

Hillary does. The great first impression was a long time ago.

But we may also be getting to know Hillary. What has already emerged about her Whitewater doings shows how very true it is that greedy people were breaking the law to make money during the Reagan years, just as the Clintons have always said. Her secret life in Arkansas is coming as a surprise even to her critics, who have tended to see her as a sort of fanatic and to credit her with a fanatic's moral integrity. But the key to her is ambition—a passion that has consistently subdued her supposed feminism. And judging by what has already transpired, the Whitewater revelations will reveal more about her than about Bill, possibly including the rumored affair between her and Vincent Foster. At any rate, the Clintons have gone to great lengths to keep the secrets secret.

Bill wasn't the only one who lied to the American people that famous night on *60 Minutes*. It was Hillary who, in effect, grabbed the mike and insisted that the marriage had been repaired. She expressed her contempt for standing by one's man, Tammy Wynette-style, even as she was standing by her nominal man; later she would vent her derision against cookie-baking wives, only to bake cookies for her Bill, like Lady Macbeth in a little apron, though she may still have been carrying on with Foster at the time.

In its way, the Clinton marriage is working. Which is not to say that anyone's enjoying it. ■

## Who Killed Vince Foster?

by Murray N. Rothbard

You read it first in *RRR*: ["Fostergate," September 1993]. More and more, it looks as if the key to Whitewatergate and to much else that is rotten in the Clinton Administration centers on the mysterious slaying on July 20 of the White House counsel and long-time lover/and partner of Hillary Rodham, Vincent Foster, Jr. What do we know about Foster's death? Vince Foster left the White House at 1:00 P.M. on the 20th, in an apparently normal mood, after having spent most of the morning grappling, as a key figure and attorney with the tangled matters of Whitewatergate. Foster was not seen alive again; his body was discovered at about 6:00 P.M. in remote Fort Marcy Park on the Potomac. Foster had been shot in the head and killed. [Fort Marcy is more a lookout over the river off the highway, than a "park".] Time of death was estimated at between 4:00 and 5:00 P.M.

The investigation was quickly handed over to the Park Police, an outfit with expertise largely devoted to spearing litter in the park. The Park Police quickly pronounced the death a "suicide" and, even though the autopsy report has never been released to the public, the lapdog media obediently went along with this unproven hypothesis, and

continued to refer to Foster's killing as a "suicide"; from then on, general speculation shifted to possible reasons or signs of Foster's supposed "depression" that had led him to this alleged act.

The dismissal of the Foster slaying as a "suicide" succeeded in burying the Foster Affair for several months. Then, in early December, the Foster death, along with Whitewatergate, came rapidly to the fore. It was discovered that chief White House counsel Bernard Nussbaum had spirited out of Foster's White House office, apparently under the noses of the bumbling Park Police, a crucial file on Foster's desk: a file (or files) dealing with the Whitewater Affair. Nussbaum then gave the file(s) into the safekeeping of the Clinton's personal lawyer, David Kendall. It was Nussbaum's curious taking of the Foster Whitewater file that sparked the agitation for the Clintons to come clean on Whitewatergate, and finally to the naming of the special prosecutor.

By mid-January, furthermore, the Nussbaum removal of the Whitewater file had skyrocketed in importance. For it was discovered that Nussbaum either separately, or together with at least two other people: Hillary's own chief of staff, Maggie Williams, and Bill Clinton's special assistant, Patsy Thomasson of the notorious Thomasson clan in Arkansas, removed the file from Foster's office on July 20, the day of Foster's death, and

*not*, as the White House had previously claimed, two days later on July 22.

Since that disclosure, two fascinating discoveries have been made in the Mysterious Death of Vincent Foster. First, the *Wall Street Journal*, in a lengthy editorial of January 14 ["The Foster Test,"] indicated the truly sensational implications of this new chronology of the Foster Case. I urge our readers to get ahold of this WSJ editorial, and *read it carefully*, preferably more than once. Secondly, the intrepid *New York Post* sent investigative reporter Christopher Ruddy to inquire into the body and the slaying itself, with some sensational conclusions of his own [Christopher Ruddy, "Doubts Raised Over Foster's 'Suicide'", *Post*, January 27].

