

PIT-TRIB-REVIEW

SCREENED  
By clp Date 11/14/2009  
NW 25720 ND 39718

# Starr's Foster case report often forecast, never seen

By Christopher Ruddy  
FOR THE TRIBUNE-REVIEW

## Analysis

LITTLE ROCK, Ark. — Los Angeles Times Washington Bureau Chief Jack Nelson recently reported that Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr had completed his inquiry into the death of Vincent Foster and was ready to release a 100-page report, but no report has materialized so far.

Yet within days of Nelson's story, Susan Estrich, a former top adviser to failed presidential candidate Michael Dukakis, penned an op-ed for the Times that began: "Kenneth W. Starr finally issued his own report on Vincent W. Foster last week, concluding, as did his predecessor, that the former White House aide committed suicide ..."

Starr's office has confirmed that no report has been issued, and Estrich did not return calls for comment on her erroneous claims.

Starr's office — which has flatly challenged false news reports such as the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette report that Starr had conducted mock trials of the Clintons — declined to say that the original Times story was false.

Debbie Gershman, Starr's Little Rock spokeswoman, simply gave an emphatic, "No comment."

Since shortly after Starr reopened the Foster death case, which had been closed by his predecessor Robert Fiske, a stream of news stories have reported that Starr was on the verge of issuing a report concluding Foster's July 20, 1993, death was a suicide.

The reports, some citing Starr's office as a source, have included:

- A Scripps-Howard wire story carried on the front page of the Washington Times. This story — claiming that Starr had concluded Foster killed himself — appeared on the very day that Starr began grand jury proceedings into the death in 1995.

- A February 1995 Wall Street Journal feature that quoted sources close to the Starr investigation as saying the case had been closed as a suicide. The story also stated that ongoing grand jury proceedings were simply an effort by Starr to give the conclusions made by Fiske more weight, since Fiske had neglected to use a grand jury in his probe.

- An October 1995 report by Mike Wallace on CBS's "60 Minutes" declaring that Starr's report would be out shortly, concluding the case.

- A July 1996 report by Wallace on "60 Minutes" again declaring that Starr had concluded the death was a suicide, and a report would be issued that summer.

- A November 1996 Newsweek cover story that featured an exclusive interview with Kenneth Starr and quoted unidentified sources as saying the report concluding suicide was to be released imminently.

The Tribune-Review has also learned that in early December 1995 Starr's Washington office told Fox News that a report concluding the case was to be issued within six weeks.

Leaks by Starr's office follow a pattern first observed during the Fiske inquiry when news reports, notably one in the Wall Street Journal, reported that Fiske had concluded the death was a suicide. Documents later released showed that no substantial investigation had taken place by that date.

One law enforcement source familiar with the case argues that the leaks from Fiske's and Starr's offices have been disseminated for two reasons. First, the leaks serve as a "trial balloon" from which the prosecutors can gauge the reaction: such a conclusion might draw from Congress, the media and other interested parties. Second, these leaks serve as a signal to investigators and witnesses that officials do not want to probe this death, and help to extinguish any interest new witnesses might have in coming forward to cooperate.

A California litigator filed suit in federal court earlier this month to compel Starr to publicly release photographs relating to the investigation of Vincent Foster's death.

Allan J. Favish, a private Los Angeles-area attorney, asked the Central District Court of California to review Starr's denial of Favish's Freedom of Information request for copies of approximately 60 Polaroids and other photos.

Starr's office has denied all such requests, arguing that release of the photos would violate privacy restrictions and could interfere with an ongoing criminal investigation.

In court papers, Favish claims that the privacy argument is "frivolous" because most of the photos he is requesting have been reprinted — albeit poorly — in a compendium of documents released by the Senate Banking Committee in 1995. These grainy reproductions in the Senate documents include photos of the 1913 Colt revolver found at the Foster death scene, Foster's Honda, and other aspects of the crime scene — but no pictures of the body. Favish also noted that federal authorities already released a Polaroid depicting a gun in Foster's right hand to ABC News in March 1994.

Documents offered by the U.S. Park Police and former Special Counsel Robert Fiske indicate that investigators were unable to show that Foster owned "the gun found in his hand."

Favish told the Tribune-Review his interest in the photos was first piqued after reviewing an Internet web site produced by Michael Rivero that deals with the Foster case (<http://www.accessone.com/~rivero/>).

