

Retraction and Apology Demand Notice to Mr. David Martin aka DCDave

Date: May 16, 2016

To: David Martin aka DCDave

Via email: dcdave2u@verizon.net. Hard copy to follow by mail after Mr. Martin provides his proper address

From: Marinka Peschmann. Author of *Following Orders: Death of Vince Foster, Clinton White House*

Re: David Martin's *Following Orders: Death of Vince Foster, Clinton White House Lawyer*, fraudulent purported "book review," entitled "Latest Foster Cover-Up Book Not Completely Worthless," that was published on the worldwide Internet at minimum, but not limited to at:

<http://dcdave.com/article5/150102.htm>

<https://buelahman.wordpress.com/2015/01/04/latest-foster-cover-up-book-not-completely-worthless/>

<http://ariwatch.com/Links/DCDave.htm>

Additional pick-up Mr. Martin will also need to address and rectify:

<http://www.rense.com/datapages/bettymartinidat.htm>

Please address and rectify them all.

Dear Mr. David Martin aka DCDave,

You and your associates, Hugh Turley, and "BMAN" have showed a malicious, reckless and wanton disregard for the truth in your purported "book review" of *Following Orders* and the events that have subsequently occurred after its publication.

I don't care if people read your friend, Hugh Turley's books/writings, or your writings, but you and your associates care if people read mine. In fact, so much so, that you have taken the time to write this purported "book review," that is a false, fraudulent, defamatory, misrepresentation of my book to plug your associates work and murder conspiracies that you have been peddling for decades that have been disputed. This is the tortious motivation behind it and your vicious, conduct elsewhere on the Internet including at Amazon.com.

It's long overdue that you correct and retract your preposterous "book review," and provide me with "BMAN's" real identity and proper contact information for you all. Moreover, both "BMAN" and Turly have already admitted that they did not read *Following Orders*, in BMAN's comment section located at:

<https://buelahman.wordpress.com/2015/01/04/latest-foster-cover-up-book-not-completely-worthless/> yet they both attacked it, defamed it, and me personally, despite that verifiable fact. It

is appalling that none of you have corrected yourselves by now, and that I have to write this retraction and apology demand, but here we are.

Retraction demands apply to all of your websites and fake identities on the worldwide Internet.

I have addressed your purported “book review” line-by-line in red/font calibri so no ambiguity exists. Your purported “book review” is in New York Times font.

Latest Foster Cover-Up Book Not Completely Worthless

To comment on this article go to [B'Man's Revolt](#) [who hides behind a fake name, does not provide contact information, bullies and defames individuals on the Internet... This is how trolls conduct themselves; not journalists, writers, publishers, or decent, ethical human beings either. If individuals are not prepared to reveal their identities on the Internet than they should not publish. Thanks to individuals like “BMAN” Internet anonymity is on the ropes, and it appears that it is only a matter of time that it will no longer be permitted.

Purported journalist Marinka Peschmann is not exactly an experienced researcher on the subject and it shows in her thin little 2012 volume, [Following Orders: The Death of Vince Foster, Clinton White House Lawyer](#). One would think that this 5x8 inch paperback with only 132 pages of actual text would at least be spare with any unnecessary verbiage, but in fact the opposite is the case. It's full of passages in which she and former Clinton White House legal office aide Linda Tripp just chew the fat, speculating about one thing or another [with 339 endnotes]. Misrepresentation of my book and is also defamatory. You do not know my true background, and have never spoken to me. As you know my sourced findings have been confirmed independently elsewhere. Unnecessary verbiage=evidence in the White House. This disputes your definitive murder conclusions, which is what this purported “book review” is all about. You don't have to like me or the style of my book, but you don't get to make false statements about it or me either to peddle debunked murder conspiracies.

RETRACT

Not until her 12th and last chapter does she come through with her really batty theory of what actually happened the day Foster died. **FALSE** and another complete misrepresentation. It is clear that you vigorously want readers and the public-at-large to ignore what happened inside the White House to propagate your murder conspiracies, but your libelous conduct is not lawful here.

What occurred in the White House is critical and it is part of a proper investigation. It is not proper or honest to cherry pick evidence to misrepresent a “book review” because it suits your murder conspiracy conclusions. It's also evidence that you cannot explain or disprove (see further below). Instead by making false statements about *Following Orders*, and how it was written, your conduct is defamatory, misrepresentative and fraudulent. **RETRACT.**

People need to go where the evidence leads them, not where you, David Martin aka DCDave and other long-standing murder conspiracy theorist go based on your “predications,” “strong suggestions” (see below) that are disguised as definite conclusions and are unverifiable.

Since you cannot debunk what happened in Foster’s White House office (nobody can—see below) then there is nothing “batty” about it. Go ahead and try. The fact that you have not, and have wildly misrepresented my book tells me all that I need to know.

