

The Nation.

FAX TRANSMISSION COVER SHEET

DATE: 8/17/99
TO: Christopher Hitchens
OF: The Nation
FAX: [REDACTED] **TEL:** _____
FROM: Yilu Zhao



Number of pages INCLUDING this cover sheet: 2

MESSAGE:

Regarding the Clinton article.

Subj: **Re: Hello again**
Date: 8/15/99 1:42:33 PM Central Daylight Time
From: [REDACTED]
To: ATENSNU1

Dear Ms Broaddrick,

I don't have my Nation column on e-mail, but if you will trust me with a fax number or address I can easily send it to you. Concerning other stories, here is what I mean. I was lunching in San Francisco recently with an old friend of mine, well-known as a liberal editor and publisher in this area. He told me that he had at first disagreed with my stand against Clinton, but was coming round to it. Then he said that there was one thing he'd known all along. His secretary had been invited on a date by Clinton in San Francisco back in 1969 (when Hillary Rodham was working here as an intern). He took the girl to Golden Gate Park and suddenly smashed her against a tree. She managed to get away, not without difficulty, and also kept quiet about it all. Several years later she received a call from Brooke Shearer (Mrs Strobe Talbott), who said that "the Governor" was planning to run for President and asked: "Is that all right with you?"

The lady in question was planning to get married and said that she would raise no objections. Remind you of anything?

I am now engaged in trying to get both my friend and his secretary to go public. What amazes me is that I could just "run across" such a story - as Michael Isikoff describes repeatedly doing in his excellent book.

Have you read Partners in Power by Roger Morris and Sally Denton? In there, they describe an unnamed Arkansas woman who was bitten and forced by Clinton. I know them both quite well if you want to know any more, but can quite imagine that you may have had enough of the story.

I hesitate to advise you about the Judicial Watch suit, but if you felt strong enough then I think it's a good cause. Larry is of course very conservative politically, so you would be accused of partisanship and so forth, but I - who come from the Left politically (as do Roger and Sally by the way) - have found him a good man.

If I can be of any further help don't hesitate to let me know.

yours,
Christopher Hitchens

I am sorry to say that I did not read your article in The Nation and I would so appreciate seeing it. I would also like to know more about the others you have talked to who kept silent for too long as I did. I did have the pleasure of seeing you interviewed on tv back in the spring. You mentioned my name and that you believed me. I will never forget that. Things here are quiet and back to normal, whatever normal is now. It is so difficult to see Clinton on tv. My husband, Dave, and I are back in the same routine of reaching for the remote control and switching channels to anything to remove his or Hillary's face from view. I am aware of the Dolly Kyle Browning suit assisted by Judicial Watch. I have been asked by someone representing Larry Klayman if I would come to Dallas with a number of the other women victims to discuss a class action law suit against Clinton.

Dear Mr. Hitchens,

Subj: **Hello again**
Date: 8/15/99 12:29:33 AM Central Daylight Time
From: ATENSNU1
To: [REDACTED]

Subj: **Re: thanks from J.Broaddrick**
Date: 8/14/99 6:45:02 PM Central Daylight Time
From: [REDACTED]
To: ATENSNUT

Dear Ms Broaddrick,

It is an honor to hear from you. (I'm sorry not to have replied before now, but have just returned from Yugoslavia today.) Did you perhaps miss my column in The Nation, which came out just after your interview with Lisa and which argued in much more detail? Perhaps you were inundated that week: at any event I would like to send it to you.

On my book tour I was often asked how I dared simply mention your case without using the word "alleged". But I now get asked this much less frequently...

I feel myself in your debt, as many of us do, and I hope that the experience of truth-telling has not been too agonising. If I wasn't hesitant about touching such a subject, I could tell you a lot of what I have learned from people who kept silent for too long, and would willingly impart it if you were interested.

Thank you again for writing,

yours,
Christopher Hitchens

PS May I ask you if you are aware of the suit brought by Judicial Watch and, if so, what your reaction to it might be?

Juanita Broaddrick

My sincere thanks,

I just read your book and enjoyed it very much. Thank you for referring to me as credible and principled. I have always tried to be those things. My father always said it was more important to tell the truth and lose than to lie and win. I feel like I am a winner, though, regardless of the outcome.

Dear Mr. Hitchens,

To: [REDACTED]

From: ATENSNUT

Date: 8/10/99 1:50:18 PM Central Daylight Time

Subj: ~~thanks from J.Broaddrick~~

CHRISTOPHER HITCHENS

The Clinton Swamp

In James Baldwin's account of the Atlanta child murders of 1979-81, *The Evidence of Things Not Seen*, he recalls a dreadful earlier moment from 1964. The swamps and creeks of Mississippi were being dragged for the bodies of Schwerner, Chaney and Goodman (done to death by the political ancestors of Bob Barr), and the search parties kept turning up corpses. Examinations proved that these were not the cadavers that the authorities were seeking. It took awhile for the subject to change, or at least for it to change enough for someone to exclaim: Wait a minute! What are all these *other* bodies doing in the swamp?