Rivero's web page details numerous documents in the case, including one FBI report of an interview with Foster's widow, Lisa. Her FBI statement suggests that FBI agents showed her a silver revolver when seeking her identification of the gun found in her husband's hand. But Favish says the photos — and other official reports — indicate the revolver was black, not silver.

Favish says he remains baffled as to why the FBI would show Foster's widow a silver gun.

The attorney also argues that release of the photos will disprove a key claim in the Fiske report on Foster's death. On Page 38, the Fiske report reads: "Lisa Foster stated that the gun looked similar to one that she had seen in their home in Arkansas and that she had brought to Washington."

"Fiske knew the official gun was a black one, and since Mrs. Foster claimed she could identify only a silver gun in her FBI statement, Fiske's claims that Mrs. Foster identified the gun suggest he was either grossly incompetent or intentionally misleading," Favish charges.

Strategic Weekly Briefings, a newsletter of political and economic analysis, reported in a Feb. 28 cover story that Starr may have another conflict of interest in his handling of the Whitewater case.

SWB reports that Starr, after his appointment to the independent counsel post in August 1994, represented a subsidiary of a company operated by the Chinese government and headed by Wang Jun, a key figure in the enlarging fund-raising scandal.

In December 1994, Starr, who has continued to argue cases for his law firm, Kirkland & Ellis, as he investigates the Clintons, represented CitiSteel USA before a federal appeals court. CitiSteel purchased a Delaware steel mill in 1988 and refused to recognize the existing union. The union took legal action, first with an administrative law judge and later with the National Labor Relations Board. In both instances, rulings were made in favor of the union.

After Starr's 1994 appearance before the federal court, the earlier rulings in favor of the union were reversed, the court agreeing with Starr's argument that CitiSteel had no obligation to bargain with the union.

CitiSteel's parent company, it turns out, is CITIC—the China International Trust and Investment Corp. SWB states that Beijing-based CITIC is the "largest Chinese corporation" and was "established in 1978 as a government-owned company that would spearhead... capitalist-style enterprise operating within a framework of Communist Party control."

Run by Communist Party stalwart Wang Jun, CITIC is also affiliated with China's largest arms dealer.

Starr's assistant at Kirkland & Ellis said he was unavailable for comment on the matter.

Not everyone in Washington is keeping mum about how they believe Vince Foster died.

C. Boyden Gray, White House counsel under President George Bush and now a prominent Washington attorney, has voiced his doubts about the suicide conclusion offered by the U.S. Park Police and Fiske. Gray was a guest last month on National Empowerment Television's "On the Right Side" program hosted by Armstrong Williams.

Williams asked Gray point-blank: "Did (Foster) commit suicide, in your opinion?"

"No, in my opinion, he did not commit suicide," Gray bluntly told Williams.

The host was visibly surprised by Gray's answer. After regaining his composure, Williams asked Gray who might have benefited from Foster's death. Gray declined to speculate.

*Christopher Ruddy is an investigative reporter whose work appears regularly in the Tribune-Review.*

# Memorandum

Office of the Independent Counsel

---

To : File

Date 2/6/96 ✓

From : Debbie Gershman

Subject: Call from Chris Ruddy

I received a call from Chris Ruddy on Tuesday, February 6, 1996 at about 10:50 a.m. Chris said he had called Special Agent James Clemente in the DC office, but Clemente said he couldn't comment and referred Chris to me. Chris didn't know if we could comment, but wanted to know if we could tell him anything about the following:

Chris said that State Trooper Larry Patterson met with SA Coy Copeland before Christmas. Patterson says that Copeland spent 45 minutes trying to get Patterson to change his mind about what time Roger Perry called informing Patterson of Vincent Foster, Jr.'s death. According to Patterson, Copeland told him that we couldn't get Tucker's phone records because Tucker is under indictment.

Chris also said that SAs Clemente and Copeland and a Mr. Green accompanied Patrick Knowlton to Fort Marcy Park in December. At the park, the group met a Mr. Reeves, described to be a black man. Knowlton believes that Mr. Reeves was told to be at the park to see if he could ID Knowlton as a Fort Marcy Park frequenter. Knowlton asked Clemente if this meeting was set up for Reeves to ID Knowlton and said Clemente denied any false pretense and said it was just a coincidence that Reeves was at the park. Chris wants to know if Clemente called Reeves and told him to be at the park to ID Knowlton.