Again, my findings has been independently confirmed elsewhere since you wrote this hit piece disguised as a “book review” to promote yourself and Hugh Turley etc. under false pretenses and defamed me. Had you been honest, you would have already updated your purported “book review” or removed it and issued retractions by now, but, alas.... **RETRACT.**

“His job is clearly to play right-wing shepherd and to herd his assigned flock away from the corruption that envelops both the Democrats and the Republicans as well as our ruling media elite,” I wrote in [my review](#) of Richard Poe’s *Hillary’s Secret War: The Clinton Conspiracy to Muzzle Internet Journalists*. It’s the same with Peschmann, except that she seems both to be on, and to aim for, an IQ level a few notches lower than Poe’s.

Richard Poe’s job? Who is his employer, etc. where is your proof of this and why is Poe in a purported “book review” about *Following Orders*? Poe is another individual you randomly defame. Just because you say so, “DCDave,” it does not make it true which is why when you falsely claimed it was *my job* as well etc., by dishonestly and fraudulently broad stroking us together based on thin air, you provided no proof of your spurious claims because none exists.

Your proof of my IQ is...? You don’t know what my IQ is, and I doubt that you know Poe’s IQ either. Moreover, where are your credentials and proof for your definite statements? Please provide. Thanks.

The truth is Poe and I have nothing to do with each other’s books; everything else you wrote is garbage, false, demeaning and defamatory pot shots. The truth is, in *Following Orders* I write about the problems on both sides of the aisle. Another fact you deliberately omitted to deceive your readers when you made false statements about me and my book. See below. **RETRACT.**

Poe was able to get a big blurb by Ann Coulter right on his dust jacket. The best Peschmann can get is a plug from [Gateway Pundit](#), Jim Hoft, a favorite whipping boy of the Fake Left web site, [Media Matters](#), where Ben Dimiero suggests that

Hoft might be “the dumbest man on the Internet.” **FALSE.** There are ZERO endorsements on *Following Orders*’ book jacket because I don’t seek blurbs or plugs. They are marketing gimmicks as you should know. Readers would believe the opposite based on your “purported” book review. Here again, you attack and defame another individual who has nothing to do with the contents of *Following Orders*, to lie and mislead your readers with a wanton disregard for the truth. **RETRACT.**

Is every website “fake” except yours, and “BMAN’s?” The irony here is rich. If it is a fake website why do you use it to defame others as a reputable source?

The following passage, which, short as it is, takes up half of the book’s penultimate page, tells you who the Peschmann audience is supposed to be, and it is surely not those she pretends to address:

A note to my secular, atheist, agnostic, and humanist friends and readers

We are all free to believe or to *not believe* in God. With or without the Bible verses, *Following Orders* is the same story. If you have a problem with references to God and to Christianity skip over the scriptures that open each chapter. When reporting on politicians who adhere to an ideology dedicated to Lucifer, I believe it is prudent to counter Lucifer with God. That said, I think it is fair to say we are all flawed. I also believe that a liar and a hypocrite, be it a person “of faith” or a “non-believer,” is still a liar and a hypocrite just like corruption, whether it appears on the right or the left of the political spectrum, is still corruption. (emphasis Peschmann’s)

FALSE, and yet another low-blow, bottom feeder attempt to deliberately, fraudulently mislead readers. This is a cherry picked red herring. *Following Orders* is not about right/left. Belief/no belief. This book is about right/wrong, corruption and goes where the evidence leads whether you, DCDave, like the ending or not. Opening a random page in my book will show the readers how you have willfully deceived them again.

A couple quick examples that contradicts your latest false statements.

Chapter 2 Rigor Mortis

“Typically, the onset of rigor mortis begins in the facial musculature area of the body, and is evident two to four hours or longer after death. However, rigor mortis may begin as early as ten minutes after death, “depending on the condition of the body at death and on factors in the atmosphere, particularly temperature.”⁹⁹ Heat accelerates the onset of rigor mortis while

cold impedes it. The “ninety degree heat that day,” according to Starr, would be linked in part to explain Foster’s warm body temperature, yet that theory should also apply to the wet blood on his face which should’ve dried quickly under those circumstances. Investigators indicated there was very little blood around Foster’s body and face—a piece of evidence supported by CW, who also “saw no blood splatter, no pool of blood” (an unexplained abnormality for a self-inflicted gunshot wound to the mouth). Yet, for reasons never explained, none of the investigations could pinpoint Foster’s time of death.¹⁰⁰

According to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), July 20, 1993, was an unusually dry and hot day with zero precipitation. At 5:50 p.m., the approximate time when Foster’s body was discovered, the temperature had barely dropped from the day’s high of 96 degrees to a sizzling 92 degrees. At 6:50 p.m., the sun would not set for another forty minutes when the temperature dropped to 90 degrees.¹⁰¹ Etc. Etc. Etc.

Or paragraphs like these ...

