



The Phyllis Schlafly Report

VOL. 32, NO. 3

P.O. BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

OCTOBER 1998

Why Clinton Still Raises Big Campaign Money

In his struggle to hang on to his failed presidency, Bill Clinton appears only before the groups he can count on to shore up his self-esteem by giving him a standing ovation, such as the United Nations General Assembly, the Council on Foreign Relations, and Democratic "fat cats" in multinational corporations. They like his policies and just don't care about his morals.

No wonder the UN provided an enthusiastic audience! Just a year ago, Clinton addressed that same forum and assured the delegates that he would enhance UN power by bringing the United States into a "web of institutions and arrangements" for "the emerging international system" through four specific UN treaties.

Clinton has delivered on his promises. He successfully persuaded the Senate to ratify the World Trade Organization, the Chemical Weapons Convention, and the NATO Expansion Treaty, and he is implementing the unratified Global Warming Treaty through federal regulations. He is also implementing the unratified Biodiversity Treaty and other agreements from the 1992 Earth Summit through his American Heritage Rivers Initiative and the President's Council on Sustainable Development.

Meanwhile, Clinton has gone the last mile to deliver on the legislation so eagerly sought by the global economy advocates, whose most elite spokesmen nest in the Council on Foreign Relations. Their wish list includes the \$18 billion handout to the International Monetary Fund, Fast Track (trusting Clinton to make trade agreements), Most Favored Nation status for Communist China, allowing U.S. technology to go surreptitiously to China, the permanent stationing of U.S. troops in Bosnia under NATO command, and corporate welfare to subsidize trade with corrupt Asian regimes.

The global economy enthusiasts are well satisfied with President Clinton because he gives them what they want, at our expense. That's why his high-dollar dinners produce so much cash for Democratic coffers.

The *New York Times* (September 20, 1998) has just

provided an in-depth look at how corporate welfare for the multinational corporations and big political insiders is milking the U.S. taxpayers for billions. While a lot of folks are worried about their stake in mutual funds and 401(k) accounts that are invested in the global market, the *Times* reminds us that the "politically connected and well-heeled financiers with big bets in these shaky regions can sleep better" because their losses will be covered by U.S. taxpayers through the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC).

OPIC is a little-known Federal Government agency that encourages Americans to invest new capital into "emerging-market" businesses in "developing" countries where no sane investor would risk his own money. OPIC investments are now in 140 countries around the globe. And how does OPIC "encourage" these overseas investments in unstable, corrupt, totalitarian, faraway countries? By adding \$2 in government-guaranteed notes, backed by the full faith and credit of the United States, for every dollar of private investment.

OPIC funds are structured so that the multinational corporations will reap enormous gains if the investment turns out well, and U.S. taxpayers will cover the losses if they fail. OPIC fund managers get a fee of 2.5 percent of the fund's assets and 20 percent of the ultimate profits, which can run into the tens of millions.

When Clinton took office, OPIC had only two funds with combined assets of \$100 million. Today there are 26 OPIC funds with \$4 billion. No wonder the globalists want to keep Clinton in power! They look upon his romping with Monica as petty stuff compared to the big bucks they have at stake.

We've been given full disclosure about what goes on in the Oval office, but not about what goes on in OPIC's bank accounts. OPIC doesn't make its financial details public, even though it is a government agency. What-ever happened to Freedom of Information?

Don't be under any illusion that we all have the same chance to get government guarantees for our own risky investments. The *New York Times* reveals what it

calls "a disturbing relationship between OPIC and major Democratic Party donors, people who attended White House coffees or slept in the Lincoln Bedroom."

Six funds valued at \$585 million were approved in 1996 shortly after the sponsors of four of them had attended White House coffees. Paul Hendrie of the Center for Responsive Politics, a liberal research group, says that a large percentage of OPIC funds is going to "people with strong political connections or who made big contributions to Democrats in the last election."

OPIC funds have committed \$1.5 billion to Russia. Off-hand remarks by Robert Peyton, manager of Agribusiness Partners International, a \$100 million OPIC fund with investments in seven Russian plants, reveal the racket.

Peyton said, "If the politicians can hold the country, we'll be O.K." It's not the survival of the Russian politicians but the survival of the Clinton politicians that will make his investment O.K.

Clinton's sex scandals are only the tip of the iceberg. It's time to call a halt to OPIC's taxpayer subsidies for overseas risk-taking by the politically well-connected.

Clinton's Treatment of Women

When former Senator Bill Bradley was asked his current opinion of Bill Clinton, he used the most appropriate word in the English language. Bradley called Clinton's behavior "disgusting." Indeed, that is the best word to sum up Clinton's treatment of women.

Monica Lewinsky's plaintive words quoted in the Starr report — "I feel disposable, used and insignificant" — display Bill Clinton's attitude toward women. He is typical of men who push for feminist laws and policies, pretending that mistreatment of women is a societal problem. It's not. The treatment of women as second-class or subservient is a personal offense by individual men like Bill Clinton, who look upon women as things rather than persons.

