

Republican Convention was "anti-Semitic." What? How do you get that? Because Newt Gingrich attacked Woody Allen, and said that the Democratic family values platform clause was a "Woody Allen plank."

And why would anyone in his right mind criticize Woody Allen these days? Because, opined Mario, Gingrich was attacking "short Jewish guys." Victimology run rampant! Gee, Mario, as a short Jewish guy myself, I don't feel that Gingrich was using Woody Allen as a code name to attack me! In fact, Woody Allen is indeed an excellent metaphor for the Democrat Party and for our entire left-liberal dominated culture.

Moreover, Mario claimed, the Republican Convention was "anti-Italian." Huh? He said all over the convention were "T-shirts of Italians as the Mafia." Wrong, Mario, there were no such T-shirts. There was, however, a satirical movie poster—being sold by one merchant—of a movie, "Slick Willie," featuring Teddy Kennedy as "the chaperone" and Mario as "The Godfather." Whatsamatter, can't take a joke, Mario? If you remember, Mario, it was not a Republican, but your own beloved standard-bearer, Slick Willie, who told Gennifer on

that tape that you "act like a member of the Mafia."

At first, Mario was going to make the New York taxpayers foot the bill for his trip to Washington to make his outrageous and odious comments on *Face*

the Nation, but, after a storm of protest, he finally agreed to pay for it out of his campaign pocket.

Mario's gutter flipout should have been page one news in every media outlet in the country. And yet, as far as I know, the news appeared in only one place: in an article by Fred Dicker in the lively tabloid, *The New York Post* (8/24). And that's it. Apart from

that one source, the news media, once again, faked reality by suppressing this item and protecting their own heroes, of whom Mario is a star.

I used to think Mario Cuomo was smart and funny. He's still smart, I guess, but he's no longer funny. He's a national disgrace. Do we want this creep on the Supreme Court? Because that's who we'll get if the leftists, left-libertarians, neocons, and short-sighted dog-in-the-manger types have their way, and Slick Willie becomes President.

Bumbling Bush is no great bargain, but to keep undercutting the President from now until Election Day means, that

whatever your intent, you are objectively pro-Clinton, and that you are helping a future Clinton Administration to dig the grave of liberty, of the free market, and of what's left of traditional American culture. ■

Woody Allen is indeed an excellent metaphor for the Democrat Party.

Bobby Fischer: The Lynching of the Returning Hero

by M.N.R

Twenty years ago, Bobby Fischer was the hero of the American media. A remarkable chess prodigy and genius, Bobby surmounted a concerted attempt by the dominant Soviet grandmasters to keep him out of the world championship. His defeat of then champion, Soviet grandmaster Boris Spassky, at the match at Reykjavik was the toast of the world; here was the first American chess player to become the best in the world. Fischer's victory revived chess in the U.S. and across the globe, and succeeded in making chess tournaments a big business.

Bobby was an eccentric, but many geniuses are eccentric, and virtually every top chess player shares that quality. As in the case of many geniuses, Bobby made many demands of officials around him, in his case tournament directors; from a distance, they seemed picky and a little batty. His demands not being met, Bobby retired from world chess, and has not played in public for seventeen

years. Now, lured by a multi-million dollar gate guaranteed by a Yugoslav businessman, Bobby, still maintaining that he is undefeated world champion, agreed to play his old rival Spassky, the first ten-game winner to be declared the victor.

One would think that the media would hail the return of the colorful, charismatic, and memorable Bobby. Americans, after all, are sentimental and love "Comeback Kids," as Slick Willie has realized. And yet, oddly enough, Bobby's return has been greeted with a stream of frenetic and hysterical abuse by the once-admiring media, the Smear Brigade being led by such Respectable organs as the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*, the *Post* being particularly vicious. The other organs of opinion duly followed the line set down by the elites.

Let us note some of the common charges.

One: Bobby is "paranoid," having charged that the Soviet grandmasters delayed his championship for a decade by conspiring to draw against each other, saving all their ammunition to turn against him. And yet, years later, defecting Soviet grandmaster Victor Korchnoi backed up Bobby's "paranoid" charges to the hilt.

Two: Bobby makes excessive, trivial, and loony demands of tournament directors. And yet, virtually all of these supposedly wacko demands have now been adopted, and chess experts have begun to see their merits. For example: It was Bobby's correct charges of Soviet conspiracy

that forced the international chess authorities to change the way they pick championship contenders, turning from tournaments (where deliberate draws can be concocted) to one-on-one matches, where such conspiracies cannot take place. Bobby has also pioneered in changing tournament time clocks, to guard against being rushed to beat the time clock. This innovation showed a principled regard for the good of the game, since one of Bobby's attributes as a chess player is that he himself was virtually never in time trouble.

Three: Bobby, now 50, is older and fatter and balder than he was as a gangling youth twenty and more years ago. Well, gee, that's a helluva charge: tell me, guys, who *isn't* older and fatter and balder twenty years later?

