

The Commie/Islamic problem of course reached its peak during the Soviet war in Afghanistan, when Uncle Sam decided that the Afghan resisters to the Soviet army were heroic freedom fighters, anti-Communist democrats who were inveterate readers of John Dewey, Sidney Hook, and all the other champions of global democracy. As a result, we armed the Afghans to the hilt, supplied them with hand-held anti-aircraft missiles which they used to shoot down Bad Soviet helicopters, etc. But no sooner did the Soviet troops pull out, when it turned out that the democratic Afghan Freedom Fighters had transformed themselves overnight into evil

Islamic fundamentalist fanatics, dedicated to putting the veil back on women. Inside the dust jackets of the books of Hook and Dewey there turned out to be... the Koran!

Indeed, the fat, diabetic "fanatic" blind sheik, he of the terrorists and the UN Building, got his start as a freedom fighter in Afghanistan, reputedly a CIA asset in that brave struggle for democracy. Poor blind sheik: a victim of the latest twist of the historical dialectic!

So: if Mr. Collins and the Clinton Administration play their cards right, who knows? We might wind up with Amer-

ican bombers, helicopters, and ground "spotters" invading the mountains of Tajikistan, if not of neighboring Afghanistan itself.

Iraq

And then, of course, if he's got nothing else to do, Bill Clinton can always bomb Baghdad again. Hell, that's always good for a few points in the approval ratings.

How About Korea?

Ruminating over our next intervention, an old friend of mine the other day brought up that old unresolved problem: Korea. Here's what Korea offers for our interventionists' delectation:

— An authentically hard-line, dictatorial, unreconstructed Commie regime, headed by the evil Marshal Kim Il-Sung.

— A "democratic," "pro-Western" South Korea.

— An unresolved war, or even American defeat, that cries aloud for vengeance. In contrast to Vietnam, Korea for left-liberals was the last Good War of the Cold War. North Korea had "aggresed" against the South, violating all left-liberal-neocon canons of international behavior.

— North Korea is rumored to be working on nuclear weapons.

So: we can bomb, nuke

North Korea back to the Stone Age to our hearts' content, and the terrain is not as inconveniently jungle-y as it was in Vietnam.

And the war could take a satisfyingly l-o-n-g, L-O-N-G time! ■

Fostergate!

by M.N.R.

Every Administration is marked by lies and evasions, but Bill Clinton has the remarkable ability to change his story (i.e. lie and evade) *on a dime*, and yet without incurring the implacable wrath of the American public. One of the most important and rapid Clintonian changes up front he seems to be getting away with: the egregious coverup of the mysterious killing of White House counsel, kindergarten buddy of Clinton's and law partner of Hillary's, 48-year-old Vincent Foster, Jr.

Fact: in the middle of the day, Vincent Foster's body was found in a park in McLean, Va., outside of Washington. He had been shot and killed with a gun that nobody knows he owned. Moreover, the gun was a combination of two other guns, the sort of thing one does when one doesn't want a gun to be traced.

The immediate response of the Clinton White House was to be tearful, puzzled, but peculiarly eager to "get the killing behind us." On the one hand, Clinton and other friends and colleagues claimed that Foster had showed no signs of depression or erratic behavior, and was always an emotional

Inside the dust jackets of the books of Hook and Dewey there turned out to be... the Koran!

Rock of Gibraltar; yet Clinton & Company showed no eagerness to probe the mysterious death. On the other hand, the Justice Department pledged a full probe into the death, as befits a killing of a top White House official. The Justice Department professed eagerness at getting to the bottom of the mystery.

It took only a few days for a change of line to set in. Foster's wife claimed that he *was* depressed, beset by the Washington pressure-cooker, and it was also asserted that Clinton had called his old friend for 20 minutes before the killing in order to "cheer him up." How come that Clinton had said nothing about the "cheer-up call" when the killing was discovered? Change of Line Number One.

And, furthermore, if Vince Foster hated Washington life and longed to return to the peace and quiet of Little Rock, why didn't he simply do so?

Next, came a curious and unexplained shift in the stance of the Justice Department. No, it said, the Justice Department was only engaging in a minimal low-level "inquiry" assisting the U.S. Park Police, who are in charge of the investigation. Change of Line Number Two. Further, since the Park Police was convinced that there was no murder here, the Justice Department has no authority to probe further, and will confine itself to figuring out whether Foster had been depressed. As for the U.S. Park Police, they have no intention of even interviewing the Clintons or the other kindergarten pal, Chief of Staff Thomas ("Mack") McLarty, about their long-time buddy's

possible depression or mental state.

Now, gentlemen, this simply will not do. A top White House counsel and aide has been shot and killed in mysterious circumstances. We need to know, quite simply: who killed Vincent Foster? And why was he killed? Was he murdered? If he did commit suicide, was this event caused by blackmail? Remorse? Or what? Is it a coincidence that the killing of Vincent Foster came shortly after he was named

in the July RRR ("The Arkansas-Stephens Connection") as part of the Rose/Stephens/BCCI connection?