The star-struck, ambitious girl, who had stalked and courted Clinton, desperately wanted him to treat her like "a person." That was not to be. He used her to service him sexually while he conducted his business by phone with Congressmen and with his famous adviser, Dick Morris. Monica was insignificant to Clinton. After all, he told her he had had hundreds of adulterous liaisons, so she was just as disposable as all the others.

The way Clinton used his secretary Betty Currie was almost as degrading. Acting like the lord of the White House plantation, Clinton required Betty Currie to serve as an enabler for his sexual encounters. She guided Clinton's girls into the Oval office, told him how much time he had before his next appointment, and protected him from sudden discovery. She, too, was disposable, used and insignificant.

Contrary to the whines of Clinton's defenders, Monicagate is not "just about sex," nor is he entitled to shield it as "his private life." It was a workplace offense for which any corporate or military boss would have long since been fired.

The acts took place in a taxpayer-financed office, with a taxpayer-salaried very subordinate employee, with a taxpayer-salaried secretary as facilitator, with taxpayer-salaried secret service protecting his trysts and lying for him, with taxpayer-salaried surrogates sent out to lie about it on the media and to the grand jury, and with taxpayer-salaried lawyers defending his illicit acts.

Clinton didn't treat any women as equals or with respect. He humiliated his wife, he used vulnerable women (Monica, Paula, Kathleen) to gratify his sexual wants, he used his secretary as a facilitator, and he used the few strong women he had around (Madeleine Albright, Donna Shalala, Ann Lewis) to spread his lies.

One good result of Monicagate is that it has totally discredited the feminists and exposed them as part of the radical left wing of the Democratic Party. Their pretense of being advocates for women's rights has been blown away, exposing them as a mean-spirited bunch whose affections are for sale. Feminist Erica Jong explained why the feminists continue to support Clinton on CNBC on Sept. 29: He vetoed the ban on partial birth abortion and he appointed feminist Ruth Bader Ginsburg to the U.S. Supreme Court. The entire media, including the liberals, are laughing at the feminists' hypocrisy and double standards.

Monicagate has also legitimized Paula Jones, whom the feminists disdained, ridiculed, and refused to support. The explicit description of Clinton's "inappropriate" relationship with Monica is exactly the behavior that Paula alleged in her lawsuit. The difference is that Monica accepted the proposition, while Paula refused it. But under the doctrine of sexual harassment, as defined by the feminists, that shouldn't make any difference when the man is the CEO and the woman is a vulnerable low-level employee. Clinton's grand jury testimony also confirms the tremendously different career prospects available to Monica, who complied with Clinton's sexual advances, and Paula who rejected them.

Clinton Is a Security Risk

Bill Clinton is a security risk. He convicted himself out of his own mouth in his grand jury testimony which was broadcast to the world on September 21.

Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr's lawyers were much too deferential in their interrogation and allowed Clinton to filibuster time and again. But in those filibusters, Clinton's admissions reveal himself as a security risk who should not enjoy the top-secret clearance that is an essential part of presidential prerogatives.

In referring to Monica Lewinsky in his grand jury testimony, Clinton said, "I'm quite aware that Ms. Lewinsky has a way of getting information out of people when she's either charming or determined."

How's that again! The President admits to an inappropriate, intimate relationship extending over a year or more with a woman who he knows "has a way of getting information out of people"! How did Clinton know that Monica was not an agent of a foreign power? How did he know she wasn't trying to be a modern day Mata Hari?

But that's not all. In the latter part of his grand jury testimony, Clinton compounded his culpability by admitting that he knew she would talk about confidential matters with third parties. Here, again, are Clinton's own words. "I formed an opinion really early in 1996 . . . that she would talk about it. . . . I knew that . . . she would talk about this. She would have to. She couldn't help it. It was part of her psyche. So, I had put myself at risk."

Can we have a President who knowingly, deliberately, puts himself at risk in intimate moments with a woman who he knows has a way of getting information out of people and who he knows will talk about it to others?

Clinton's own Presidential Decision Directive 29 established a Security Policy Board, which set forth guidelines for determining eligibility for access to classified information. Sec.147.6 Guidance D states: "Sexual behavior is a security concern if it involves a criminal offense, indicates a personality or emotional disorder, may subject the individual to coercion, exploitation, or duress, or reflects lack of judgment or discretion."

On August 2, 1995, Clinton issued Executive Order 12968 on Access to Classified Information. Sec.3.1(b) states: "eligibility for access to classified information shall be granted only to employees . . . whose personal and professional history affirmatively indicates loyalty to the United States, strength of character, trustworthiness, honesty, reliability, discretion, and sound judgment, as well as freedom from conflicting allegiances and potential for coercion. . . ."

Bill Clinton doesn't pass the test. He can't be trusted with the classified information available to the President.

Clinton Is an Embarrassment

Everybody knows that Clinton lied. He looked us in the eye through the television camera, shook his finger at us for emphasis, told us to listen to what he was saying, and declared, "I did not have sexual relations with that woman, Monica Lewinsky." That statement can't be excused by any bizarre definition of "sexual relations." He was talking in plain language to the American people.

