subpoena from the Senate Whitewater Committee, he hired as his Washington attorney Theodore Olson, who also represents the *Spectator* and sits on its board. Completing the web of associations, Mr. Olson is also a former law partner and close personal friend of Mr. Starr, the independent counsel. Sources close to Mr. Burr said that Mr. Olson played a role in negotiating the settlement that led to his departure.

As for Mr. Boynton, he said he became acquainted with Mr. Hale through David Henderson, a vice president of the American *Spectator* Educational Foundation Inc. and a longtime associate of Mr. Scaife. Mr. Henderson, according to Mr. Boynton, "is an old friend of Mr. Hale's."

CONTINUED ON PAGE 14

Mr. Boynton
said that
he became
'a friend of David
Hale' around the
time that he
was under
investigation
for fraud

Scaife Paid For Clinton Dirt In *Spectator's* 'Arkansas Project'

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 5

Mr. Boynton is also connected with the Scaife foundations through Richard Larry, president of the Sarah Mellon Scaife Foundation, who is widely regarded as Mr. Scaife's top adviser and is also a friend of Mr. Henderson. He said, without apparent irony, "We've fished together. Mr. Larry and I have fished together many times."

A former *Spectator* employee said that in 1994, "Henderson and Boynton would spend hours hanging around the office and would boast that they were 'onto big leads' that would end in the downfall or 'impeachment' of the President." The same ex-staff member said, "There was lots of mystery about what they were doing. It was fairly well known that they never delivered anything that could be published."

Said Mr. Boynton, "I have extensive files detailing everything I did for the *Spectator*. I can document it."

Actually, the ties between Mr. Scaife, Mr. Larry and Mr. Henderson date back at least as far as 1985, when the conservative billionaire financed Gen. William Westmoreland's libel suit against CBS, and Mr. Henderson served as the general's spokesman.

Mr. Henderson, reached at the *Spectator* office, declined to be interviewed over the telephone, except to say that he has known Mr. Hale for more than 25 years. Mr. Tyrrell did not return calls seeking comment.

According to Mr. Boynton, he has met with Mr. Hale on several occasions during the past four years, both in Washington and in Arkansas. The reason for those meetings, which he described as "social," he said, was "renewing friendship, general discussion." Asked whether his encounters with Mr. Hale had anything to do with the Arkansas Project or his work for the *Spectator*, Mr. Boynton replied, "Not really, no. Not really, in the sense

Mr. Burr's firing outraged many members of the *Spectator's* staff and led to resignations by writers including P. J. O'Rourke.

of, that I was paid to go see him or anything of that nature, no."

He said he had never discussed Mr. Hale's Whitewater testimony with the former judge. He declined to say to whom he had paid money from the Arkansas Project funds, but denied having given any money to Mr. Hale. Questions have arisen about how Mr. Hale has paid his enormous legal bills—including those to Mr. Olson, whose fees are estimated to be in the range of several hundred dollars an hour.

Whatever Mr. Boynton's work for the *Spectator* may have involved, he seems at first glance to be an odd choice for investigative endeavors. An avid outdoorsman, he is a sole practitioner who has specialized in con-

servation law, usually on the side of hunting interests. At one time he was a registered lobbyist for the Government of Iceland, which was seeking to overturn a ban on whaling, and he has written several pro-whaling articles for various periodicals. Although his practice is based in Virginia, he has done previous legal work in Arkansas, representing victims of a 1991 flood in Hot Springs against a local utility in a case that he lost.

The existence of the Arkansas Project and Mr. Scaife's role in financing it first began to emerge last October, when Mr. Burr was ousted from the *Spectator*. His firing, after having served as the magazine's publisher for 30 years, outraged many members of the staff

and led to resignations by a few prominent writers, including the humorist P.J. O'Rourke. At the time, Mr. Tyrrell denied that Mr. Burr's insistence on an audit of the Scaife funding had caused his firing, but *The Washington Post* reported that Mr. Tyrrell

had told a staff meeting that Mr. Burr's actions had "jeopardized the editor's relationship with Richard Larry."

Mr. Olson, the *Spectator's* attorney and a member of its board of directors, would not comment on the Burr firing or the Arkansas Project, although he confirmed that "Steve Boynton was involved in it in some way." He said it was "not consistent with my memory or understanding" that Mr. Burr had demanded a fraud audit. But Mr. Olson told *The Observer* that the magazine's board has been conducting its own "internal analysis" of the Arkansas Project for several months now.

"We're moving at the proper speed, as far as I'm concerned," Mr. Olson said.

The Internet has a listing of Far Right Wing causes being supported by Richard Mellon Scaife