First, the WSJ chronology. Foster died between 4 and 5 o'clock. No one knows who found the body; apparently, the person who called the police was told of the body by its discoverer. The police and ambulances arrived on the spot at 6:00 P.M. or a bit after. It apparently took several hours for the police to identify the body and notify relevant people. Thomas "Mack" McLarty, White House Chief of Staff, and the boss of the White House in the absence of the Clintons (who were vacationing in Little Rock), only found about the Foster death at 9:15 P.M. McLarty informed Hillary of the death of their mutual buddy Foster in a phone call to Little Rock at 9:45 P.M. (Eastern time), and he told Slick

Willie at 10 P.M., after Willie had finished a stint on the Larry King show.

In short, the White House did not know about the discovery of the body of Vince Foster until 9:15 P.M. But *in that case*, why oh why did Nussbaum, Williams, and Thomasson remove the file, which they presumably did during office hours, that is, long before 9:00 P.M. of July 20?? Why did they remove the file when, as far as they knew, Foster was not dead, and would return to his office the following morning, so that there would be no need to spirit the Whitewater file out of the office for safekeeping?

The *WSJ* concludes its account with these intriguing words: "Let us specify, lest compiling these facts gets us accused of the dread crime of innuendo, that we do not know what to make of all this. But we do think it's high time someone found out." Amen! Those of you who don't mind committing innuendo in your heart are invited to mull over the implications of this story. *Especially* when combined with the investigation by Christopher Ruddy of the *New York Post*.

Ruddy interviewed the Fairfax County paramedic who was the first rescue worker to see Foster's body; the first Park Policeman on the scene; various other witnesses to the body; and a medical examiner and former New York City homicide investigators and forensic experts with whom he discussed his findings. Here is what Christopher Ruddy found: Foster's body

was discovered lying straight on a hill, "every extremity straight, as if it were ready for the coffin." The gun which shot him in the mouth was clutched in Foster's right hand.

There were many anomalies here. In the first place, the body, in such a case, should be consistent with the person's original position. In other words, Foster should have been lying down if he shot himself in the mouth. The bullet would then have been lodged in the ground behind him. And yet the *police were never able to find the bullet*. Where is the Foster Bullet? The police speculated the Foster bullet "must" have gone back into the woods. But in that case, he would not have been lying straight and rigidly on the ground.

Secondly, when a person shoots himself in the mouth, a reflex action usually hurls the gun up to 20 feet away from the body. It is unusual for a suicide to remain, after death, with the gun gripped tightly in his hand. Vernon Geberth, a former New York detective who has written a nationally recognized homicide-investigation textbook, says that generally "after the firing the gun is away from the person," although he acknowledged that in "rare" cases the suicide can keep gripping the gun.

Thirdly, the murder weapon was a .38 caliber Colt revolver. A .38 Colt firing into the head almost always results in a "tremendous amount of blood, blood all over the place, it would be a mess... [A] .38

makes a powerful explosion. There's a backwash of blood and tissue." *And yet:* everything was remarkably clean; there was little blood anywhere. There were no pools of blood around the body, no mess, no splattering of blood on face or shirt, no blood on the gun.

No blood anywhere; no bullet; no mess; body lying rigid and straight with gun clutched in hand; what does all this imply? These facts all strongly imply that Vincent Foster, Jr., was shot and killed by person or persons unknown, his body transported to Fort Marcy Park, laid straight on the ground, the gun placed into his hand and his fingers wrapped around the gun. Clearly, there would be no blood and no bullet if the murder had taken place elsewhere.

Was there time for all this? You bet. Vincent Foster was last seen leaving the White House at 1 P.M., July 20. He was killed, apparently, between 4 and 5 P.M. and his body reached by police and rescue workers just after 6 P.M. There was plenty of time unaccounted for, to commit the deed and transport the body. Furthermore, there is no evidence that Vince Foster owned the fatal 1913 Colt .38 revolver that did the foul deed. No member of the Foster family has been able to identify the gun as his. So: not only no bullet and no blood, but no Foster gun.