Chapter 6: Inside Hillary’s White House Counsel’s Office

“Hillary claimed she had “craved information like oxygen,” when she learned of Foster’s death and “was frantic because she felt so far away and couldn’t figure out what was going on.”¹⁵⁵ However, her actions and the actions inside the counsel’s office suggest otherwise.¹⁵⁶

Phone records disclosed two years after Foster’s death showed Hillary called the White House at least four times that night into the early morning, including calling her chief of staff, Maggie Williams. “Immediately after speaking with Mrs. Clinton, Ms. Williams proceeded to Mr. Foster’s office.” After searching Foster’s office, Williams called Hillary in “Little Rock at 12:56 a.m. on July 21, 1993.”¹⁵⁷ Etc., etc. etc. **RETRACT ALL.**

Peschmann never explains how she developed such a cozy relationship with Tripp, the woman who brought Foster his last lunch, a cheeseburger, but one gets some idea of the degree of the coziness, as well as a feel for the reading experience that one is in for, with this early passage in the first chapter: **FALSE:** Yes. I did. *Following Orders* is a sequel, as it is clearly stated in the book on the cover page and again in:

Chapter One: It Does Not Take a Village

“Indeed, as reported in *The Whistleblower*, Linda had protected the Clintons in all the earlier investigations—which is the real reason she needed to be discredited and destroyed during the events that led to only the second president in the history of the United States being impeached. It had nothing to do with sex.”

What you wrote is not only false, but more evidence of actual malice in your purported “book review” to willfully deceive readers and cause me harm. **RETRACT**

With Cleo, Linda's golden retriever dog, gently asleep at her usual spot, in front of the living room couch, I faced the computer and clicked print. Page after page rolled out documenting the events of July 20, 1993—that was the day White House deputy counsel to the president of the United States, Vincent Walker Foster Jr., was found dead of an apparent self-inflicted gunshot wound to the head in Fort Marcy Park in McLean, Virginia. It was the highest-ranking suicide in government since 1949, when President Truman's secretary of defense, James Forrestal, committed suicide by throwing himself from a sixteenth floor window to his death from the Bethesda Naval Hospital.

She's still toeing the prevailing propaganda line on Forrestal (who was no longer defense secretary at the time of his death) some eight years after this writer had [blown it out of the water](#), and it really should not surprise one to find that she really does pretty much the same with Foster. In the Foster case it is the propaganda line of the Fake Right.

FALSE. Where is your proof? Just because you say so? I want to see hard proof that I am a part of the "fake right." I am not. The fact is I'm not towing anybody's propaganda line and the "writer" you cite is yourself, David Martin aka DCDave, because, evidentially, in your world everyone has been definitely murdered based on your "predictions" and "strong suggestions." See below. **RETRACT.**

"She pretty much does the same." **FALSE**, ridiculous and fraudulent misrepresentation. No, you want people to ignore what happened in the White House to perpetuate your murder conspiracies because **you also ignore** what happened in the White House. Here's some proof that I am not a part of the "right." Obviously the "right" is not happy with the findings either or with other reporting I've done because honest journalists know that the problems are on both sides of the aisle (as I wrote in *Following Orders*..) which people are finally now seeing in this presidential election. You need to provide the wall-to-wall right wing media outlets that have covered *Following Orders* and a right wing person who is funding me to back up your false claims about me. Good luck with that. It does not exist. **RETRACT.**

We heard it early on, coming from the likes of Rush Limbaugh and Jerry Falwell [and this has what to do with my book in your purported "book review?" It also appears that you are twisting from a cherry picked passage I wrote that naturally you also omitted from **Chapter 1: It Does Not Take a Village**]. Yes, it might have been a suicide, they agreed, but it didn't happen like we have been told. There had to have been something about it that was terribly embarrassing to the Clintons. Hillary and Vince had a love nest, they suggested, somewhere in Northern Virginia. Perhaps Foster killed himself there, and the body was transported to the park rolled up in a carpet and dumped. It is consistent with the thrust of reporter Christopher Ruddy's work before he [defected to the Clinton](#)

[camp](#), and that is the theory that she is marshaling support for with the following passage:

FALSE, misleading and wholly misrepresentative. I have never spoken to Rush Limbaugh or Jerry Falwell so to falsely broad stroke me with them as you have with others in your purported “book review,” is disingenuous at best. Also I did not suggest a “love nest” either. That’s another conspiracy theory, nothing to do with *Following Orders*. **RETRACT**.

The fact is you, Dave Martin aka DCDave, have shown a highly disturbing pattern of falsely broad-stroking and tying people together who do not “tow” your murder-conspiracy line based on your “predictions” and “strong suggestions,” by defaming them all, even when they do not know each other and have nothing to do with *Following Orders* (see below).

The truth is Ruddy’s book, like mine, is also documented. It raises legitimate concerns. *Following Orders* has 339 endnotes—again a fact you have maliciously omitted to deliberately, and fraudulently mislead readers into thinking that *Following Orders* is a book about me and Linda Tripp “chewing the fat,” when it is not.

