that "one of their few enduring
certainties, that Communists
were evil," somehow did not
apply. Their confusion is com-
ounded by the fact that the
military had been applying the
"damning" epithet "Commu-
nist" to Aristide.
Good. After they get
t thorough explaining all this
to the poor Haitians, maybe
they can explain it to us. One
Haitian social-democrat lead-
er offered the excuse that "in
the five years, he [Theodore]
has been back in Haiti, I
have never heard him talking
about Marxism." So what?

Has everyone ever heard
Alger-Hiss talking
about Marxism?

Or any-one else,
for that matter,
except Western
academics?

But that's all
right. Haitian con-
fusion, at least,
will be eased by
the fact that, as
soon as the Aris-
tide/Theodore
compromise
goes through, the
United States/OAS
will lift its
embargo, and the
U.S. will start
pouring aid funds
into Haiti to make up for the
losses imposed by that
embargo. This leaves, in a state
of permanent confusion, that
old punching-bag, the U.S.
taxpayer, who has to pay for
this insanity. And you say
they're worried about Pat
Buchanan's "isolationism"?! •

The Smith
"Rape" Case
by M.N.R.
The vindication of Willie
Kennedy Smith on nationwide
TV was a delightful one-two
punch to the Monstrous Regi-
ment, coming so soon after
the Thomas nomination. Just
as we predicted, at the out-
come of the case, one of the
feminist "experts" whined bit-
erly on TV: "I suppose that
from now on the burden of
proof will be on the 'victim.'"
Yes, that's the whole idea,
lady, the burden of proof is on
the plaintiff in a
criminal case to
prove guilt be-
yond a reason-
able doubt.
The case was
preposterous
from the begin-
nning: No tearing
of dress or un-
derwear from the
alleged act of
"violence"; none
in the household
hearing any al-
leged screams;
the convenient
loss
of memory
by The Woman
on when and
why she voluntarily removed
her pantyhose, etc. And once
again there was the blather:
what possible motive could
she have had to lie? Well, let's
go down the list: (a) she could
be "a nut," as Willie percep-
tively noted; (b) she could be
vindictive; (c) she could be
after the Kennedy loot. How?

Well, if the criminal case had
been won, The Woman could
have gone after big bucks in a
civil suit.

There was a lot of wail-

ing because testimony about
Willie's three previous alleged
acts of sexual coercion was
not permitted. Those com-
plaints, of course, coming from
the same women who consider
it simply self-evident that The
Woman's previous sexual es-
capades could not be men-
tioned. In addition to a single
standard being important, we
have to consider what The
Case helps reveal to us about
the time in which we live. Wilt
Chamberlain testified recently
(but not "under oath") that he
has slept with 20,000 ladies in
his lifetime. Deduct some
vigorish for braggadocio, de-
duct some years for Willie,
and we still have a wealthy,
looking, ostentatiously eligible
and clearly not celibate bach-
elor knocking down—how
many?—several thousand?
ladies.

Of the several thousand
putative ladies, it stands to
reason that at least three could
be found who were mad at
Willie and willing to go after
the Kennedy fortune. One of
those three, it turns out, spent
the night with Willie after the
alleged "rape" occurred, and
only got mad at him the next
morning when he was reading
the paper at breakfast instead
of paying court to her: after
which she decided that she
had been, after all, a "victim"
of date rape.

An interesting facet of
The Woman's character: upon
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meeting Willie, she was happy to meet someone of her stature and class at this trendy singles hangout. Before going off with Willie, she demanded to see his I.D. card to make sure he was a Kennedy. It seems to me that if Willie had had any smarts, this should have been a signal to back off. Could demanding to see your I.D. card have meant that The Woman did not love him for himself alone?

Willie testified that The Woman shifted from consenting adult and seductress to Angry Avenger when he made the tasteless mistake of calling out the name of "Cathie" during their sex act. [Cathie is the name of Willie's former long-time girl friend, who said she never saw any signs of raping behavior; we also now know the vital piece of information that The Woman's name is not Cathie.] In another bit of misnaming, The Woman, after their sex act, told Willie: "You raped me, Michael." [In a fact that may or may not be significant, is also the name of The Woman's step-father.]

One Moral of this story; don't sleep around with so many people that you can't remember the name of the partner of the moment.

One Moral of this story, for bachelors and bachelorettes: don't sleep around with so many people that you can't remember the name of the partner of the moment. Not only is mixing up names bad form, it might also lead to a Fatal Attraction.

And finally: why must we put up with this monstrous double standard in which the innocent accused gets his name and visage plastered all over television, whereas The Woman, at the very least a false accuser and possibly a liar, keeps having her name protected and her face enshrouded in a gray bubble? Who is This Woman? I hate to agree with the odious Alan Dershowitz on anything, but I must admit he has a good point when he says that now that The Woman has been shown to be a false accuser, there is no reason whatever, even that of a repellent double standard, to shroud her identity from the eager public. Free press of America: Name That Woman!

Until the Republican convention in August, Llewellyn H. Rockwell Jr., will be taking occasional leaves of absence to serve as senior advisor to the Buchanan for President Campaign.
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