



March 7, 2008

From the Desk of Judicial Watch President Tom Fitton:

Judicial Watch Victory: Archives to Release Hillary's White House Daily Schedules to JW before March 20!



Thanks to a Judicial Watch lawsuit, later this month the American people should finally be getting a look at Hillary Clinton's daily schedules from her tenure as First Lady.

On March 1st, the National Archives and Records Administration notified the U.S. District Court that it expects to release to Judicial Watch 10,000 pages of former Hillary's daily schedule records by March 20, 2008, the date of a status hearing in Judicial Watch's [lawsuit in the matter](#) [Judicial Watch, Inc. v U.S. National Archives and Records Administration, Civil Action No: 1:07-cv-01267 (JR)].

Here's an excerpt from the [Archives' brief](#):

"The Clinton Presidential Library ("Library") completed its exacting page-by-page, line-by-line review of approximately 10,000 of the 30,000 pages of records potentially responsive to [Judicial Watch's] April 5, 2006 Freedom of Information Act request ("Request") that is the subject of this action," The National Archives stated in its brief. "The Library has notified the Presidential representatives of the records scheduled for disclosure and anticipates that it will produce those records to plaintiff Judicial Watch, Inc. in advance of the March 20, 2008 hearing."

(The Archives, however, suggests it will take "one to two years" to *begin* processing Hillary Clinton's telephone logs.)

This is a huge victory for Judicial Watch, and we are definitely glad we (and the American people) are going to get our hands on these schedules despite the Clintons' delay of their release. But it should not have taken this long and we shouldn't have had to file a lawsuit to make it happen. And it is ridiculous to expect the American people to wait "one to two years" for the telephone logs of a candidate for President of the United States. The Archives needs to get its act together and comply with the law, which requires these records be released in a timely fashion. I'm sure Hillary supports a delay, but the Archives is supposed to be helping disclose documents to the American people, not helping the Clinton campaign.

Stay tuned on this issue. (And watch the [headlines](#) too. The press has been all over this story.)

Just as a reminder, in a [separate lawsuit](#) Judicial Watch continues to push for the release of records related to Hillary's National Taskforce on Health Care Reform, a "cabinet-level" taskforce she chaired [Judicial Watch, Inc. v U.S. National Archives and Records Administration, Civil Action No: 07-1987 (PLF)]. We have already uncovered some incriminating documents. [Click here](#) to check them out.

More Obama Questions

Remember that “boneheaded” and suspicious real estate deal that Obama consummated with indicted political fundraiser Antoin “Tony” Rezko? ([Click here](#) for a review) Well, the Rezko public corruption trial got underway this week, and the story just took another [interesting twist](#).

Enter Nadhmi Auchi, an Iraqi billionaire who made his fortune largely through shady business deals with the Saddam Hussein regime. According to federal authorities, Auchi wired \$3.5 million to Rezko, “[Mr. Obama’s bagman](#),” as the London Times called him, approximately one month before the suspicious land transaction.

The Times raised the question as to whether or not “funds from Nadhmi Auchi, one of Britain’s wealthiest men, helped Mr. Obama buy his mock Georgian mansion in Chicago.”

The news is also buzzing this week about Obama’s friendship with [domestic terrorist William Ayers](#). Ayers, a founding member of the terror leftist group Weather Underground, who evaded the police and the FBI for 10 years in the 1970s and 80s while murdering police officers and bombing high profile government buildings such as the U.S. Capitol and the Pentagon. Ayers and his long-time girlfriend (now wife) turned themselves in to police in 1981, but most of the charges were dropped due to alleged prosecutorial misconduct. On, of all days, September 11, 2001, Ayers told *The New York Times* “I don’t regret setting bombs. I feel we didn’t do enough.”

What is Ayers doing today? What else? He’s a college professor for the University of Illinois at Chicago. Moreover, as recently as 2002, Ayers also served with Barack Obama on the Board of the non-profit Woods Foundation, which reportedly gave \$75,000 in grants in 2001 and 2002 to the Arab-American Action Network, a radical organization with terrorist ties. This piece reports that [Ayers and his terrorist wife hosted](#) an intimate political affair for Obama.

Mr. Obama has some serious explaining to do.

Barack Obama has made honesty and integrity the centerpiece of his campaign. In speech after campaign speech, Obama excoriates the establishment in Washington, contrasting his image as a squeaky clean “outsider” with that of the “insider” Hillary Rodham Clinton. And thanks largely to his adoring fans in the press corps, who have behaved more like groupies than journalists, the strategy is working. According to an ABC poll earlier this primary season, “Obama beats [Clinton] by 2-1 as the most honest and trustworthy candidate.” With the Rezko and Ayers revelations, the media may be over their swoon and begin to cast a more critical eye on Senator Obama.

On the issue of ethics, is there really that much difference between Obama and Hillary? Perhaps less than Obama supporters would like to think.

Gay Marriage Hearing in California Supreme Court

This week I was in San Francisco to attend the California Supreme Court’s hearing involving the issue of gay marriage. The courtroom was so jam-packed, folks unable to get a seat watched the proceedings on a big screen television in a downstairs auditorium as protesters from both sides of the issue chanted back and forth outside the courthouse.

One of the legal issues is whether or not a California initiative overwhelmingly approved by voters in 2000 banning same sex marriage, violates the state’s constitution. The court’s oral arguments on the matter were nearly four hours long.

Lawyers challenging the traditional definition of marriage made unabashed pleas to the court for judicial activism to impose same sex marriage on the people of California.

On the other side was California's state government and supporters of the pro-marriage initiative. It was shocking, even for me, to see principled lawyers have to work to persuade a court that there is nothing wrong with the law reflecting the reality that marriage is between a man and woman. Many, if not most members, of the court seemed ready to upend the social order and redefine marriage. You may recall that Judicial Watch filed an *amicus curiae* brief in this lawsuit last summer, siding with the appellate court ruling upholding tradition laws on marriage.

Here's an [excerpt from our brief](#):

"...The Court of Appeals prudently exercised judicial restraint and refused to usurp the power of the [legislature] by redefining or otherwise expanding by judicial fiat the concept of marriage to include the idea of same sex marriage which has been rejected directly by the people of California...The Court rightly concluded that the power to change the definition of marriage rests with the people and their elected representatives and that its role here was simply to decide the legal issues based on precedent and the appellate record. This prudent conclusion should not be overturned."

The California Supreme Court now has 90 days to render a decision.

Liberals have not had luck implementing their policies at the ballot box, so they have turned to the courts to push their agenda through judicial fiat. And far too often judges oblige. The job of the courts is to interpret laws, not innovate social policy. Let's hope the California State Supreme Court agrees. The decision will be close, but, based on what I witnessed during the arguments, I'm not hopeful our side will win this particular battle.

Until next week...

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tom Fitton". The signature is stylized and cursive.

Tom Fitton
President

Judicial Watch is a non-partisan, educational foundation organized under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue code. Judicial Watch is dedicated to fighting government and judicial corruption and promoting a return to ethics and morality in our nation's public life. To make a tax-deductible contribution in support of our efforts, [click here](#).