Moreover what Ruddy does with the Clintons has nothing to do with me or with *Following Orders*. You must stop fraudulently misleading your readers to avoid addressing the book’s true contents. Your deceptive practices know no bounds. I find it ironic and hypocritical that you have the audacity to complain that people ignore you and Knowlton and then attack, malign and defame me. I didn’t ignore Knowlton. You proved that yourself—thereby discrediting yourself and this purported “book review” that is not a book review (see further down below to verify).

Additionally, your issues with Ruddy are your issues, not mine. Deal with them and leave me out of it. It is disturbing how malicious you are, how you demean people. However, your issues do not give you the right to defame me and other individuals and actively engage in fraudulent misrepresentation. **RETRACT**.

According to an independent Foster investigation conducted by Vincent Scalice, a veteran New York City Police homicide investigator, and an expert in crime scene reconstruction, identification, and forensic analysis, and Fred D. Santucci, a Forensic Photographer and Crime Scene Expert: “Carpet-type fibers of various colors which were found on almost all of Foster’s clothing was clearly indicative of the fact that his body probably was in contact with one or more carpets. This evidence raises the possibility that his body may have been in a prone position,

and/or his body may have been transported while in contact with some type of carpeting.”

She leaves out one name here. Richard Saferstein, author of the popular textbook, [*Criminalistics: An Introduction to Forensic Science*](#), was also a member of the “independent investigation” team.

Actually, there was nothing really independent about it [I think they may disagree with you. Yes?]. It was all set up by Christopher Ruddy. He roped me into the “reconstruction of the crime scene” to play the role of the Vince Foster corpse because, he said, I was the right height. I protested that I was some 30 pounds heavier than Foster and therefore unsuited for the role, but Ruddy insisted.

Question: So because Ruddy insisted, you played along and somehow that’s my fault? I was not there. If you were concerned, you would not have done that.

Where’s your integrity? I think his purpose was simply to get me emotionally invested in the snake oil that he was selling, which I never found all that persuasive, no matter how “expert” the people might have been, because the reconstruction took place much earlier in the year than when Foster died, and conditions would have been completely different. **Question:** Again, why is this in a purported “book review” about *Following Orders*? Your pontificating and theories on Ruddy has nothing to do with me, or the contents of my book. My guess is that Ruddy does not share your “opinions,” and he does not use the Internet to defame people either, like you and your associates do. **RETRACT.**

Also, among the true contents of *Following Orders* [in the thin, nothing book with me and Linda “chewing the fat”—according to you] that you deliberately omitted from your purported “book review” to portray it in a false light is information like this:

Chapter 11: The Confession and the Case

“...when collection gathering at the time of the incident was at best shoddy, all one can do is attempt to go back and re-create it.”

That’s what OIC Kenneth Starr and Robert Fiske did as well. What else should they have done? Nothing? Rely on your unverifiable “predictions” (see below)? Reality check—investigations, after-the-fact, involve reconstructions. None are perfect, obviously. Here are a couple additional examples of more of your deliberate omissions to fraudulently misrepresent *Following Orders* and to intentionally deceive readers.

Chapter 3: The Foster Investigations

“For openers, evidence gathering where Foster’s body was found was at best poorly handled, as Starr wrote, “The collection and preservation of physical evidence is [sic] the most

important building blocks available to the crime scene investigator.”⁶⁸ In Foster’s case, the 35mm photographs that Park Police took of his body “were underexposed and of little value.”⁶⁹ Because Foster’s “clothing was packaged together before trace evidence was collected, specific trace evidence cannot be conclusively linked to particular items of clothing [that Foster] was wearing at the time of his death. To obtain precise trace evidence analyses, each item must be kept separate before trace evidence is collected.”⁷⁰ The medical examiner’s laboratory “intended to take x-rays” of Foster’s body but the lab’s new x-ray machine was “not functioning properly.”⁷¹ No alternative arrangements were made. Foster was buried three days after he died.

“A perfect reconstruction ... was not possible,” wrote Dr. Henry Lee, famed Director of the Connecticut State Police Forensic Science Laboratory...” Etc.

Chapter 3: The Foster Investigations

“Based on the Park Police’s failure at evidence gathering, common sense would say there was only one reasonable and solid conclusion that all the Foster inquiries should have reached: it was not possible to decisively conclude what had happened to Vince Foster.

Both Starr and Fiske attempted to recover evidence and complete what the original investigation had missed or failed to do. Starr sent investigators to the neighborhood around Fort Marcy Park because there was “no record of any effort to canvass the neighborhood near the time of death to determine whether anyone had seen or heard relevant information.”⁷³

Another failed attempt brought Fiske and Starr’s investigators back to the park to locate physical evidence, specifically bone fragments from Foster’s skull and the fatal bullet that four Park Police investigators had unsuccessfully tried to locate two days after Foster’s death by using a “metal detector” in the immediate area where his body was found. OIC investigators recovered bullets and other metal objects, but none of the bullets was the one that killed Foster. During Fiske’s inquiry, agents screened and sifted through approximately inches down into the soil, and found “no bone fragments” that belonged to Foster.⁷⁴

Taking into account the indisputable failures of the Park Police’s unreliable investigation, who had confidently accepted the official Foster findings? Bill and Hillary Clinton....” Etc., Etc., Etc.

