

for all of us to get them out now, as fast as possible. Better the Clintons walking freely around the streets of Little Rock than having them in the White House for one minute more than is absolutely necessary.

And remember: Clinton has already shown a remarkable capacity to come back off the floor and recoup. Best to go for a quick knockout and prevent any resurrection of the detestable "Comeback Kid." And besides we all know that to get rid of a vampire permanently, a wooden stake has to be driven through his heart. Putting the pressure on and going for quick impeachment would be the equivalent of driving that stake. ■

Russia's Triumph at Sarajevo

by M. N. R.

In one of the most brilliant foreign-policy coups in many a moon, Russian President Boris Yeltsin roused himself in late February from his habitual drunken stupor to put over a sparkling fast one on Bill Clinton and the sinister forces of US-UN Social-Democratic imperialism. In a lightning-fast master-stroke, Boris Yeltsin may have saved the beleaguered Serbs and saved all of us from the New World Order.

The massed forces of social

imperialism and "global democracy," stretching the entire mini-spectrum from Tony Lewis of the *New York Times* on "the Left" to Bill Safire, the neocons, and Ariel Cohen of the Heritage Foundation on "the Right," had been hysterically pushing and pulling a reluctant Bill Clinton to annihilate the Serbs, this year's candidate for demonization and "Hitlerite aggression," in order to punish them for existential evil and to save the bacon of this year's allegedly gentle and lovable Victim Group, the Bosnian Muslims. CNN sent its malignant cameras, point-men for US armed intervention, to show exploding mortars and sobbing Muslim women in Sarajevo, with the ubiquitous Christiane Amanpour of CNN wailing her elegies for the Muslim victims and wondering why justice had not yet struck the Satanic Serbs.

American military intervention needs an Incident to prod the emotional American masses into using force, and thus to override the sensible objections of military men, who have kept warning about an impossible quagmire in trying to root Serb

mortars out of the wooded mountains. The bloodthirsty American pundits, safe in their plush armchairs in Washington, keep calling for air strikes ("Bomb! Kill!") singing the usual siren song that of course no American ground troops are contemplated. The war hawks are smart enough to know that they are lying through their teeth: that once air strikes have begun, and, inevitably, they are

not successful, and indeed the Serbs are even more warlike than before, that then "we have to make the air strikes credible" by bombing military depots, and then Belgrade, and pretty soon there are hundreds of thousands of American troops in Bosnia and Serbia battling the Serbs yard by yard, and getting chopped up in

the process. The armchair war hawks, of course, don't get chopped up. They keep thirsting for escalating the slaughter, and Christiane Amanpour and the CNN photographers, having accomplished their appointed task, are safely out of the battle zone and preparing the way for the horror photos for the next U.S. intervention.

The requisite incident was

CNN sent its malignant cameras, point-men for US armed intervention.

provided by the mortar shelling of Sarajevo square, killing a few dozen Muslims. Everyone assumed, without evidence, that it *must* have been the Serbs who did the shelling, even though it was never proven, and even though it was admitted that the area from which the mortars were launched was dotted with both Serbian and Bosnian mortars. The idea that perhaps the Bosnian Muslims did the mortaring themselves in order to manufacture an incident and bring world-wide hysteria down upon the Serbs—this very plausible idea was quickly dismissed as, of course, an example of “a conspiracy theory of history.”

And so Slick Willie, the Monster from Little Rock, finally allowed himself to be roused into action, NATO was wheeled into position, the UN was lined up, and then Clinton hurled his threats: air strikes against the Serbs if they don't move their guns out of the Sarajevo area, or put them under UN control.

