

Letters

Our last issue, *The Three Rs: Reassessing, Repudiating, and Rebuking*, continues to inspire rancorous debate. Many took exception to our willingness to acknowledge the growing disquiet in the conservative movement, arguing that a public forum is no place to discuss family matters. Thankfully, more clearheaded readers offered their full support, agreeing that American conservatism is at an impasse, its future dependent upon an honest, critical evaluation of the persons who brought us to this point and the ideas they espouse. A representative selection of the mail follows:

Accusations Levelled and Rebutted

Sirs:

The interview with Mr. Kissinger which appeared in your publication is so riddled with factual errors, misquotes, and falsifications as to require a piece of equal length simply to set the record straight. In the interest of brevity, we will address only the most egregious lies and distortions here:

When he agreed to sit for the interview, Mr. Kissinger was led to believe that the article would be a lifestyle piece focusing on Mr. Kissinger's associations with many of the most talented and interesting persons of this age. In this light, Mr. Kissinger's repeated efforts to steer the conversation away from geopolitics towards, "celebrity whores and power-fellating scum" [the author's words] is perfectly understandable;

At no point in the conversation, and certainly not when speaking of the 1971 Chilean coup, did Mr. Kissinger assume an expression of "ghoulish delight";

At no point did Mr. Kissinger "laugh gleefully" at mention of the term, "war criminal";

Mr. Kissinger did not "giggle" or "smirk" when reference was made to the Nobel Peace Prize awarded him in 1973;

Mr. Kissinger has never referred to Ms. Sawyer as, "a tarted up piece of eye candy, dazzled by power, [and] always ready to service the best and brightest";

Mr. Kissinger's longstanding concern with human rights abuses on the part of the Chinese government is a matter of public record. To suggest that his manner when discussing the issue was "glib" or "light-hearted" displays a callous disregard for the tenets of responsible journalism;

Mr. Kissinger has never had a substance abuse problem, and has never sought treatment at the Betty Ford Center. In light of these facts, it is clear that Mr. Kissinger would never have "spoke[n] at length" about his "room-mate [at the Betty Ford Center], Chevy Chase." Further, Mr. Kissinger has never referred to Mr. Chase as, "one of my closest confidantes and advisors";

Mr. Kissinger, like all private citizens, is under no obligation to release his personal financial records, and his determination to safeguard his privacy can in no way be construed as "a clear act of self-incrimination." Since Mr. Kissinger has never released these records, it is clear that table 3 [titled, "A Sycophant's Rewards"], which purports to document Mr. Kissinger's finances is a work of fiction.

In summary, the piece demonstrates a reckless disregard for the truth and a fumbling lack of familiarity with the workings of civil society. On behalf of Mr. Kissinger, we demand an immediate retraction and apology.

[Signed by four partners of the firm, Shelby, Atwick, and Stone]

EoH: We stand by the piece.

Worrisome Hints

As a practicing psychologist, I read your interview with Henry Kissinger with much interest. Though one should never attempt to diagnose an individual based on his public persona, it seems clear to me that the esteemed gentleman may very well be suffering from false memory syndrome—certainly, in this interview and others, as well as his actions of the past two decades, Kissinger has exhibited many of the behaviors and belief structures associated with FMS.

Given his background—a New York intellectual of foreign descent—it seems reasonable to assume that Mr. Kissinger has spent some time in therapy, and this causes me to wonder whether there hasn't been gross negligence on the part of his therapist or therapists. No licensed practitioner could, in good conscience, allow this man to persist in such an elaborately constructed fantasy world for such a length of time. In fact, I fear that he may have reached such a state of self-rationalization that when the inevitable collision with reality occurs—perhaps as a result of one of the lawsuits now pending against him—his psyche will prove unable to reintegrate itself, with catastrophic consequences for his emotional and mental health. Please encourage Mr. Kissinger to seek qualified treatment at once.

Paul Digot, M.Sc., MACP
Santa Monica, California

EoH: We oppose any effort to stigmatize those individuals who seek treatment for psychological distress.

Praise from the Heartland

It was with great satisfaction that I read, then reread from cover to cover *The Three Rs: Reassessing, Repudiating, and Rebuking*. For some time now

I—and many others, I am sure—have believed the conservative movement to be in trouble. For your troubles, I have no doubt that you will be attacked from many directions, charged with indiscretion and even betrayal of conservative principles. I say, Screw 'em! It has been obvious for some time that the Republican establishment has no idea just how angry middle-America conservatives are. The party's commitment to one-world globalist policies is a slap in the face to every person who has ever voted Republican and then watched his job and future relocate to Mexico. Keep up the good work, and don't let the bastards grind you down!

Alfred Rawlings, U.S.M.C. (ret.)
Deerfield, Illinois

EoH: We proudly salute our nation's veterans, and support any and all efforts to grant them the recognition they so richly deserve.

A Plea for Discretion

The Right has always been its own greatest enemy, and your latest issue only continues a long tradition of self-immolation. Ours is a history of attempts to enforce ideological purity through regular purges, a cycle that guarantees a lack of leadership and vision whenever history presents us with an opportunity to make real change. Now I see the process beginning again, with your publication choosing to play the role of inquisitor. Please, do not pursue this line of inquiry—only our enemies benefit from the exhumation of long-buried doctrinal disputes and the smearing of our most prominent representatives. We need your attacks to be aimed at the liberals, the socialists, and their fellow travelers; they're the real enemies of freedom.

Francis Dawkin
Burbank, California

EoH: As Mr. Dawkin's letter shows, the rightist tendency to idolatry and cultism is alive and well, and it is for this reason that authentic conservatives must continue to ruthlessly critique both the base and superstructure of our worldview. A conservatism that refuses to engage in self-criticism is nothing more than traditionalism in a mercantile garb, and such a philosophy must inevitably lose mindshare and influence to the more fashionable left.

Anxiously Awaiting His Return

I found your caustic refutation of Mister Buckley's life-long project to be unacceptable. "Speaking truth to power," is all nice and good, but it does not excuse the leveling of easily rebutted accusations against one of the leading figures of American conservatism. For sometime now I've

observed your publication's drift towards 'neo-conservatism', and this hit piece only confirms my suspicions. Your publication, like so many on the soft right, is essentially anti-Christian in character; no surprise, to be sure, given the backgrounds of so many of the 'thinkers' (and I use that term loosely) associated with the 'neo-conservative' movement. Cancel my subscription; from now on, I'll be sending that money to Jews for Jesus.

Thomas Overbeek
Arlington, Virginia

EoH: This publication takes no official position as to whether Jesus of Nazareth was, in fact, the Messiah.