

been the sainted Bosnian Muslim troops who have done their darndest to prevent UN workers from getting Muslim civilians out of Srebrenica and other Muslim towns; they want the Muslim civilians staying there in mortal danger, to keep world pressure on for these towns to become part of Muslim Bosnia. All these clashing groups perform ethnic transfer/cleansing when they can get away with it.

And what about the mass rapes, which have brought Left Feminists screaming into the kill-the-Serbs camp? Well, I don't want to disillusion any tender souls, but almost *all* victorious troops through history, commit systemic rapin' and lootin' of the vanquished. It's called the "spoils of war," and will continue to exist, despite received opinion, so long as war exists. Trying to *expand* the war, as the Establishment is doing, will only prolong and expand the looting and raping. And yes, it hasn't only been the *Serbs* who have committed these crimes, believe me; all the groups do it, and it's just that the Serbs have been better fighters in this civil war and so have had more occasion to indulge in this time-honored practice.

American meddling is made even more futile by the fact that

it is impossible for Americans to understand, not only these fierce rivalries, but the tremendous sense of *history* they all possess. How can Americans, who have no historical memory whatever and scarcely remember

when Reagan was president, possibly understand these peoples of the Balkans, to whom the great 15th century battle against the invading Turks is as real, nay *more* real, than yesterday's dinner? To the Serbs and the Croats, the Bosnian Muslims are not the "gentle people" lionized in Western propaganda. The Bosnian Muslims are not only still

reviled as traitors selling out to the hated Turks, but in addition, the very quality of their devotion to Islam is in question. For the Bosnian Muslims were once the hated Bogomil heretics, a Manichaeian heresy with horrifying implications, and there is much evidence that the Muslims still practice their Bogomil rites in secret, engraving its symbols on their tombstones. The Bogomils were what Ayn Rand followers wrongly believe all Christians to be: believers that the world of matter and the flesh are pure evil created by Satan, whereas the spirit is good and created by God. As for the Nazi question, the Serbs tried to be as much

"pro- Nazi" as the Croats (a minority) but weren't trusted by the Germans, whereas the "gentle" Bosnian Muslims enlisted in proportionately far greater numbers in the Waffen SS than did the Croats or Serbs. So let's stop romanticizing the Bosnian Muslims. Let them take their chances on their own.

So what to do about Bosnia? What do to do about the Serbs? The answer, as repugnant as it is to this meddling age, is to stay the Hell out. Let the peoples of Bosnia and the Balkans slug it out and sort it out.

US Out of Bosnia and the Balkans, hands off the Serbs, and let these people sort it out among themselves. If any of our host of desk-bound warriors, from Abe Rosenthal to Mrs. Thatcher to Christopher Hitchens to Noam Chomsky, want to fight the Serbs, let them parachute into Krajina or Srebrenica and slug it out, mano a mano. Frankly, in any kind of a fair fight, my nickel is on the Serbs. Every time. And, by the way, if you were caught in an ambush, wouldn't you love to have a few Serbs on your side? ■

"Debauchery! Debauchery!" At Tailhook

by M.N.R.

Drunkness and "debauchery" at a convention of naval aviators and their boosters! My, my, my! I hate to keep bringing up Claude Rains and his "shocked! shocked!" at gambling in *Casablanca*, but it seems to be

Trying to expand the war, as the Establishment is doing, will only expand the looting and raping.

the appropriate response for this nonsense. Drunkenness at a social hospitality suite at a convention! And in Las Vegas yet—that model city for strait-laced propriety! Hey, give me a break!

I am a great fan of quaint and obsolete words; I haven't heard that lovely word "debauchery" for many a year. I can see Victorians using it about eighteenth-century excesses. "Debauchery!" But since when has debauchery been a high crime, or drunkenness off the job for that matter?! Our culture is getting rapidly crazier at an accelerating rate, and the poor guys at Tailhook are caught in a culture loop, victims of a new and raging form of Left Victorianism.

And this Inspector General Derek J. Vander Schaaf, the guy who wrote the Tailhook investigatory report, must be a real doozy. He reports, with a great air of concern, that while the "symposium aspects of Tailhook '91 were reasonably educational and professionally presented," that, horrors! less than 2,100 people attended these "professional events," while as many as 4,000 naval officers came to the convention, which means—ye gods!—that maybe half the attendees came only to participate in the "social" events and not to attend the symposium at all!