Chapter 11: The Confession and the Case

“We know the Clinton White House stonewalled investigators, and staffers supplied conflicting testimony or suffered from bouts of “I can’t recall” amnesia. We know the White House barred investigators from any meaningful access to Foster’s office, an office that was already contaminated by Hillary’s senior staff. And because Foster’s office was not searched or tested for forensic evidence, *there is no evidence to rule out* the possibility that his office was *not* his place of death. We also know five government investigations drew conclusions using shoddy and incomplete evidence initially gathered at Fort Marcy Park by the Park Police.” [This is all sourced earlier in *Following Orders*.]

Furthermore, all that evidence of carpet fibers on Foster's clothing came from the FBI crime lab when, contrary to what one might learn from Ruddy or Peschmann, the FBI was, itself, deeply implicated in the Foster cover-up. **FALSE: You are a such a liar it is sickening and disturbing.**

See: **Chapter 11:** "According to the FBI report, "the FBI Laboratory found 35 definitive carpet-type fibers" from Foster's clothing. Of those fibers, 23 were white fibers ... 12 were various colors, which suggests 'those fibers did not originate from a single carpet.' The white fibers ... were consistent with carpet samples taken from Foster's home. The others, including blue-gray, blue, goldbrown, light-brown, gray, pink, and orange in color, were consistent with samples from the White House or his car." 246"

RETRACT

Dave Martin aka DCDave, you and your associates, have definitively accused the FBI of a cover-up when some of the evidence they collected is actually very damning, but your readers would not know that. So instead you do what you always do. You maliciously malign and defame an entire Federal Agency, and everyone who works there, based on falsehoods, by cherry picking, fraud, misrepresentation... etc. etc.

Moreover, you have also failed to acknowledge the **challenges** the FBI faced collecting evidence which is also in *Following Orders*. The **challenges** the FBI faced are also verifiable facts. These are more facts that you have deliberately omitted to willfully misrepresent and make false statements about my book to deceive readers to peddle your debunked murder conspiracies.

In addition, contrary to your purported "book review," my book (and Ruddy's) include the FBI and their role. Just look at our endnotes for starters. It's shameful how you lie and wholly misrepresent facts to maliciously smear and defame individuals and an entire agency. It's also very disturbing. This speaks to your character. **RETRACT.**

Peschmann has this lone endnote (#250) at the end of her paragraph:

"Vincent J. Scalice, 'What really happened,' access online at:

<http://whatreallyhappened.com/content/vince-foster-documents-reveal-judges-deliberations-death.>"

How many endnotes do you use at the end of a paragraph when you are referencing one source? More than "lone"? Additionally, you are citing a bad link which I have acknowledged and was beyond my control. I don't pretend to be perfect or all knowing like you do in this preposterous "book review." This happens on the Internet. The source material is not there anymore or even on the Internet. One bad url out of 339 endnotes does not constitute an basis for a "book review" that's a hit piece based on lies, false pretenses, and fraudulent misrepresentations to peddle your friends book and your murder conspiracies. It is worth pointing out that your friend, Hugh Turley, also will not speak to me, just like you won't.

Whoa! Wait a minute! How in the world did that get there? There's nothing about Scalice et al. in the referenced article. What's there is the very illuminating work of Foster researcher Hugh Turley, which appears on this writer's web site. **FALSE: That's right. The information I cited is not there anymore. I've acknowledged it's a bad link. I don't care if people read your friend's book. You have proven that you care if people read mine. RETRACT.** Here we reprint it in its entirety:

PLUG FOR DAVID MARTIN's AKA DCDAVE'S FRIEND'S HERE. The motivation and the reason behind your preposterous, fraudulent, false, misleading purported "book review."

NOTE: The word count in your purported "book review" of *Following Orders*: 2,368 words. Your plug is 715 words. This alone shows your fraudulent conduct.

Documents Reveal Judges' Deliberations on a Death

By Hugh Turley

Vincent Foster, former president Bill Clinton's deputy White House counsel, died nearly 18 years ago, and his death was ruled a suicide. But recent research has revealed that the judges who had appointed the independent counsel investigating his death were worried about "be[ing] charged as conspirators in the cover-up," in the words of Judge John Butzner.

Butzner was part of a three-judge panel on the Special Division of the District of Columbia Circuit that had appointed Kenneth Starr to investigate several matters relating to the Clinton's Whitewater land deal, an inquiry that grew to include Foster's 1993 death.

