

in getting on the ballot, since he was willing to invest many millions in the process. The Kristol scenario could only work if Perot and the Perotvian move-

ment gave their full backing to Pat, monetarily and in grass-roots activity. A combination of Perot, Perotvians, and the whole-hearted backing of the conservative masses could prove formidable indeed. (I know I have warned in RRR of the lessons of the flop of the Marlin defeat in New York City, but this could be considered a special situation where everyone con-

cerned with saving New York as a city was anxious above all to get the disastrous Dinkins out of office.) But for this strategy to work, Perot and Pat would have to work closely together, and it is hard to envision Perot playing second fiddle to anyone. However, it is certainly true that Perot has been getting more conservative economically, and is increasingly anti-Clinton, and that bodes well for the potential alliance.

The most remarkable thing about the Kristol article, however, is a mystery. It calls to mind the famous remark of Sherlock Holmes in *The Hound of the Baskervilles*, which roughly went: "The most remarkable thing about that night, Watson, is the dog that didn't bark."

**Where is the special neocon twist in this article, which we have come to know and love?**

Why didn't the dog bark? In other words, where is the special neocon twist in this article which we have come to know and love so well? Why doesn't Kristol

conclude, in the standard neocon manner, by warning everyone of the menace of Pat Buchanan, this Nazi, anti-Semite, fascist, Francoite, Klansman, bigot, and of German ancestry? Where are the smears and the hysterical cries of "Hitler?" How come the article is so darned, well *friendly*—ranging from value-free analysis to downright appreciative? The worst thing he

says about Pat is his "effective demagoguery," which, in neocon parlance, is almost a compliment. What's going on here? Surely, the Godfather is up to something sneaky. Is he trying to coopt Pat? Offering him a job in the (Kemp, Bennett, Cheney, Quayle—choose one) Cabinet?

It will be fascinating to see how this plays out. But Pat, remember the old motto: Never trust a Kristol bearing gifts. ■

## Impeach Boo-Boo!

by M.M.R.

Every UN Secretary-General has been a dictator and a pain-

in-the-neck, the active embodiment of at least the potential role of World Emperor. But Boutros-Boutros Ghali (known to UN watchers as "Boo Boo") is by far the worst of the lot. He has been the single most active Sec-Gen, continually pushing for UN troops, "peacekeeping," stopping "aggression," and in general throwing his weight around in the world arena.

It is good to see that Boo-Boo is now in a peck of trouble, even within the arrogant, highly-paid, immune-from-laws, and income tax-exempt "international community" that infests the East Side, more specifically the "Turtle Bay" area, of Manhattan.

The flap arose over what can be called the "downside" of "privatization": crookery, actual or potential, in government's granting contracts to private firms. The bone of contention is the highly lucrative private contracts for air transport of the UN troops and their entourage for all the literally dozens of "peacekeeping" operations around the globe. It seems that the United States' favorite air transport firm, Evergreen Helicopters, which has had long-time connections to the CIA, was getting outbid for contracts, especially by its Canadian competitor, SkyLink. And so Evergreen, aided by "friends" in the U.S. Mission to the UN, concocted charges that the eight members of the UN procurement office, in charge of the contracts, had engaged in hanky-panky with SkyLink to grant contracts to the Canadian firm.

With suspicious eagerness,

Boo-Boo's close friend and new appointee as Assistant Secretary General for Inspection and Investigations, one Mohammed Niazi, suspended the eight UN officials (now known as "The Turtle Bay Eight"), and launched a multi-million dollar investigation. The Turtle Bay Eight have been suspended for four months, and not once have any of them been charged with a specific offense. Finally, the UN's own Joint Appeals Board has denounced the Niazi probe, and urged the immediate reinstatement of the Turtle Bay Eight. Also in hot water is Under Secretary General Melissa Wells, who strongly backed Niazi, and was heavily involved in this witchhunt. Since two of the eight are Canadians, the Canadian Ambassador to the UN has launched a protest against the Niazi investigation. Unfortunately, the Secretary

General is indeed a dictator, and he is not obliged to follow the Appeals Board recommendation. For the Niazi case and for other reasons, many diplomats and governments are searching for a way to replace Boo-Boo in the middle of the term. Unfortunately, and not surprisingly, there are no legal means to impeach a Secretary General before the end of his term. But so what? Let's be creative; Let's not be bound by legal niceties. Why not demand that Boo-Boo be impeached forthwith; otherwise, the U.S. withdraws from the misbegotten United Nations? Impeach Boo-Boo; and if Clinton won't go along with the idea, impeach him too!

[For more on this neglected case, see Ian Williams, "Turtle Bay Eight Vindicated: Is Boo Boo in Trouble?" *The New York Observer*, Nov. 15.] ■

a heated board meeting a month earlier, Mary Cummins had called La Chan by the dread epithet "chink eyes." Moreover, Ms. Chan claimed to the *News* that two other board members had heard this terrible slur and would back her up.

Now, Ray Kerrison, in the competing tabloid *New York Post*, reports the complete vindication of Mary Cummins. (December 20). Mary vigorously denied committing the slur, and reports that she was "devastated" when she read the charge in the *News*. Another board meeting in mid-December was held to thrash out this vital issue. The two board "witnesses" turned tail; one of them said he was misquoted by the *News*, and recanted the testimony; while the other simply reported that La Chan *had told* her about the slur, but she had not heard it herself. So much for the smear of Mary Cummins.

After this complete and public vindication at the board meeting, the candid Mary Cummins turned to La Chan, and said emphatically: "I believe you are a wicked woman. I repeat it, I believe you are a wicked, evil woman. You made this up out of whole cloth because you favored Joe Fernandez and the 'Rainbow' curriculum."

It turns out, furthermore, that, at the original board meeting, Mary Cummins had indeed denounced La Chan, but not for her race. She told Chan: "You don't have a brain in your head." Stupidity transcends race and religion.

Fernandez was succeeded as Chancellor by Ramon Cortines, a moderate and an open gay

## Mary Cummins Vindicated!

by M.N.R.

The Education Heroine of the Year was, of course, the feisty, courageous Mary Cummins, an instinctive grass-roots paleocon. A long-time member of the New York City School Board, Mary single-handedly defeated the attempt of leftist School Chancellor Joe Fernandez to push through a compulsory pro-homosexual "educational" Rainbow program in the elementary grades, and then followed with the remarkable feat of ousting the Chancellor, a man who had been lionized by the *New York Times* and by Manhattan liberalism. In her very person, Mary Cummins embodies what New York liberals especially detest: for she is an Irish Catholic housewife and grandma from the despised, unfashionable, blue-collar, conservative, "outer borough" of Queens, a place long derided by the white-wine-and-brie set as "Archie Bunker country."

Left-liberals thirsted for revenge, and, finally on December 1, they struck. On that day, leftist Louisa Chan, a newly elected member of the School Board, told the tabloid *Daily News* that, at