Look, Derek baby, let me clue you in on the facts of professional life. I have never attended any convention, even the most staid, where the socializers did not outnumber the guys who actually came to the official proceedings. And this is true even at economists' conventions, where I can assure you, Derek, there was no "gantlet," mooning, strippers, and all the other debauched practices you have reported in such loving detail. And precious little drunkenness, let alone debauchery. All these hijinks, all these piggish fraternity-like practices, most of which, despite all the hysteria, seem to have been consensual, had been going on at previous Tailhook

conventions for the previous thirty-five years. Even Inspector-General Derek admits that this stuff had become a veritable "tradition" at Tailhook. And even Derek concedes that the least consensual part of the festivities, the notorious third-floor hallway "gantlet," had a sign posted, saying "Gantlet—Enter at Your Own Risk." So, if this was a well-known tradition, and the sign was up, why did these women show up at the Tailhook convention or at the famed third-floor hallway or hospitality suites? Doesn't this showing up make the basic

proceedings consensual and voluntary? And in any case, what's the big deal?

It's pretty clear that this whole thing was launched by that haridan Lt. Paula Coughlin, who strutted down the "gantlet" secure in the arrogant belief that being an admiral's aide would spare her the indignities heaped upon lesser females. And when the young lads gleefully shouted "admiral's aide!" and gave her extra treatment and she reported them in a huff to her admiral, he had the nerve to do the old-fashioned thing in the military: to tell her to forget it! And so Paula went public in a big way, taking advantage of the raging feminist advance in our culture, to bring that admiral down, and the rest of the Navy and the "military culture" down with him.

The inevitable question: do I "condone" the actions of the young lads at Tailhook? The very question is idiotic. I am not a fan of fraternity-culture, but so what? I'm not a member of Tailhook and I didn't go to the convention. Those who went to Tailhook should have known what they were doing. And the charges of a "coverup" that have smeared so many higher officers are also ridiculous. The whole thing should have been thrown out from the very beginning, and the "victims" told to butt out and grow up.

The *real* victims of Tailhook are the naval aviators who were suddenly, *ex post facto*, trapped in the vise-like grip of a whirlwind culture change, the accession of an implacable Left-Puritanism. One of those female military experts that seem

The poor guys at Tailhook are victims of a new and raging form of Left Victorianism.

to have sprouted like weeds let the cat out of the bag on a TV news program recently: "We have to get rid of the *macho* culture of the military."

Yes, of course, that's the key. The military, especially crack pilots, are trained for discipline, quick-response, aggressiveness—indeed, a macho culture. A macho culture might even go in for occasional off-duty drunkenness and debauchery. I was reminded of that lovely line from Wordsworth: "Shades of the prison-house begin to close / Upon the growing boy." Because these "boys" are going to be hit hard by the prison-house of an anti-macho cultural revolution. Those young lads who don't get jailed, fined, or expelled, will be subjected to compulsory "counselling sessions"—sensitivity training to fit them into our new "therapeutic" state. The anti-macho revolution will include, in particular, feminization and gayization. That should do the trick. Thus, Command Master Chief Elaine Human, the first female master chief at the Pacific Fleet headquarters, put the needed change this way: that military service must become "gender-blind."

I am trying to figure out the role of sex in this new culture. It's not an easy task. On the one hand, kids in elementary grades are being handed out free condoms, and instructed how to use them, all in the absurd idea of warding off AIDS, because chastity for teen-agers and sub-teen agers is supposed to be ridiculous. On the other hand, drunkenness and debauchery have to be outlawed

for adults, including the military. And what is a truly "gender-blind" and "trans-gender-blind" military going to look like? If gender-blinding is a serious goal, then there will have to be total integration, into every aspect of the military: combat, submarines, showers, toilets, of all genders and trans-genders: men, women, gays, lesbians, cross-dressers, transsexuals, hermaphrodites, and

whatever other sexes the Left will have dreamed up. And while all these assorted "genders" will have to be integrated in all activities, *any* sexual action or thought of any kind: not simply "groping" and "fondling" but also leers, ogling, and verbal references of any kind—all of which have been defined as "sexual harassment"—will be outlawed to the hilt, with disgrace, imprisonment, expulsion,

Quotes That Need No Comment

Statistics are the bedrock on which democracy is built. — Carol Carson, head of the Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce

The bizarre pyramid of federal actions that led to the frying of 86 Christians—merely suspected of wrongdoing until federal storm troopers attacked their church during services Feb. 28—could brand the Clinton presidency as surely as the Bay of Pigs set its mark on that of John Kennedy. . . . One is reminded of Peter Ustinov as Nero in the 1951 film "Quo Vadis" Perhaps we need to be reminded, however, that it is Nero who is depicted in the film as being insane—not the Christians, who need only have denied their faith to be spared. — *Las Vegas Review-Journal*

Three months into the Clinton presidency, his third choice for attorney general has yet to hire a staff, and appears to have "led" the final Waco fiasco Monday from some closet in the FBI building.

