

# No let-up in British assault on Clinton and U.S. presidency

by Edward Spannaus

As President Clinton embarked on his eight-day European trip, he was still being subjected to unrelenting attacks on his presidency coming from the circles around the Hollinger Corp. associated with Henry Kissinger, Margaret Thatcher, and Thatcher's Bush-league friends in the United States. At the same time, there was increasing evidence that the White House is carefully noting the role of the British press in fomenting the scandals against the President.

The President's trip comes at a time when the Anglo-American "special relationship" is at its lowest ebb in the postwar period. This shows up in a particular way concerning the D-Day commemorations, around which the President's trip is centered. For example, the June 1 London *Financial Times* observed that D-Day "has been made a central feature of the [British] national nostalgia for days of military glory, when Britain was great and victorious"—and firmly allied with the Americans. "The memory of the Anglo-American line-up against the continental Axis created a distorting prism which is still reflected in the knee-jerk anti-Europeanism of Britain's ruling Conservative Party"—which "appears to be trying to idealize D-Day as the epitome of a lost 'golden age.' "

It may be nostalgia on the part of some, but from other quarters in London what is being aimed at Clinton is pure vitriol. As Clinton left for Europe, Henry Kissinger was in London to push his new book *Diplomacy*. The London *Times* interviewed Kissinger, giving him a forum to catalogue the alleged fiascoes of "Wobbly Willie," ranging from China to Haiti. Kissinger identified Clinton's problem as that of being in the tradition of the "idealism" of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt, as against the "realpolitik" of Britain's Lloyd George, Winston Churchill and France's Clemenceau.

On May 23, the London International Institute for Strategic Studies also targeted the Clinton administration in its annual Strategic Survey for 1993-94. While complaining that the western powers overall seem to be suffering "from a serious attack of strategic arthritis," the IISS report singled out the United States. Clinton's foreign policy "was a mess," it declared. "The United States, even more than usual, does not seem to be following a steady compass. President Clinton, however clear and straightforward his views on domestic affairs, has been blowing a very uncertain foreign-policy trumpet."

The real issue is that to the extent that the U.S. President has shown signs of acting independently and bucking the British policy—be it on Russia, Bosnia, or Northern Ireland—he has been hit by scandals which are being orchestrated by sections of the British press, above all by the Hollinger group's Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, the Washington correspondent for the London *Sunday Telegraph*.

## White House blames British press

Evans-Pritchard on May 29 tore into Clinton for having botched up relations with Britain. Pritchard suggested that having the D-Day celebrations in Britain will be particularly irksome, because the White House "doesn't want an untimely reminder that the President has managed to cock up relations with one of America's closest friends." But, Pritchard murmurs, "fussing about the end of the Special Relationship is quite unnecessary." Why? "Britain and America continue to be twin states of a single nation, bound together inextricably by financial cross-holdings and a shared entertainment, media, and academic culture," i.e., the engines of British subversion of the U.S.: finance and culture.

Pritchard continues: "The fact that the White House is accusing the British press of fanning the Whitewater scandal and keeping it alive is evidence enough of British purchase upon the United States. It is impossible to imagine the Japanese, French, or Russian press causing headaches in Washington with coverage of internal American affairs.

"Nobody would even notice what they are publishing. The British, however, are exercising subtle influence by a process of percolation—and they are drawing blood."

White House irritation at the British press was also noted in the June 2 *Financial Times*. In the course of an article describing the "edgy sense of foreboding" in the Clinton camp over the President's European trip, Jurek Martin wrote: "The White House is also patently nervous about his treatment in the British press, particularly its lurid emphasis, far greater than most of its U.S. counterparts, on the sexual harassment suit against him. Aides recently surveyed several weeks of U.K. cuttings and found virtually nothing positive. They fear an eruption of bimbo stories while Mr. Clinton is in Britain—but at least they now accept that they would not be orchestrated by the Conservative Party central office."

In a telephone interview, Martin confirmed that the White

House did conduct a review of the British press. He said that, in contrast to the 1992 campaign, when the Clinton people believed that the Tories were working against them, they no longer think now that it is the Conservatives, but rather the British press, which is working against them.

Asked if this particularly referred to the Hollinger group, Martin said: "Nobody in the White House will say that. They think it's certain press barons."

### Evans-Pritchard boasts

Pritchard himself has been remarkably blunt about his active role in fomenting the scandals against President Clinton. He recently declared that the British interest in the Whitewater scandals is to "open up the governor's mansion" (referring to Clinton's days as governor of Arkansas) and "find out what kind of a man Clinton is."

Pritchard had already admitted in his London *Sunday Telegraph* column that he had participated in a legal strategy discussion with Paula Corbin Jones's lawyers, and that he had spoken with Jones personally at least a dozen times, before her suit against Clinton for "sexual harassment" was filed. Pritchard was the first in the U.S. or Britain to report that Jones was going to file the lawsuit which she did file on May 6.

In a recent discussion, Pritchard conceded that he hadn't realized the complications of bringing a lawsuit against a sitting American President. "I wasn't aware with the Paula Jones thing how easy it would be for them to use the immunity defense," Pritchard said. "I somehow thought that would be rather unlikely. I obviously misjudged that."

But, said Pritchard, it doesn't really matter whether the case against Clinton proceeds immediately, or is delayed. "The only thing that matters is whether the Ferguson case goes ahead," he said, referring to Arkansas State Trooper Danny Ferguson. "He's a co-defendant. That's why they put him in, so that he can't claim immunity."

"The Ferguson case is the insurance policy for Paula Jones's lawyers," Pritchard continued, saying that what the lawyers want to do is to "parade the troopers through depositions." After all, he noted, "the purpose of the Paula Jones case being to use the power of discovery to open up the governor's mansion."

When asked what other irons he had in the fire, or if he was going to get into the Bank of Credit and Commerce International case and possible BCCI connections into Arkansas, he admitted that it's "just too complicated."

"It's just not our interest in England," said Pritchard. "You know we're interested in finding out what kind of a man Clinton is. But in terms of all the other things, that's only of secondary interest to us really."

A second British journalist, when asked about the fact that he seems to have crossed the line from journalist to participant, responded: "I think he would happily agree with you. Some people believe journalism should not be objective



*Ambrose Evans-Pritchard listens in dismay to a press conference sponsored by Lyndon LaRouche's presidential campaign exploratory committee on April 6, exposing the British intelligence operation to smash the U.S. presidency.*

but participatory . . . what you might call advocacy journalism."

*EIR* has also learned that Pritchard recently discussed the strategy of the Paula Jones case and the issue of presidential immunity with federal appeals court judge Laurence Silberman, a Reagan-Bush appointee. Silberman is a highly partisan Republican, who was appointed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia by President Reagan, after having served as a foreign policy adviser on the Reagan campaign staff, and on Reagan's intelligence transition team after the 1980 election.

Silberman was part of the "secret government" apparatus which was responsible for the Iran and Contra affairs—which were simply two of many covert operations run by the apparatus created in the early 1980s under then-Vice President George Bush. He was one of the handful of judges to attend early-1980s sessions of the Consortium for the Study of Intelligence, a private seminar series directed by Prof. Roy Godson, the LaRouche-hating National Security Council aide who provided money-laundering services for Oliver North's operations.

With this background, it is not surprising that Silberman was one of the judges on the appellate panel which overturned Oliver North's 1989 Iran-Contra conviction. Observers noted at the time that Silberman should have recused himself from sitting on the North case. Having helped protect the Bush-North operation, it is no shock that Silberman is now giving free legal advice to the enemies of Bill Clinton.