If Vince Foster was murdered and his body transported to the park, where someone, no one knows who, reported a body to a

second person who called the police; if this is what happened, does anyone in his right mind think the killer was a "lone nut"? Why would a lone nut take the trouble to move the body and make it look like suicide? What would be the lone nut's motive? A lone nut murderer of Vince Foster is about as likely as the notion that the guy who banged Nancy Kerrigan on the leg was a lone nut. So: if the murder of Vince Foster was, say, a contract hit, in light of the *WSJ* chronology, does anyone have an idea of *who* might have taken out the contract?

Enough! We need an independent, tough, no-holds-barred Congressional investigation, armed with subpoena power, financed by as much as it may take, which will fearlessly go into every nook and cranny, and investigate every likely suspect, without fear or favor, and *as high up as necessary*. And following *RRR's* long-time exhortation to "Exhume! Exhume!" the body of every mysterious death suffered by anyone occupying or high up in the White House, the body of Vincent Foster should be exhumed and analyzed by independent and fearless experts. *And this time*, let's not get

deflected by any phony, coverup, "Rehnquist" Commission. This time, let's not get distracted by the moral equivalent of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, or by the Russian Embassy, or Castro, or Sam Giancana or Jimmy Hoffa. This time, let's dare to think the unthinkable. ■

**And this time, let's not get deflected by any phony, coverup, "Rehnquist" Commission.**

## More On Who Killed Vince Foster? by M.N.R.

The stunning article of Christopher Ruddy in the *New York Post* (Jan. 27) casting strong doubt on Vince Foster's "suicide" brought forth a storm of calls upon the White House for comment. Curiously,

the White House referred all inquiries to well-know Pittsburgh forensic pathologist, Dr. Cyril Wecht, who maintained that a suicide who shoots himself in the mouth is often found with his hand clutched around the weapon.

The odd part about the Clinton Administration using Dr. Wecht as their Court Pathologist on this issue, is that Wecht is well-known to Kennedy

Assassination Revisionists as an intrepid champion of the idea that Jack Kennedy was *not* killed by a "single bullet" fired by Lee Harvey Oswald. It was Dr. Wecht, too, who first called attention to the fact that Kennedy's brain is missing in the federal archives. So, how come that an intrepid revisionist in the Kennedy matter leaps up to become a Clintonian apologist on the Foster case, *and does so without having bothered to see the autopsy report*, which has been sealed from view? Could it possibly have anything to do with the fact that most [though not all] Kennedy Assassination Revisionists have been leftists, whose conspiracy analyses have focussed generally on the CIA, and not on leftist forces? Whereas the Clinton Administration is beloved by the Left? Dr. Wecht, it might be added, was once a Democratic candidate for the U.S. Senate.

In an important follow-up to his original article, Christopher Ruddy ["More Questions About Foster's 'Suicide'", *New York Post*, Jan. 31] mentions the Wecht comment, and rebuts it by pointing out that the park police had claimed that Foster had fired the gun with his thumb, which is appar-

ently quite common for a suicide shot. But various homicide experts pointed out to Ruddy that it is highly unusual for a gun fired by a suicide into his mouth to wind up clutched in his hand. Thus, Dr. Lester Adelson, highly respected forensic pathologist and a medical examiner for the city of Cleveland, pointed out the absurdity of thinking that a person could shoot himself in the mouth, firing it with his thumb, "and then change his grip and move the weapon to his side." Said Adelson, "Nature is honest. Use common sense. I think that if a person shot himself in the mouth with a .38, they are not going to be able to carry out purposeful acts."

In addition to effectively rebutting the Clinton-to-Wecht ploy, Christopher Ruddy has carried his inquiries to a further stage:

Who reported the Foster body? It turns out that at about 6 P.M. of that fateful July 20, park worker Francis Swan was in the parking lot of a maintenance facility about two miles away from Fort Marcy Park. Swan was sitting in his truck with a co-worker "having a beer after work." At that point, a white utility

van, driven by a heavy-set white man in his mid-40s, with

graying hair and dressed in work clothes, pulled up to the truck. Speaking through the van window, the heavy-set driver told Swan: "There's a dead body by the cannon up in Fort Marcy. Will you call the Park Police?" At which point, the man drove off. Swan then went to the pay phone in the parking lot and called 911, setting off the chain of events that brought the police and paramedics to the site where Foster was found.