I told Chris that we couldn't comment on the ongoing investigation. Chris said he didn't think we could but had to ask anyway.

# A Special Report from the Pittsburgh Tribune-Review

Sunday, December 24, 1995

## Starr's Probe Failed to Challenge Privilege Claims

By Christopher Ruddy  
FOR THE TRIBUNE-REVIEW

WASHINGTON—As the Senate last week moved to seek judicial help in obtaining a set of Whitewater-related notes written by a White House lawyer, one key player in the confrontation went largely unnoticed: Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr.

The Tribune-Review has learned from a source familiar with the independent counsel's probe that Starr has continually accepted without question White House claims of attorney-client privilege since his inquiry began, including claims of privilege over the Whitewater notes written by then-Associate White House Counsel William Kennedy III.

Kennedy's notes of November 1993 were taken during a meeting with key White House staffers shortly after White House officials

sought information relating to federal probes into a failed Arkansas savings and loan and a Little Rock lending company that granted fraudulent Small Business Association loans.

According to a source, Starr, following in the footsteps of his predecessor Robert Fiske, has accepted without challenge claims of attorney-client privilege asserted by nearly every member of the White House Counsel's Office, including Kennedy and former White House Counsel Bernard Nussbaum.

Starr has also accepted such claims of privilege by others, including Susan Thomases, a New York lawyer who has been a chief factotum for Hillary Rodham Clinton. The claim of privilege has been used frequently to deny Starr both testimony and documents before his Washington grand jury, the sources said.

Though the White House ultimately caved in and agreed

to hand over the Kennedy notes late last week, the administration continued to assert its right to claim privilege.

By going toe-to-toe with the Senate Whitewater Committee, Clinton's apparent strategy wasn't simply to protest attorney-client privilege with the Kennedy notes.

Rather, it was an attempt to protect an array of testimony and documents that have been withheld from the Independent Counsel's Office with Starr's acquiescence, according to sources familiar with the congressional probe as well as Starr's.

Just Tuesday, the White House won an important concession when Starr signed a "no-waiver" agreement under which the White House would release the notes but Starr would agree that the White House has the right to withhold documents and testimony based on such a privilege. The House Banking

Committee also made a similar concession later in the week.

The Senate committee, led by Sen. Alfonse D'Amato, refused to make such an agreement. That led to the Senate vote, which in turn led to the White House surrender.

Observers say Starr may have good reason to ink a deal with the White House agreeing to the privilege. If the Whitewater committee gains unfettered access to testimony and documents that Starr himself turned a blind eye to, and if the committee finds information leading to criminal indictments, then these revelations could be a major embarrassment to Starr.

Starr is a retired federal judge who had never handled a prosecution before.

The Kennedy notes and other questions became an issue in his probe during the fall of 1994, just months after Starr took over the case from Fiske. That's when then-Associate Independent Counsel Miquel Rodriguez, wrote a memo to his superiors stating that in the normal course of a prosecution, attorney-client privilege should be challenged. Rodriguez recommended that Kennedy and others be compelled to turn over notes and other informa-

tion, but those recommendations were nixed by Starr and the rest of his team.

Starr has turned in no indictments in the Washington side of his probe even though it deals with some of the most sensitive aspects of his investigation: the death of Vincent Foster, possible obstruction of the death investigation, and possible obstruction of federal inquiries into Madison Guaranty, a failed thrift with links to the Clintons.

The Tribune-Review reported that Rodriguez resigned earlier this year after being thwarted in his attempt to conduct a full probe into Foster's death.

The failure by Starr to adequately challenge claims of privilege is just another indication his investigation has been less than vigorous, according to experts familiar with federal prosecutions.

"If the prosecutor just rolls over on every claim of privilege, an investigation can be totally and completely thwarted," explained Thomas Scorza. Scorza, a former federal prosecutor from Chicago and a professor of legal ethics at the University of Chicago, was perplexed at the idea that the independent counsel has not challenged each and every claim of privilege asserted by

witnesses—which Scorza said is standard procedure in a criminal procedure.

Whether the notes written by Kennedy fall under attorney-client privilege is a "very complicated" issue, Scorza continued. He said that during his tenure as a federal prosecutor "the grand jury practice was each time witnesses claimed the privilege, we would take the matter before the chief judge."

The judge, Scorza said, determines if the privilege applies. The judge has the right to uphold the claim or even selectively apply it to the point of examining a document sentence by sentence, according to Scorza.