Why has Janet Reno no personal staff? Hillary and her PC police are presumably still out beating the bushes for the proper ratio of lesbians, Marxists and other minorities. — *Las Vegas Review-Journal*

If the clown act of Reno, Sessions and Clinton juggling their conflicting explanations makes Larry, Curly and Moe look downright balletic, imagine how a Clinton team . . . might manage a somewhat larger action—say, a war in Bosnia. — *Las Vegas Review-Journal*

There has been some European sniping at [Venezuelan UN delegate Diego] Arria for trying to lead [the UN] on Bosnia. "Arria can be as irate as he wants, but it's not going to be the Venezuelan army that will march up the hill in Bosnia," a senior European diplomat told reporters. "That army is only good for marching toward the presidential palace in Caracas." — *Los Angeles Times*

So we're back to national origins, which leaves out people like me whose relevant ethnicity is regional American. — Virginia Postrel in *Reason*

Classical liberals . . . should be free thinkers, meliorists, inveterate volunteers, sterling neighbors, faithful friends, devoted parents, attentive lovers. . . . They should be fervent egalitarians. — Paul R. Weaver in *Reason*

and maybe castration as the instant punishment.

How can they give out compulsory condoms and still outlaw any sexual thought much less action? How can something be "indecent exposure" at Tailhook and yet be compulsory in barracks and showers in the name of "gender-blinding"? How can we possibly make sense out of this crazy quilt of sexual attitudes? Perhaps the answer is this: the Enemy is what used to be called "normal," or "macho," hetero-sex. *Anything* else, any kind of transgendering, is good, healthy, a liberating "orientation," etc. That seems to be what the military, and the rest of us, are in for.

Well, one thing I'm sure of. After a steady diet of the new culture, we won't have to worry about the military and its "macho culture." It will be very interesting to see what will happen when the new, liberated, sensitive, feminized, gayized, and trans-genderized Army, Navy, and Air Force run up against the Serbs, who, God bless them!, haven't caught up with the modern world yet.

To repeat a point I've made elsewhere: *who* would you rather have defend you, a feminized, gayized, de-machoized military, or a group of Serbs? Think about it. ■

The Bosnian Serbs Stand Tall

by M.N.R.

In a world that honors charlatans, plagiarists, and multicul-

tural Reds, I wonder if we still have the capacity to recognize and salute authentic heroes. If we do, we should acknowledge the historic moment in the early morning of May 6 when the parliament of the Serbian Republic of Bosnia took its final stand, and told the paladins of the "international community" to go to Hell, and, in effect, offered to send them there.

At the Heavenly Valley Hotel near the ski slopes of Mount Jahorina, twenty miles southeast of Sarajevo, the Serbian Republic parliament considered the Vance-Owen peace plan for the third and last time. Tremendous pressure was applied on the Bosnian Serbs. Clinton and the UN had already tightened the cruel embargo against Serbia, and President Clinton was making war threats, and muttering about bombing Serbian artillery. In addition to pleas for accepting Vance-Owen from the President of Greece, who journeyed to Mount Jahorina for the occasion, their supposedly beloved President of Serbia, Slobodan ("Slobo") Milosevic came there to plead with the Bosnian Serbs to accept the agreement, as did their leader, the shrink Radovan Karadzic, who had signed on to the plan in Greece a few days earlier. The Serbian Republic

parliament had rejected the plan twice before, but now the pressure was piled on from their supposed maximum leaders.

After many hours of consideration and debate, however, the Serbian Parliament of Bosnia overwhelmingly rejected the Vance-Owen plan, by a vote of 51 to 2, although 12 deputies abstained, and 17 had left the assembly in defeat before the vote was taken.

Our supposed champions of "democracy," of course, pursued their usual course of implicitly defining "democracy" as "voting the way I say." Have you ever noticed how quick our liberal/Official Conservative/

neocon Establishment is to denigrate and smear democratic voting that goes the "wrong" way? From the very beginning, our "objective" media denigrated and sneered at the Bosnian Serb parliament, continually referring to it as "self-styled," "self-proclaimed," "self-named," or "self-designated." Well, who do they think proclaimed, named, or designated, the

parliaments of the new republics of Slovenia or Croatia? Or, for that matter, of Kazakhstan and Ukraine? I suppose that a similar Establishment in 1776 would have sneered at the Continental Congress meeting in Philadelphia as "self-designated." So

I wonder if we still have the capacity to recognize and salute authentic heroes.