Notes between the now-deceased Butzner and his colleagues Peter Fay and David Sentelle are part of the collection of Butzner's papers at the University of Virginia's law library. They show discussion about whether to include the testimony of Whitewater grand jury witness Patrick Knowlton, who had been at Fort Marcy Park the day Foster's body was found. As a passerby, he testified that Foster's Honda was not at the park at the time of death. Foster therefore could not have driven to the park in his car as claimed by Starr.

Knowlton asked the judges to include additional evidence based on official records contradicting Starr's report: Other witnesses did not see Foster's car, the gun found was not Foster's, there was a bullet hole in

Foster's neck, crime scene photographs and X-rays had disappeared. Knowlton provided evidence he was the victim of witness intimidation by Starr's staff.

On Sept. 24, 1997, Judge Sentelle sent his colleagues Knowlton's motion to include comments and factual information as an appendix to the report on Foster's death. Sentelle told them: "The question of what to do with his comments is not an easy one. ... If I were forced to decide the question alone, it would be my inclination to deny the motion."

Judge Fay disagreed with Sentelle. "[Knowlton] does comment on specific findings and conclusions in the report," he argued. "He contradicts specific factual matters and takes issue with the very basics of the report filed by the [Independent Counsel]."

The following day Butzner concurred. "I suspect if we deny the motion we will be charged as conspirators in the cover-up," he wrote. "I suggest we let the motion and the attachments speak for themselves."

That afternoon, Sentelle faxed his colleagues a message that, after reviewing their memos, he had changed his mind and agreed to draft an order granting the motion. So on Sept. 26, the court ordered that Knowlton's comments and evidence be included in Starr's report. On Sept. 29, Starr filed a motion appealing the order. It was denied the next day, marking the first time in history that an Independent Counsel was ordered to include in his report evidence of a cover-up by his own investigators.

After Starr's motion was denied and before the report was made public, Knowlton and his attorney visited the Associated Press office to show the reporter on the case the evidence contradicting Starr that had been ordered part of the final report.

They were not prepared for his response. "[The reporter] told us the story was already written and [the cause of death] was suicide," Knowlton told the *Hyattsville Life & Times*. "We did not believe the press could ignore the court-ordered attachment."

Now, for 13 years, the American press has not reported on the Knowlton appendix, and the attachments did not "speak for themselves" as Butzner envisioned. But the press *has* reported the latest news about Kenneth Starr -- he will become the president of Baylor University this June.

This article appeared originally in the [April 2010 Hyattsville \(MD\) Life and Times](#). All the documents described in the article, including the Knowlton appendix ordered included with Kenneth Starr's report over his strenuous objection—and the objection, itself—can be [found here](#). The complete Starr report on Foster's death, including the vital Knowlton appendix, is [here](#). The Washington Post, however, protecting Starr's reputation in a manner that the three judges, to their credit, refused to do, have what it claims to be the full Starr report [here](#). In an act worthy of Pravda in the old Soviet Union, The Post has censored out the Knowlton appendix.

David Martin

April 14, 2010

Peschmann's Scalice passage appears on page 106 of her book. At this point the reader might as well just continue with his Internet reading and ditch the book [to go read David Martin aka DCDave's debunked conspiracy theories and/or your pal's book, where you all definitively accuse people of murder ... etc.]. The Knowlton appendix referred to—by dint of the judges' decision as much a part of the official report as the work of Starr's team—thoroughly destroys Peschmann's thesis. **FALSE.** Peddling your pals in a purported "book review" again and false statements. "Thoroughly destroy?" Five people believe your premise that I know of and that includes you, BMAN and Turley. Moreover, Starr's official report "thoroughly destroys" your "predictions" (see below). And no, it does not thoroughly destroy mine as documented in *Following Orders*. Just because you say so does not make it true. Borrowing from your words, what occurred and is verifiable in Foster's White House office "thoroughly destroys your thesis." **RETRACT.** She guesses **FALSE and fraudulent misrepresentation.** It's not a guess. It's a reconstruction using the evidence – that includes, in part, his stomach contents as written in *Following Orders*. **RETRACT** that Foster, after going out and eating some more somewhere, came back to the White House shortly after 5 o'clock and shot himself in his office with his own gun and was then transported to Fort Marcy Park and dumped there by panicked fellow White House lawyers working late [**Selective truth telling.** You deliberately omitted who else was at the White House that is verifiable for good reason to intentionally deceive readers etc.].

We learn from Knowlton's document, though, that the widow, Lisa, was shown a silver gun and told that it was the one found at the park, when the gun found at the park was black and therefore not the one that the family brought up from Arkansas. In brief, you are ignoring, among other things, the issues with your friend, Patrick Knowlton's version and his FBI 302's. Knowlton would not speak to me either.