Starr's failure to follow standard procedure and use the judge each time the privilege has been claimed is "highly unusual," according to the professor.

"A grand jury is entitled to every man's evidence, and a privilege is an exception to those general rules," Scorza said, adding that a prosecutor certainly does not want potential targets in a criminal probe to decide themselves if something is privileged.

"In an ordinary prosecution," he added, the prosecutor "requires people who claim privilege to put up or shut up."

# A Special Report from the Pittsburgh Tribune-Review

Friday, December 29, 1995

## Starr Expired Washington Grand Jury, But Why?

By Christopher Ruddy  
FOR THE TRIBUNE-REVIEW

WASHINGTON—An abrupt change of grand juries this year—that went unreported by the major press—may have major implications for the criminal inquiry of Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr into Whitewater-related matters and the death of Vincent Foster.

### News Analysis

In about March 1995, Starr allowed his Washington grand jury to expire and replaced it with a new one, though he could have renewed the jury for another six-month term. The expired grand jury had been probing some of the most significant and sensitive areas of Starr's investigation for about a year, the Tribune-Review has learned.

As a result of the move, Starr's prosecutors were forced to perform the tedious task of reviewing evidence heard by the previous grand jury and then rehashing it for the new panel.

Since new grand juries generally do not have the benefit of rehearing or even reading the original testimony, some experts believe that such a change causes jurors to lose the true flavor of a case.

In addition, it appeared the original grand jury would have completed its work in a very short period of time, if Starr had extended the panel's life.

Starr was appointed independent counsel in August 1994 and took the reins of the Whitewater probe begun by Robert Fiske. In early 1994, soon after his appointment, Fiske had impaneled two grand juries, one in Washington and another in Little Rock. After Fiske was fired, Starr continued using the Fiske grand juries.

Under Fiske, the original Washington grand jury began probing issues relating to possible obstruction by administration officials of a Resolution Trust Co. investigation into links between Madison Guaranty, a failed Arkansas thrift, and the Clinton's Whitewater land part-

reviewed issues related to the activities of White House officials after Vincent Foster's sudden July 20, 1993, death.

Starr incorporated Fiske's work into his own investigation and built upon it by using the Washington grand jury to investigate a key area Fiske had exempted from his grand jury: a review of Foster's death and the subsequent investigation. The Foster probe was led by Associate Independent Counsel Miquel Rodriguez.

The Tribune-Review has reported that during Rodriguez's handling of the Foster case before the Washington grand jury, major discrepancies surfaced between the official version of events surrounding Foster's death and the sworn testimony of several officials.

It also has been reported that Rodriguez resigned in March amid allegations that he was being hampered in conducting a full probe by his superiors and the FBI.

### EXPIRING GRAND JURY

At about the same time,

Washington in March to return to his position as an assistant U.S. attorney in Sacramento, the Washington grand jury term was coming up for renewal.

By then, the grand jury was 2 years old. It had been dealing with other matters since early 1993, and was assigned in 1994 to Fiske's Whitewater probe—giving it a remaining six months before its original term of 18 months was up.

Typically, Washington federal grand juries are seated for 18 months and may be renewed for six-month intervals at the discretion of the prosecutor and chief judge.

Fiske was fired just months after impaneling the grand juries and Starr was appointed independent counsel on Aug. 4, 1994, by a three-judge panel.

Starr picked up where Fiske left off and began using Fiske's grand juries.

With the Washington grand jury nearing the end of its 18-month term in the fall of 1994, Starr moved to have the grand jury renewed for another six months so the continuity of the probe would be preserved.

To seat a new grand jury at this point would have meant that Starr's prosecutors would face the laborious chore of reviewing all the testimony gathered during the Fiske probe and then summarizing it for the new jury.

During the six-month extension, some of the most sensitive issues surfaced before the grand jury, sources close to the Starr probe have told the Tribune-Review.

Rodriguez took testimony from the U.S. Park Police, emergency workers and other officials examining Foster's death. Rodriguez

soon after resigned in frustration, citing resistance from his superiors and FBI recalcitrance to investigate the case.

After he took over the probe, Starr retained the same FBI agents who worked for Fiske to review their own work.

Rodriguez's requests to FBI agents on the case fell on deaf ears.

For example, agents refused to have something as simple as a map of Fort Marcy Park drafted for jurors and witnesses.