Clinton has never apologized for that lie. Based on his arrogant and self-righteous grand jury testimony, there is no evidence that he is sorry for it.

If Clinton had any sense of decency, he would resign. But, of course, he won't. Having put our nation through eight months of obscene soap opera, which he could have avoided by telling the truth in January, he will have no compunction about continuing to try to bluff us, ride the polls, and blame his problems on

Kenneth Starr.

For the self-respect of America, the Congress must go forward with impeachment proceedings. Clinton's last ditch defenders are trying to pretend that Clinton's behavior, while "inappropriate," doesn't rise to the level of impeachment.

But impeachment is not a criminal proceeding; it's a political proceeding. Conviction does not send

anyone to jail. The only punishment after conviction is removal from office.

The best description of what impeachment requires was written by — guess who — Hillary Rodham when she was on the staff of the Judiciary Committee about to impeach President Richard Nixon in 1974. She quoted approvingly from Alexander Hamilton in Federalist 65 that impeachment should apply to "those offenses which proceed from the misconduct of public men, or, in other words, from the abuse or violation of some public trust. They are of a nature which may with peculiar propriety be denominated political, as they relate chiefly to injuries done immediately to the society itself."

Yes, Clinton should be impeached for presidential misconduct and violation of the public trust. He has made the Presidency a dirty joke.

A TEENAGER...WANTING TO BE JUST LIKE THE PRESIDENT



Calling Activist Judges to the Bar of Public Opinion

I participated in an event on June 23 called the Court Jester Awards, sponsored by the Family Research Council at the National Press Club. The purpose was to spoof some of the bad court decisions handed down by activist judges.

My assignment was to give the "Invisible Ink Award" to a judge who sees words in the Constitution that aren't there, but can't see words that really are there. I chose U.S. District Court Judge Ira DeMent for his decision in *Chandler v. James*, which went far beyond Supreme Court decisions in banning all semblance of prayer in schools, even if initiated by students, and set up a system of court monitoring of classrooms to ensure compliance. I presented the award in verse:

We present the award for Invisible Ink
To an activist judge who stirred up a big stink
By thinking his job was new law to invent.
Our winner is clearly Judge Ira DeMent.

The judge's temptation to see words invisible
And think he's infallible was so irresistible.

Chandler v. James is without precedent;
It's a "con law" contortion by Ira DeMent.

Alabama's indignant at the scope of his decision;
He declared a court war against children's religion.

He joined in the atheists' culture destruction
By thumbing his nose at the law's strict construction.

Our Constitution's not safe from his gavel and quill;
He's replacing James Madison with Hillary and Bill.

DeMent makes us wonder where common sense went;
He just can't comply with original intent.

He distorted the meaning of First Amendment;
Free Exercise is in danger, we sadly lament.

The Supreme Court allows prayer if started by student.
Under Ira's policemen, even that is imprudent.

This judge has created his own prayer police
To monitor classrooms and tell students to cease
Asking for help from th' Almighty, and then
Inviting their classmates to answer "Amen."

Even prayer in emergency, DeMent won't relent;
He calls it religion Establishment.

He prohibits all prayer, even during a crisis.
No student may utter an *ora pro nobis*.

No hurricanes, cyclones, killings, disaster
Can make prayer legal under this court schoolmaster.

He banned invocations and all benedictions;
But can't cite prior cases for his activist fictions.

He forbids high school grads to recite godly speeches;
He's determined to censor what everyone teaches.

If schools dare to announce baccalaureate event,
That will bring down the ire of Judge Ira DeMent.

When playing school sports, beware of the shame;
He'll send you to jail for prayers before game.

He forbids kids or teachers to carry a Bible;
Only books are allowed with a secular title.

The teachers must suffer through re-training sessions
And study texts only from Ira's selections.

Prayer monitors report to Judge Ira DeMent
In *ex parte* sessions, their complaints to present.

This judge is so proud of his way-out decision,
He posted it all over, despite public derision.

Just look at prayer monitors this judge has invented;
He gives new meaning to the word of "demented."

We urge him to promise a new resolution
To stick with the words of our real Constitution.

We all hope some day he'll reform and repent;
So let's join in prayer for Judge Ira DeMent.

Note: Eagle Forum has set up a Court Watch Committee to educate and lobby Congress to use its constitutional powers to curb the Imperial Judiciary, to alert members to oppose Senate confirmation of activist judges, to press for impeachment of judges who misbehave, and to reverse recent transfers of jurisdiction from the states to the federal judiciary. If you would like to work on this project, contact our Eagle Forum Court Watch Chairman, Virginia Armstrong, at Eagle Forum headquarters or email her: vcaphd@juno.com

The Phyllis Schlafly Report PO Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002 ISSN0556-0152

Published monthly by the Eagle Trust Fund, PO Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002. Periodicals Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois. Postmaster: Address Corrections should be sent to the Phyllis Schlafly Report, PO Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002. Phone: (618) 462-5415.

Subscription Price: \$20 per year. Extra copies available: 50¢ each; 3 copies \$1; 30 copies \$5; 100 copies \$10.

<http://www.eagleforum.org>

eagle@eagleforum.org