Turley's interpretation of the Judge's deliberations is interesting, slanted. I agree with the Judges. They would have been accused of being co-conspirators by individuals like you, Turley and "BMAN," and you would probably troll them and defame them too. The gun, then, appears to have been planted. We also learn that the one wound seen at the park by witnesses [witnesses--plural? Are you sure about that? No. More deception] was to Foster's neck—an apparent bullet entrance wound—and no one there saw any exit wound in the back of the head, much less the half-dollar-sized one that was shown in the autopsy sketch. The missing fatal bullet that Peschmann makes a big fuss about [I did not make a fuss. But the fatal bullet is important for obvious reasons and because it dispels your debunked murder conspiracy theory and explains this hit piece, fake "book review"] was likely not missing at all but still in Foster's head. [Your definitive proof of this is where? Batty?] The "malfunctioning" X-ray machine that failed to detect the bullet was not malfunctioning at all [and you know the X-ray machine was definitively not malfunctioning because...]; the corrupt autopsy doctor, James Beyer, simply falsified the autopsy report. [Indeed there were problems, but where if you proof he "simply falsified" it?]

The truth is my book, using your words, "thoroughly destroys your thesis," hence your malicious "book review." Individuals can agree to disagree, and there are individuals like you who engage in fraudulent misrepresentations, defamatory conduct, etc. etc..

Note: Mr. Martin, I am surprised that you did not include the conspiracy theory that Foster's tongue was removed during the autopsy, put on a plate, and photographed, to show others as a warning from the Clintons to shut up and keep them quiet. Some individuals have gone so far to definitively state that it was also a warning sign from the "Illuminati." You too? The individual who started that one, and has been peddling it for years, to be repeated as false fact in the Alternative media, contacted me as if it were 100% true.

This individual is quite the story teller. Incredibly, he even acted like he was concerned for my safety (he's like you. He's another "expert" who thinks the Clintons go out and kill people). So I told this individual to show me the pictures and I'd update my book. Funny, he didn't have any pictures, so then, I asked him to describe them in specific detail, and he couldn't even do that. Finally he admitted he never saw any pictures either. It was a friend of a friend thing ... Yet that nonsense has spread in the alternative media fear porn echo chamber as a false fact. The reality is zero proof exists to support it.

The best evidence strongly indicates [according to you if you ignore what happened in the Counsels office that day and to Foster's White House office afterwards which is verifiable] that Foster was driven to Fort Marcy Park [by whom and why? Moreover you deliberately omitted with actual malice the fact that Foster was depressed and wanted to resign. Wouldn't you if you had his

job? You also, among other facts, ignore the Whitewater criminal indictments that were filed shortly after he died. What was Vince Foster's job again? Unfortunately and tragically individuals have committed suicide living under far less stress. You also ignore Tripp's promotion and pay increase—verifiable and all in *Following Orders, etc., etc.*]—which happens, by coincidence or not, to be quite near CIA headquarters —where he was surprised by someone who pressed a small caliber pistol to his neck and fired it upward into his brain [and killed Foster in the most outrageously sloppy, messy, pre-mediated murder-plot in the history of the world because ... David Martin aka DCDave says so. Do you listen to yourself? You make no sense considering according to the conspiracy theory experts like you and your pals the Clintons are experienced at murdering people and kill people all the time, so why were they so sloppy here with such an important murder?]. That is the scenario **strongly suggested** by Starr's lead investigator, Miguel Rodriguez, in his [resignation letter](#) and his [memorandum for the record](#). (emphasis mine)

In brief, the key here to your link in that paragraph to the “memorandum for the record,” is: “We are confident in our **prediction.**” Also “**strongly suggests**” in the paragraph.

BINGO. Exactly, it's a prediction—not supported, and “predictions” are certainly not the grounds to make false statements and to fraudulently misrepresent/defame me or my book in your purported “book review,” that's not a book review, to willfully and maliciously deceive readers on the world-wide internet. I don't care if people read your predications.

Note: I understand why Rodriguez resigned. It must have been very frustrating working there at that time—years after the incident to attempt to solve this case when the initial investigation was so sloppy, evidence was contaminated, etc. in the worst planned murder ever (according to DCDave and pals)...

In addition, you also fraudulently misrepresented my book to deliberately mislead readers and the public-at-large, by omitting how in *Following Orders*, I use new information that is also *second-sourced, sometimes three times*, and is supported by other evidence. Unlike you and your associates—you all unequivocally accuse people of murder and an entire federal agency of being dirty and guilty of a cover-up based on your debunked “predictions,” and “strong suggestions.”

Unlike me, where I honestly state in *Following Orders*: “Now we may know...” Another fact you omitted in your purported “book review.” **RETRACT ALL.**

People should read whatever they want to read—not be deliberately, fraudulently mislead with actual malice by you, David Martin aka DCDave. Again, I don't care if people read Turley's book or whatever you have written. You all care very much if people read *Following Orders*, as evidenced in your purported “book review” that is not a book review.

Peschmann makes no mention of Rodriguez . True, but I did acknowledge the theories and how frustrating it was for investigators with the challenges and obstacles they faced—a fact you omitted. I just couldn't support Rodriguez's theory with evidence like you can't either with your "prediction" and "strong suggestions" so I did not include it. Additionally I did not go out on the worldwide Internet and maliciously defame you, like you have with me.