Sources familiar with the grand jury at that time say that its members felt frustrated by both Fiske's and Starr's handling of the case.

Often, grand juries serve as a rubber stamp to satisfy prosecutor's desires, though occasionally these panels take an active role in an investigation and utilize their sweeping powers.

With Rodriguez gone and the witnesses all heard from in his limited grand jury probe into Foster's death, Starr was faced with renewing the grand jury for another six months. It was at this point that he decided to let the grand jury's term expire.

Starr has not given a reason for doing so.

His spokeswomen, Debbie Gershman, in Little Rock, said that she could not comment on any matter relating to the grand jury.

Historically, District Court for Washington grand juries serve no longer than two years.

But according to Jeanine Howard, grand jury administrator for the District Court in Washington, "a special grand jury assigned to an independent counsel—can be indefi-

nately renewed for six-month periods, as long as the prosecutor and chief judge agree.

Howard said that special grand juries are typically renewed three times, giving them lives of about three years.

She recalls two recent special grand juries whose terms exceeded two years.

One reason for replacing a grand jury, experts say, is because an investigation is destined to go for years, making it unfair to indefinitely tie up the time of citizens serving on the panel.

But all indications were that Starr's Washington grand jury was coming to an end and the major issues had been investigated with no wrongdoing found.

The resignation of Starr's deputy, Mark H. Tuohey III in September was one indication of that possibility. Starr had appointed Tuohey, a Democrat with close ties to the Clinton administration, to head up the Washington probe. According to a source, Tuohey had accepted a job offer with a Washington firm in the spring of 1995, expecting the investigation would be wrapped up by the fall. Tuohey's associate, John Bates, was named deputy after Tuohey left.

Starr also had given a green light for Congress to hold hearings on issues relating to activities in Foster's office after his death—an indication that area had been cleared by his investigators. Starr's grand jury has been dormant for months on issues related to Foster's death, and Starr turned up no indictments.

Starr's grand jury was abruptly excused and a new grand jury impaneled.



With that done, Starr's prosecutors faced the task of reviewing evidence heard by the previous grand jury—though this was done in an abbreviated manner.

For this type of review, an expert or FBI agent will read transcripts and other documents relating to the original grand jury probe and give the new jurors his own interpretation of what the evidence and testimony means.

Typically witnesses are not recalled and the new grand jurors do not read the testimony themselves.

Another reason grand juries are sometimes allowed to expire is because members become bored and tired of the issues in the case.

Iran-Contra Independent Counsel Lawrence Walsh told the Tribune-Review his lengthy prosecution required several grand juries because "as a practical matter it becomes too big a drain on the jurors."

But that does not appear to have been the case with Starr's Washington grand jury.

Rodriguez, who said he was unaware of the change in grand juries, was surprised because the grand jury he worked with "was very interested in the testimony, demonstrative evidence and in further proceedings."

According to Thomas Scorza, a professor of legal ethics from the University of Chicago and a former federal prosecutor, the changing of a grand jury "is not unusual." However, he said, most prosecutors don't like to have to transfer grand juries because "it's a large amount of work" and the process loses flavor for jurors who inherit "a paper case."

Scorza said he had not heard of a situation where a grand jury was expired to close down or reduce the momentum of an investigation. However, such a transfer, depending on the ethics

of the prosecutors, could have such an effect, he said.

Starr's handling of his Whitewater probe has already raised some eyebrows. It was reported earlier this month that Starr had not been following standard prosecutorial procedure by not challenging claims of attorney-client privilege asserted by White House lawyers during the course of his inquiry.

In addition to the resignation of Rodriguez, Starr's trial counsel, Russell Hardin, resigned prematurely over a disagreement with Starr in handling the plea agreement with Webster Hubbell.

The criticism stemmed from the fact that Starr signed the agreement with Hubbell without adequately debriefing Hubbell and that Hubbell subsequently cooperated little with Starr's prosecutors.

# A Special Report from the Pittsburgh Tribune-Review

Tuesday, January 9, 1996

## Did Clinton Counsel Take Part in Clean-up of Foster's Files?

By Christopher Ruddy  
FOR THE TRIBUNE-REVIEW

WASHINGTON — Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr's grand jury heard testimony earlier last year suggesting that former White House lawyer William Kennedy took part in a clean-up operation of Vincent Foster's Whitewater-related files at the Rose law firm.

