

[REDACTED] Alden, Michigan 49612

Phone: [REDACTED]

December 14, 1998

Mr. Brian Lamb
C-SPAN
400 N. Capitol St. NW
Suite 650
Washington, DC 20001

0- impeach

Dear Mr. Lamb:

To me, these are basic issues in the impeachment proceedings which I believe one or more of your guests should be called upon to discuss, clearly, cogently, and in a single hour on one of the programs you yourself conduct.

"This case is not about sex; it is about perjury..."

Perjury (def.): "The willful assertion as to a matter of fact, opinion, belief or knowledge, made by a witness in a judicial proceeding as part of his evidence, either upon oath or in any form allowed by law to be substituted for an oath ... such assertion being material (under-scoring mine) to the issue or point of inquiry and known to such witness to be false."
- Black's Law Dictionary. Rev. Fourth Ed.
P. 1297

Questions: If the issue in this case is not sex, just what is it? What justice has been obstructed? What presidential power has been abused?

The House Judiciary Committee has relied entirely on the Starr referral for evidence, and Mr. Starr was the only witness the majority called on for direct testimony. In this, the independent counsel acknowledged that he had not met any of the witnesses before his grand jury, nor, except for the telecast testimony of President Clinton, had he personally observed the testimony of any witness.

Question: Was not all of the evidence in his report and in his own testimony, merely hearsay?

Hearsay evidence (def.): "Law evidence based on something ^{ON} the witness has heard someone else say rather than ~~at~~ what he himself has seen or experienced; it is usually inadmissible as testimony ~~as testimony~~."

Question: What, according to this definition, would unusually be admissible in the impeachment proceedings?

At no time during his testimony before the judiciary committee did Mr. Starr point to evidence that might be open to interpretations other than he assigned to it.

Question: Did Mr. Starr act properly (Sam Dash believed he did not) in serving as a prosecutor rather than as an adviser to a body which Mr. Hyde said he would try to help reach bipartisan conclusions?


over

A final question: Where is the line to be drawn between the authority of Congress to pass judgment on the private morality of the president, and that of the electorate at the polls?

I do not believe these issues have been presented clearly by either members of the judiciary committee nor media reporters. For example, is it not true that lying under oath, while germane to perjury, is not synonymous with it? Nor have viewers been reminded frequently enough that the burden of proof is on congressional accusers, not upon the president who is accused.

In my opinion, you can do the American people an immense service by presenting a program on the order I have suggested. If you do follow up on this, I would very much appreciate being alerted to the time you air the interview.

Sincerely yours,

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the sender.

P.S. I am handicapped by the fact that I have not yet had access to the text of the impeachment resolutions.