I also wrote about how Bernie Nussbaum and Craig Livingston, who worked in the White House, resigned in disgrace which is very relevant, and another fact you omitted and ignore to fraudulently deceive readers. Her one reference to Knowlton comes in the second sentence of her climactic Chapter 12, "At 4:30 p.m., on July 20, 1993, according to an eyewitness, Foster's car was not at the parking lot at Fort Marcy Park."

The accompanying endnote, no. 294, has this reference, "Kenneth W. Starr, Independent Counsel, *Report of the Death of Vincent W. Foster*, October 10, 1997, Appendix to Report; September 23, 1997 letter from Patrick Knowlton's attorney, John H. Clarke." Earlier, you claimed I was "towing the propaganda line" based on thin air—when you yourself proved right here that is not true. Your "book review" is garbage, fraudulent. Your attacks on me personally are vile and despicable. **RETRACT all.**

So there it is again, but the reader, unless he ferrets it out for himself, would never guess how significant that appendix, and its inclusion in the report over Starr's objection, really is. Thanks to that earlier endnote, though, not a great deal of ferreting is required. It's right there in the links, and the accompanying article explains its significance. Still plugging your friend's book in your fake "book review" that is not a book review but a plug for your debunked murder conspiracies/predictions/suggestions by making false statements and fraudulent misrepresenting regarding mine over a bad link that I should not have included in the first place—in 339 endnotes. **RETRACT ALL.**

Having revealed what newspaper, magazine, and book writers across the political spectrum have worked hard to conceal, Marinka Peschmann, then, has managed to write a book that is not altogether worthless. One can only wonder if she knows it. I find it ironic how you, Turley, "BMAN" and Knowlton complain about ad hominem attacks yet engage in them to dishonestly, fraudulently portray a book to willfully deceive readers and attack me personally. Is there anyone you won't slime based on falsehoods, wild misrepresentations, your debunked "predictions" and/or thin air? **RETRACT ALL.** And that includes in your fake "book review" on various websites and "BMAN's" comment section.

David Martin
January 2, 2015

To recap Mr. Martin: (1) Individuals, like “BMAN,” who hides behind fake names on the Internet, and do not provide contact information lack integrity and are cowards. Their tortious conduct will play a role in future Internet regulation, while crying “censorship,” “banning,” etc. like he has predictably already done in the comment section on his website. It is not surprising that “BMAN” (who would not speak to me either) published your purported “book review” of *Following Orders* that is not a book review. It is laden with lies, fraudulent misrepresentations, deliberate omissions etc. -- where you defamed not just me, other individuals and the entire FBI to plug your debunked murder conspiracies.

See: Rudy Takala, “FCC commissioner: U.S. tradition of free expression slipping away,” *Washington Examiner*, February 16, 2016, “Pai concluded that if voters and institutions fail to defend free speech within their own spheres, it could lead to more government regulations curtailing that freedom.” <http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/fccs-pai-freedom-of-speech-slipping-away/article/2583354>

(2) It was also not surprising to see that your trio –that includes Hugh Turley have been banned elsewhere and that nobody wants anything to do with you as you also complain and write about. That’s not my issue. The only individuals’ who have a problem with me, are liars, cowards, dirt bags and/or frauds. Indeed there are many of them.

(3) Again, I don’t care if people read Turley’s book or your predictions; you all very much care if people read my book. I would never waste my time, making false statements and fraudulent misrepresentations to deceive readers about his work or yours not just here, but elsewhere on the Internet like you have done. Retract this fraudulent purported “book review,” and apologize for the malicious damage you have intentionally caused me and other individuals with actual malice.

(4) In addition, according to you and your associates, one minute I’m on Hillary’s payroll, the next it’s the Republicans and then I didn’t even write the book. It’s preposterous and a complete fabrications which is why you provided no proof as none exists. You just spew venom.

(5) Lastly, one more time, you also know there has been independent confirmation of what I wrote regarding what *may have happened* based on the evidence that is second sourced—that includes all the problems with the investigations and the FBI contrary to what you falsely and fraudulently claimed in your purported “book review.”

RETRACT and apologize.

I look forward to your retraction, and public apology. Again, please provide me with proper identification and contact information for you and your pals. It’s long overdue. I sincerely hope that you stop maliciously hurting innocent people because of your debunked conspiracy

theories “predictions” and “strong suggestions.” There are enough real problems; there is no need to make anything up.

Mr. Martin, it’s long overdue that you remedy your egregious conduct. You have intentionally, with actual malice, caused me damage with your fake “book review.” Please email me to confirm this when it is done on all your websites—fake names and all, and then do not darken my door again. It is horrific the amount of time I’ve had to waste dealing with vicious people like you on the Internet in the so-called “Alternative media.” You are entitled to your opinion, but not to your own facts.

/s/Marinka Peschmann

Marinka Peschmann

marinkapm@aol.com