The Menshevik War Hawks believed that at last they were getting Their War, The Serbs would be crushed, their leaders subject to War Crimes Trials, and the New World Order would be in business. And then, as the deadline approached, and Clinton got into the swing of war threats and began to resemble a fat, hoarse-voiced George Bush before the slaughter of the Iraqis, just as Clinton was going to be vic-

torious over the Serbs, came the cavalry over the hill to save the heroic Serbs: except the “cavalry” was not American, as in the old Western movies, but Russian. Yeltsin roused himself, without a word to his alleged buddy Slick Willie, and sent 400 Russian troops from Croatia to join the UN contingent. The brilliance of the Russian ploy was this: Ostensibly, they were being good New World Orderites and enforcing the NATO order against the Serbs. But *actually*, as everyone quickly realized, Yeltsin was doing just the opposite. He was saving the Serbs' bacon, giving them a face-saving device to go along with their Russian Orthodox friends and cousins, and the Russian troops were interposing their own bodies between Serbs and the itchy-fingered US/NATO air force. For “air strikes” would kill, not only impoverished Serbs, but also Russian troops, and then the entire U.S. foreign policy fat would be in the fire. Not only that: but, in a corollary masterstroke, Yeltsin sent to Sarajevo as his spokesman, the articulate, telegenic Vitaly Churkin, who speaks excellent English, and who has always played well on American television. Publicly, the Americans and the rest of NATO had to thank the Russians for joining them, whereas privately or semi-publicly, they were fuming in hatred and frustration.

Attaboy, Boris! Give 'em Hell! Take the Yankee billions

and then make 'em sweat! Returning to his vodka, the (former) Old Bolshevik must have had a big laugh at his victory over his old-time Menshevik-“Western”-CIA tormentors.

Particularly instructive was the reaction of the “gentle” “victimized” Sarajevo Muslims. Did they rejoice at being spared any further shellings? Did they cheer the prospect of peace and a NATO “victory”? Hell, NO! Instead the lovable Muslim ladies in Sarajevo, interviewed by CNN, were griping that the Serbs had gotten off the hook, and complaining that NATO hadn't bombed the Serbs.

It is high time we got one thing straight: there is nothing particularly lovable or gentle about the Bosnian Muslims. This is a recently manufactured liberal/neocon/Official Con/Menshevik myth. During World War II, the supposedly “pro-Nazi” Croats were surpassed in pro-Nazi fervour by these self-same Bosnian Muslims; and these Muslims, when given a chance, have been fully as enthusiastic “ethnic cleansers” as the despised Serbs. In fact, another fascinating little item conveniently overlooked by the Establishment media, from the *New York Times* to CNN: the current civil war in ex-Yugoslavia was launched, *mirabile dictu*, by none other than those peaceful, gentle victims the Bosnian Muslims, who, without provocation, machine-gunned a Serbian Orthodox

wedding in Bosnia. And yet there have been no Tony Lewis-Bill Safire-Ariel Cohen calls for war crimes trials for the Muslim machine-gunners.

This brings me to a fascinating conundrum that has been overlooked in this entire business: Why is it that our liberal / neocon Establishment, which routinely treats every Muslim as a "fanatic," a "terrorist," and an "anti-Semite," if not also a "blind sheikh," is so gentle and loving toward the Bosnian Muslims? Why are the Bosnians the only Muslims they have ever liked? Why suddenly does the entire U.S. drive for "global democracy" rest on the shoulders of the fanatical Serb-haters of central and eastern Bosnia? Why is it that, come Sarajevo and Gorazde, the fanatic Islamic mullah suddenly becomes transformed into a gentle and peaceful social democrat, struggling to preserve the "territorial integrity" of a "nation" (Bosnia) that has never existed?

Mulling over this puzzle, I realized that, as in the case of the fallacies of Keynesian economics, we have to disaggregate: a "Muslim" is not necessarily a "Muslim." Ethnic and national factors also play key roles.

Disaggregating, then, we find that the Muslims routinely execrated by the U.S. Establishment are not just any old Muslims; there is not much hysteria, for example, directed against Indonesia or Malaya, both staunchly Muslim. Muslim Pakistan, despite

its internal political troubles, is routinely hailed as a staunch ally of "the West." In fact, there are only two groups of Muslims habitually reviled by the U.S. opinion-moulding elite: Arabs, and Black Muslims. Arabs have been continually denounced because they have reacted grumpily to their systemic dispossession and oppression by Israel and organized Zionism in the Middle East. It is the "A-rab" Muslims, of course, who are the alleged terrorists, fanatics, anti-Semities, and blind sheiks. (The small number of Christian Arabs, largely dwelling in Palestine and in Lebanon, have been spared Establishment calumny because they have generally been less ardent in resisting Zionism than their Muslim co-ethnics, and the French-oriented Christians in Lebanon have long been the major Arab allies of Israel.) As for the Black Muslims in the United States, they have been bitterly denounced, not because of their theological adherence to Islam, which can only be considered eccentric at best, but rather for their hostility to whiteness in general and to Jewish whites in particular.