But several critical questions rush to the fore; (1) Who was this driver? (2) Why didn't he make the call himself? (3) It turns out that Foster's body was not visible from the main trail that runs through Fort Marcy Park. But this means that the van driver would have to have been out of his van and off the main trail to spot the Foster body. What was he doing in Fort Marcy Park? It should come as no surprise that the U.S. Park Police have been unable to locate the driver. Clearly, the driver, if ever found, might be able to shed light on key questions, in addition to who he was and what was he doing in the park, such as: Did he see Foster alive? Did he hear the fatal shot? It would also be interesting to know if said driver has any political connections.

Another mystery about the 911 call about Foster's body: George Gonzalez, the Fairfax County paramedic who was the first rescue worker to examine Foster's body, distinctly remembers a 911 call about Foster made by an "unidentified

**It is highly unusual for a gun fired by a suicide into his mouth to wind up clutched in his hand.**

woman." The Fairfax County 911 dispatch unit says that Swan's call about the Foster body was the only one on record, but it admitted that they "only keep [a record of] the first call that comes in." Unfortunately, all tapes of 911 calls for that night were destroyed, as per usual practice, 30 days after the night in question.

Surely, all the investigative resources of the government should concentrate on finding the unidentified driver, as well as the mysterious woman.

Fostergate grows curiouser and curiouser. When will the veil over Fosters demise be ripped off? ■

## Within a Month! The Bringing Down of Bobby Ray Inman by M.N.R.

On December 16, President Clinton named retired Admiral Bobby Ray Inman to fill the post of Secretary of Defense. To say that the nominee was universally hailed would be a masterpiece of understatement. To pundits, media people, politicians, and leading "well-informed sources" inside the Beltway, Bobby Ray Inman could walk on water: He was the perfect choice to bring order and prestige to Clinton's troubled and screwed-up foreign and military policies. Bobby Ray was brilliant, sober, knowledgeable, the

Insiders' Insider, Mr. Intelligence. When Bobby Ray retired from many years of public service in Washington in the early 1980s, and returned to Texas, the reporters at Austin put on an affectionate show in his behalf, singing, to the tune of "Jesus Christ, Superstar,": "Bobby Ray, Superstar/Are you the messiah that they say you are?" Clearly, Washington greeted his return on December 16 with the fervent answer, Yes!

Moreover, Inman had come highly recommended. The main person pushing for his appointment within the Administration was Clinton's First Friend in the Trilateralist Establishment, Rhodes Scholar and Oxford roomie Strobe Talbott, now Deputy Secretary of State, and Secretary of State-in-waiting. Inman's coronation seemed secure.

And yet, in just three weeks from that date, on January 6, Bobby Ray Inman, reeling from bitter attacks by *New York Times* columnist Bill Safire, attacks seconded by a couple of other media people, decided to withdraw from the fray. He waited a couple of weeks to tell the President, until Clinton's mother's funeral and his Russian trip were out of the way, and then Inman went out in a blaze of fury, in a remarkable televised press conference on January 18, less than a week before his Senate confirmation hearings were slated to begin.

The almost monolithic response by the media was the most instructive and revealing aspect of the Inman Affair. Almost exclusively, the media

focused on speculations on the supposedly odd psychological state of mind of Admiral Inman. How could Inman retreat just because Bill Safire and a couple of other columnists were criticizing him? How could he possibly conjure up a "conspiracy" between Safire and Senator Dole to attack him and besmirch his character? Inman talked about "sources" but he couldn't *prove* his charges, could he? Inman was denounced as remarkably "thin-skinned," his behavior in charging conspiracy treated as "weird" and "bizarre," and the general reaction echoed that of Senator Dole: that someone harboring "fantasies" of this sort was not really equipped to be the captain at the helm of America's defenses. In the psychobabble beloved by the media, it was noted (which Inman had never denied) that Inman was always reluctant about taking the job, and that therefore these fantasies and this thin skin were really excuses for Inman's not taking the position.

Amidst all the stress on Bobby Ray's supposedly fragile psyche, it was overlooked that very little space was devoted to the content of the charges that Safire and the others were levelling against Bobby Ray; and virtually *no* space to Bobby Ray's explanation of the hostility that Safire and the others had long harbored against him, and which led to their anti-Inman campaign.

The media accounts all stress that no Senators were opposing the Inman nomination; but the Senate staffers were pre-