Four: Bobby *must* be a nut, since he lived as a "recluse" for these lapsed seventeen years. Well, being a "recluse" is often in the eye of the beholder. In Bobby's case, it seems to mean guarding his privacy against the prying of the barracuda press. Is it really nutty, for a celebrity to want the press to leave him alone?

Five: The writer in the *Washington Post*, who reached the acme of frenzy in denouncing

poor Bobby, noted that since Bobby is in violation of the absurd UN "sanctions" against Yugoslavia, his "dealing with the enemy" Serbs by playing chess could subject Bobby to a large fine and ten years in jail. For playing chess?! The *Post* writer declared that prison for Bobby wouldn't be bad, since it would compare favorably with the residential motels in Pasadena where Bobby has been living for the past two decades. I'm sure this writer is one of these guys bleeding with compassion for the "homeless," How would his fans like it if he said that jail is fine for the homeless, since jail is better than living

on the streets? If the *Post* guy would never make such an "insensitive" statement, does he really think that living in cheap motels is worse than being homeless?

Six: Bobby is now accompanied by an 18-year old Hungarian girlfriend, a fellow tournament chess player who thinks Bobby is the greatest. Fischer has actually been denounced for

having a young girlfriend, by people who liken this fact to the Woody Allen case of quasi-incest!

So why the unfair and out-of-line hysteria about Bobby? Well, it turns out that Bobby, an independent thinker in other

Is it really nutty for a celebrity to want the press to leave him alone?

fields than chess, is definitely not Politically Correct. Apparently, even chess players are not allowed to stray beyond the narrow bounds of p.c. without being severely punished. When asked about the "sanctions" against him, Bobby heroically pulled out a letter from the U.S. Treasury, warning him that if he went through with the match, he would be violating UN sanctions and subject to fine and imprisonment. Bobby met this challenge by heroically spitting on the Treasury letter, and declaring that he doesn't recognize the sovereignty of the United Nations in fact, that the world would be a lot better without the UN. Bobby then magnified his deviation from the Accepted Norm by denouncing Zionism as racism, and declaring that "Bolshevism is a mask for Judaism." The stunned journalist pointed out that, as a lad born in Brooklyn of Jewish descent, Fischer is himself a Jew under "Jewish law" because his mother is Jewish. One wonders why the supposedly secular American press treats "Jewish law" as if it were the law of the land; would they accord the same reverence to, say, Muslim law?

So we are faced with the important question: are we going to insist that, successful people in every walk of life, in order to maintain their positions, will have to sign on to the entire barrage of politically correctness? Before we honor or consult a dentist, an actor, an astronomer, a baseball pitcher, a composer, are we going to run them through the gauntlet of p.c., quiz them unmercifully,

and make sure that everyone of them is sound on the Jewish, black, gay, Hispanic, disabled, animal rights, and dozens of other issues of the day? Are we going to fit everyone, regardless of occupation, to the Procrustean bed? How far are we going to forge the chains of totalitarianism in our society?

Are we going to have say, metaphorically, and even literally if he is nabbed for "violation of sanctions": Free Bobby Fischer and All Political Prisoners?! ■

Liberal Hysteria: The Mystery Explained

by M.N.R.

"Why," an old paleocon friend of mine and I were musing the other day, "why are leftists so hysterically opposed to the reelection of an innocuous president like George Bush?" My friend and I agreed that we hadn't seen such naked media bias since the days of the demonized Joe McCarthy. Why? Is it abortion? Feminism? What?

The first time I had seen left-liberal frenzy at work was growing up in the thirties in New York City. In the late Thirties, my leftist family, friends, and neighbors were in a paroxysm of fear and rage over the counter-revolution of Franco and of the looming defeat of the Leftist Spanish government in the Spanish Civil War. There abounded denunciations of Franco, and calls for everything from milk to arms to soldiers

—the volunteer "International Brigade to defend the Spanish Left (dubbed "Loyalists" in the value-loaded term adopted by the *New York Times* and other Respectables).

Note, these were people who displayed no interest whatever, before or since, in Spanish history, culture, or politics. So why all the bother about Spain? Left-liberal historian Allen Guttman has even recorded and celebrated this hysteria over Spain in his book, *The Wound in the Heart* (the title says it all.) One time I asked my friend Frank S. Meyer, who had been a top American Communist, about this puzzle. "Why all the emotionalism about Spain, Frank?" Frank shrugged: "We [the Communists] could never figure it out. But we made use of the liberal emotionalism on the issue."

The orthodox explanation of historians is that American leftists were especially sensitive to the "threat of fascism," and that they were frantically pro-Spanish Left because they saw the Civil War as a preview of an inevitable World War II. But the problem with *that* explanation is that, while left-liberals were of course enthusiastically in favor of the "good" World War II against the Axis, they never summoned up quite the same emotionalism, quite the same frenzy, even against Hitler, as they had done against Franco.

To come back to the present: is the abortion issue the key to the mania, to the fear and loathing? Yes and no. Yes, abortion is an important issue to the left, but consider the situation *before Roe v. Wade* in