On the other hand, the Bosnian Muslims have a very different pedigree. When the hated Ottoman Turks invaded Europe in the 14th century and swept westward, these Bosnians, unlike their co-ethnic Slavs and other Christians in the region who fiercely resisted the Turkish Muslim

invaders, traitorously "converted" to Islam and thereby won special privileges from their Turkish masters. Perhaps because these Bosnians were crazed Bogomil heretics who were hated by Catholics and Orthodox alike, they converted to Islam and played a "Quisling" role for the Turks, and were therefore cordially detested by the Christians in Europe.

Slowly and painfully over the centuries, nation after nation won their freedom from Turkish rule, until, in the years before World War I, the Turks were finally driven out of most of the Balkans. But still, they remain in a wedge in Europe, and the historic city of Constantinople, renamed "Istanbul" by the Turks, remains in Turkish hands.

And so, when the Bosnian Muslims started feeling their oats, and demanding unitary minority Muslim rule over all of Bosnia, it was not difficult for the Croats and the Serbs, the Macedonians, the Bulgars, and the Greeks, to see in the sudden thrust forward of the Bosnian Muslims the crafty and sinister hand of the Turk. A "conspiracy theory of history"? Not quite, for it is an open secret that the Turks have been the main supporters of the Bosnian Muslims, have sent professional military cadres to train their infantry (the largest in the area, since the Muslims are the most populous group in Bosnia), and have shipped arms to the Bosnian Muslims.

If, then, the Turks are the key

to the Bosnian Question, what is the attitude of the U.S. Establishment, of liberals neocons/Official Cons, et al toward the Turks? The answer is simple: they *love* the Turks. Why? Turkey has always been staunchly "pro-West," a code term that breaks down into: pro-CIA and pro-Israel. The Turks are part of NATO. They have long been anti-Russian (long before the Soviet Union) and "anti-Communist." They have been pro-CIA and, though Muslim, have been staunchly anti-Arab and pro-Israel. The Arabs, of course, reciprocate this enmity, since Turkish imperialism, until World War I, ruled the Arab world, while Turkish feudal landlords ate up the substance of the Arab peasantry.

After World War I, the Turks provided Zionists with their local claims to Palestinian land by "selling" the Zionists the lands occupied and tilled by the Arab peasantry, lands which the Arab peasants justifiably believed were genuinely owned by themselves and not by their hated Turkish conquerors.

Pro-CIA; pro-Israel; a restricted militarist "democracy"; and a cartelized, statist

"free market": what else can the U.S. Establishment want? In addition to all that, Turkey appeals to the West because after World War I the monstrous dictator Kemal Ataturk, beloved by the U.S. Establishment, built up the power of the Turkish State and destroyed Islam, and was therefore hailed by Western social democrats as a great "modernizer." So, very much

like the Bosnian Muslims, who are urban secularist with very little interest in Islam. The Turks, since Ataturk, have been traitors to the Muslim faith.

Possessing all these qualities that endear them to the U.S. Establishment, other even less lovely aspects of modern Turkey get swept under the rug. For example, most of eastern

Turkey has been peopled by non-Turks groaning under Turkish imperial despotism. Long before the Serbs in 1991, the Turks practiced genocidal "ethnic cleansing" on a mammoth scale. In the early years of World War I, the Turks genocidally and systematically massacred the Armenians who peopled northeastern Turkey. Not only have the Turks never apologized for this first twentieth-century Holocaust,

let alone made restitution to the Armenians, they have not even acknowledged the fact of the Armenian Holocaust. They have been blatant "Holocaust deniers." Have the Turks been attacked for this monstrous deed by all the liberal and neo-con pundits? By the Lewises and the Safires et al.? To ask that question is to answer it. Every couple of years, an Armenian-American group puts a little ad in the paper demanding that the Turks acknowledge their guilt, the Turks dismiss the whole thing as obscure wartime troubles, an anti-Turk resolution is introduced into Congress, a resolution which never gets anywhere. In the Cold War days, the Establishment answer was that the Turks are too important to the Cold War against the evil Commies to bother about ancient history. And now? Well who knows? But no resolution ever gets passed.