What we need is a deep, lengthy, and well-funded independent probe, *with* subpoena power, that will go into every nook and cranny of the Foster-Clinton-Rose connection, that will be fearless in finding out the truth, that will probe deeply into the lives of the entire crew, and will expose it all for the American public. One of the

Quotes That Need No Comment

Mr. [Alan] Greenspan is a compulsive courtier, rarely turning down tennis at the White House or missing a cocktail party of any political hue. . . . And he has what one senior Bush official calls "the greatest economic bedside manner of anyone who came to Washington." — *The Economist*

Legally, we have free speech. But the Israel lobby, not content with owning many important media organs, tries to keep potential dissenters good and scared. It is not enough for the lobby to have a voice; its opponents—usually American patriots—must be shut up. . . . The worst of this is that most Americans think they are hearing all points of view on the Mideast when they aren't. They don't realize how many normally outspoken journalists are keeping their mouths prudently sealed on one issue. . . . We have taboos that aren't even acknowledged as taboos, and nothing is more insidious than the illusion of freedom without its substance. This won't be the land of the free again until it's the home of the brave. — Joe Sobran, *The Wanderer*

"THE UNHOLY TRINITY [AIPAC, ADL, AND THE CONFERENCE OF PRESIDENTS OF MAJOR JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS]: AMERICAN JEWISH NEOCONS REBEL AGAINST 'LAND FOR PEACE'" — Robert I. Friedman, *The Village Voice*

Journalists have a job to do, and cannot pull their punches at wrongdoing on the assumption that high officials may be mentally ill. — William Safire, *New York Times*, on the Foster case

I'm Jewish, homosexual, alcoholic, a communist—and I'm a cripple! — Jane Bowles, the late playwright

I've been criticized for doing more than one thing at once. I've always felt—can you do one thing at once? Can you do—wouldn't it be nice if all you had to do was go to work and not take care of your family? Would it be nice if you could pay all your bills and not earn any money to pay them? I don't understand this whole—you can't do one thing at once. But anyway, that's what they say. — Bill Clinton

problems of Lawrence Walsh as independent counsel is that his emphasis, perhaps because of the way his commission was set up, was on indictment and trial. Instead, the emphasis should be on ferreting out all aspects of the truth, on digging deep into the lives, fortunes,

and interactions of these people. Truth is the crucial point; indictments can always come later. In short, we need the sort of open-ended inquiry that is usually denounced as a "fishing expedition." Well, what's wrong with a fishing expedition? How *else* do you find any fish? ■

to know the winning issues to stress, they could do worse than trying to see what issues really drive the Left to distraction. And the answer should be all too clear: the Left will grudgingly allow Rightists to talk about marginal tax rates or cuts in the capital gains tax or even limited privatization of garbage disposal. What really sends them up the wall is any stress on the hot-button "social issues," any threat to roll back the vast "social gains" experienced in recent decades by the left cultural movement. In short, gains by the systematic assault on Euro-white heterosexual males in the name of "anti-racism," "multiculturalism," feminism, "transgenderism," and all the rest.

None of the horrendously leftist appointments of Bill Clinton could be challenged by conservatives because every one of them has cunningly come wrapped in the untouchable and sanctifying clothing of victimology and of "oppressed" groups, groups embodying a "diversity" that have become uncriticizable regardless of ideology.

Hence, Republicans rolled over and played dead for a monstrous parade of leftist appointments. Thus, Ruth Ginsburg, a left feminist with the general demeanour of a diminutive beetle, is hailed on all sides as a "moderate" and is virtually escorted onto the Supreme Court by both parties and all factions: the fact that she wants to crack down on "hate" thoughts goes unnoticed amidst the general festivity. Even the usually astute and principled jurist Richard Epstein,

Losing The Culture War: Republicans Roll Over For The Left

by M.N.R.

The Republicans in Congress have done good work in opposing some of the more egregious of Clinton's socialistic economic plans. So, why is it that the Republicans have failed shamefully and consistently (with one exception: see below) in opposing any of the horrible and egregiously leftist appointments that the Clintonians have hurled at our heads? Why have the Republicans rolled over and played dead, becoming groveling pussy-cats, as the Clintonians have come up with one ultra-left horror after another? The reason is that the Republicans have already lost the culture war. They have bought the leftist charge, hook, line and sinker, that *any* cultural opposition to the left is shameful, "racist," "sexist," "homophobic," and all the other smear slogans with which the Left has been able to bring all of its potential opponents to heel. The Republican Party, down deep, is the country club party, and the country clubs have long given up on the culture war, have long surrendered to the enemy. Only much of the right-wing masses remain defiant and unbowed, but, shorn of any spokesmen, and under continual barrage by the media, the intellectual elite and the bureaucracy, they have been largely reduced to sullen silence.

It has always been an irritating habit of the liberal media to hand out unsolicited advice to conservatives. In the decades before the Reagan triumph, the advice, in the name of "value-free pragmatism," urged the Republicans, for their own good of course and for the sake of their political health, to adopt the siren song of "moderation" (i.e. accepting the New, Fair, and various other "Deals" foisted on the country by the Democrats) and to abandon "extremism." One would think that conservatives would be deeply suspicious of any advice handed them by their mortal enemies, but that's not the way it appears to work. Even after Reagan's victory gave the lie to the moderates, the liberals continued their work, managing to deflect Reaganite "extremism" to the safer realm of economics, and away from the cultural issues in which the liberals are fanatically interested. If conservatives would like