The testimony has taken on increased credibility in light of the release last month of Kennedy's notes of a Washington meeting in the fall of 1993 that some have interpreted as suggesting a need to "vacuum" or clean-up such files.

Kennedy's ex-wife, Gail, told Starr's Washington grand jurors in early 1995 that during the time when Whitewater first became prominent in the news, her husband, then associate White House counsel, had taken an unusual trip home

from Washington to Little Rock, according to a source familiar with Starr's probe.

At the time Kennedy made the trip, Mrs. Kennedy had not yet separated from her husband. The couple divorced in August 1994.

Kennedy, according to testimony, told his wife that he was taking a break to go hunting in Arkansas, the source said. At the time, Mrs. Kennedy found that hard to believe, considering her husband's pressing duties at the White House.

Under grand jury questioning she said she had other reasons to doubt the hunting story, including knowing that during part of the trip he was at the Rose firm.

At about the time her husband was on his "hunting trip," Mrs. Kennedy told the grand jury, she spoke with a senior White House aide, also from Arkansas. The woman told Kennedy that her husband had

not gone to Little Rock for hunting, but instead was at Rose cleaning up Whitewater-related matters.

Mrs. Kennedy refused to reveal the aide's identity under questioning from Brett M. Kavanaugh, a junior prosecutor for Starr, who, like Starr is, handling a prosecution for the first time.

After completing her grand jury appearance, Mrs. Kennedy returned to Arkansas, but was again pressed, this time by Starr's then-deputy, Mark H. Tuohey III, to reveal the name of the White House aide. She ultimately did so reluctantly, the source said.

Kennedy resigned from the White House inner circle Nov. 18, 1994. His notes from a meeting dealing with Whitewater-related matters a year earlier became the focus of an intense confrontation recently between the White House and Senate Banking Committee, which is probing

the Clintons' dealings. Committee members sought the notes over claims of attorney-client privilege.

The November 1993 meeting took place with several White House officials and the president's private lawyer, David Kendall. Committee investigators were concerned the participants may have discussed administration plans to interfere with two federal inquiries into Whitewater-related matters after Foster's death.

The notes released by the White House last month show Kennedy wrote:

Vacuum Rose Law files  
WWDC (Whitewater  
Development Corporation)  
Docs—  
subpoena  
Documents—never go out  
Quietly?

Republicans interpreted the notes to mean that participants at the meeting wanted to sanitize or remove any incriminating files relating to Whitewater stored at Rose.

In a statement released by the White House, Kennedy said that the use of the term "vacuum" in the notes referred to an "information vacuum" that had stymied Clinton aides in assembling data relating to the Whitewater partnership.

If prosecutors can prove that files were destroyed or concealed from investigators as a criminal probe was about to begin, those who participated could be charged with obstruction of justice.

Starr has brought no indictments on the basis of Mrs. Kennedy's testimony, or on any such information relating to the possible destruction of Foster's files from the time it became apparent that a special counsel was to be appointed in early 1994.

Recently, the Tribune-Review reported that Starr was aware of the existence of Kennedy's notes, but did not pursue basic prosecutorial tactics by challenging Kennedy's claims of privilege to have the notes released to his investigators.

Meanwhile, two Rose law firm couriers, Jeremy Hedges and Clayton Lindsey, testified before the grand jury in Little Rock in 1994. The couriers have stated publicly that they shredded a box of documents on Feb. 3—just after Robert Fiske's appointment as special counsel—marked with the initials "VWF," for the late Vincent W. Foster. Foster, at the Rose firm, and later the White House, worked on Whitewater matters for the Clintons.

Foster, like Kennedy, Webster Hubbell, and Hillary Rodham Clinton, were all senior members of the Rose firm—and all took senior positions in Washington with the new administration in 1993.

Kennedy left the White House under a cloud, himself the focus of intense press scrutiny for, among other things, his involvement in the so-called Travelgate affair. Early in the administration, Clinton functionaries sacked the long-time staff of the travel office, putting Clinton friends in charge. The White House claimed the regular travel staff was guilty of mismanagement and possible fraud.

Kennedy received a large part of blame for the fiasco, especially after he was fingered for summoning FBI agents to the White House to open an investigation into the Travel office without proper authorization from the Justice Department or FBI officials.

Kennedy said at the time of his resignation that he was leaving to be closer to his children in Little Rock.

Within months he also rejoined the Rose firm.