Why, then, do the Armenian-Americans, who far outnumber the tiny handful of Turks in America, never get anywhere? Is the combined power of the CIA and Zionism too much for them?

In addition to the Armenians, who are Christians, we should not ignore the systemic oppression and crushing of the Muslim Kurds, who populate southeastern Turkey. The Turks, while ostentatiously helping the U.S. embarrass Saddam Hussein by aiding the Kurds in Iraq, at the same time continued to oppress the far more numerous

The Turks practiced genocidal "ethnic cleansing" on a mammoth scale.

Kurds living in Turkey, people whose very existence the Turks deny. Thus, Turks habitually refer to the poor Kurds as "mountain Turks" speaking not Kurdish but some mountain dialect of Turkish. In a pig's eye.

The Turkish question brings me to the much-maligned but heroic Vladimir Zhirinovsky, good old "V.Z." First, I am convinced that without the goad of V.Z.'s electoral victory, Yeltsin would never have roused himself from his vodka-soaked stupor, alienate his "Western" masters, and assert Russian nationalism and their age-old friendship with the embattled Serbs. It was the spectre of V.Z. that forced Yeltsin to move toward Russian nationalism and assert Russian interests. Secondly, Ariel Cohen of the Heritage Foundation has translated excerpts from V.Z.'s campaign autobiography, and it is clear to me that, rather than being Satanically evil, V.Z. was reasserting a truly Russian foreign policy, and in particular his desire to reawaken Russia's historic drive toward the south, toward a warm-water port in the Mediterranean and to move against Islam in general and Turkey in particular. V.Z. wishes to reassert the old Russian yen to protect the Serbs and South Slavs, and to end once and for all the Turkish menace, and, who knows? Perhaps to right the great wrong of 1453, to drive the Turks at long last out of Europe,

to put an end to the trumpery of "Istanbul" and to restore the glories of "Constantinople."

And if Mother Russia is to champion Orthodox Christianity, get a warm water port, turn Istanbul into Constantinople, and wreak justice upon the Turks, why in the world should Uncle Sam stand in its way? ■

American Spy in Washington

Calling All Conservatives!

by Joseph Sobran

I often try to amuse people by inviting them to imagine any of our current politicians trying to hold a conversation with any of the framers of the Constitution. What would Dan Rostenkowski say to James Madison? It would be like Al Capone talking to Plato.

But you expect a certain vulgarity from elected officials. What's more depressing is trying to imagine a conversation between the framers and current members of the Supreme Court. Such a chat would offer less crudity, but more dishonesty. Consider a recent encounter between two of those members and a Senate committee.

Justices Anthony Kennedy and David Souter, presenting the Court's proposed annual budget to the Senate Appropriations Committee, have virtually pleaded for defeat of pending federal anti-crime

legislation. Kennedy said that the tough-guy legislation, popular with pols of both parties, would turn the federal judicial system into over-worked "police courts."

Conservatives and Republicans have been complaining for a generation about the power-hungry "activist" judiciary usurping legislative power. So how come the Court (we can assume that Kennedy and Souter were speaking for their colleagues) doesn't welcome the new powers it would enjoy under the tough new laws?

And—the more interesting question—if the court doesn't welcome those powers, why not just wait a bit and strike down the proposed laws as unconstitutional? After all, conservatives (including me) have often accused the Court of finding unconstitutionality in any laws it doesn't happen to like. Yet neither justice suggested that the get-tough laws would violate the Constitution. What gives?

After all, violent crime has always been a state concern, not a federal one. If the Tenth Amendment means anything, it means that such matters should be reserved to the states.

Then again, the Tenth Amendment *doesn't* mean anything. It hasn't meant anything since 1940, when the Court, staffed with Roosevelt flunkies, ruled that it merely "states a truism" and adds nothing to the rest of the Constitution. Until then, the Tenth had haunted Roosevelt, because it had