It's one thing to say, with reasonable confidence, that the Oval Office is currently occupied by a war criminal, a rapist and a pathological liar. It's another to ponder the full implications. If half of what one knows about Clinton's business deals and date-rapes is half-true, then he has been going through political life for years, aware or quasi-aware that any or every telephone call might be the one he has been dreading. That's more stress than most of us could take: Only a certain kind of personality could be expected to endure it. You can find this under the simpering liberal media description of "Comeback Kid," or you can check it in a taxonomy of an entirely different kind, where the key phrase is "Threat to self and others."

In the last tape of conversation between Lewinsky and Tripp, on January 15, 1998, the two women are heard wondering how Clinton will explain away a two-hour telephone call to "Juanita." Investigation shows that this Juanita is not Juanita Broaddrick. But then who is she? What else is in the swamp? And is this man a stone-cold rapist or isn't he?

It seems to me morally feeble, as well as intellectually slack, to split the difference between Clinton and Broaddrick or to characterize her allegation as unprovable. The feeblest summary of this compromise is contained in the lazy phrase "he said, she said." In the case of the "he," we already know that he is a hysterical, habitual liar. We also know that almost no allegation ever made by a woman and denied by him has proven to be untrue. And we know that ex-girlfriends have been subjected to extraordinary campaigns of defamation, amounting in some cases to intimidation, merely for speaking about "consensual" sex. What allegation could be more horrific than that of rape? And yet, "he" hasn't said anything yet. If I were accused of rape and the woman making the charge were a lady of obvious integrity, I would want to do better than have a lawyer speak for me and make a routine disclaimer (especially a lawyer, in this case the pathetic figure of David Kendall, who had not even met me at the time of the supposed crime). Asked by NBC to say where Clinton had been on the morning in question—a fact easily established in the life of a state attorney general—the White House declined cooperation. I would have wanted to do better than that, too.

So much for the "he said." What of the "she"? If the allegation is false, then Broaddrick is not just getting her facts wrong.

MINORITY REPORT

She is deliberately fabricating one of the most damning charges that any one person can make against another. She must be a wicked or deluded or malicious person. There seems no escaping this corollary conclusion. There also seems no reason at all for reaching it. Where is the famous Clintonia rapid-response team? Has it no pride? Can it not find or produce any shadow of a doubt to cast on Broaddrick's character? I think that if it could, it would know by now. Furthermore, a woman who groundlessly makes such a charge may be, and in my

opinion ought to be, proceeded against for slander and wasting police and legal time. No hint of that.

A provisional but by no means unsafe induction, then, is that Broaddrick is speaking the truth. Questioned fairly closely by NBC's Lisa Myers, she and her contemporaneous corroborative witnesses were easily able to answer the questions about silence and delay. The victim felt guilty for letting an unchaperoned man into her room, even if he was the attorney general. In a banana republic like Arkansas, allegations against powerful men were believed to have potentially unpleasant consequences. The victim was also having an extramarital affair with a man she hoped to marry. She did not want to be exposed, and she did not expect to be believed. Finally—and very importantly—she didn't "go public." She was made public. The feminist movement has taught us to recognize this pattern of response as a familiar and intelligible one. (How sad it was, by the way, to see Patricia Ireland changing her mind at this late stage. Doesn't she know that she has lost something that she can't ever hope to retrieve, and has lost it to Clinton?)

Perhaps I won't be taken as an authority on the moral credibility of the feminist leadership. But something ought to be said about the honor of the male sex in this business. It has been disgusting, all through the past year, to hear Clinton defended as *homme moyen sensuel*. "Everybody does it...all men lie about sex...a gentleman is expected to lie." One reason a gentleman may be obliged to lie is to protect the reputation of the woman. Clinton has lied in order to trash them. I don't have any male friends who say that it wasn't "sex" because the woman got nothing out of it (the gallantry defense). I don't have any male friends who hump the help and then (with the assistance of paid slanderers) call them liars, goldiggers, sluts and blackmailers. I don't have any male friends who have been plausibly accused of rape, either, though I do know several women who have been sexually assaulted and decided not to go public. I also know of three other women who could, if they chose, lay a charge of assault against Clinton, which would make him a *serial* rapist. This puts him, in male terms, way outside the limit of what can be tolerated. I see him on the television all the time, biting that fat lip of his, and now I have an additional reason for the powerful nausea I have always felt. I imagine his teeth in Juanita Broaddrick's lips, after he's told her to lie still or he'll bite her again. But hey, it's time to move on. So forget it. Forget it if you can. ■