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." What'samatter, 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-liberals, 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.

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 Rejkjavik was the toast of the world; here was the first American chess player to become the best in the world. Fischer's victory revitalized 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 be-
ing 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 com-
mon 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 ammuni-
tion 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 
wocko 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 tour-
naments (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 prin-
cipled regard for the good of 
the game, since one of Bobby’s 
attributes as a chess player is 
that he himself was virtually 
ever 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 “re-
cluse” is often in 
the eye of the 
beholder. In Bob-
by’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 ab-
surd 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 Pas-
dena where Bobby has been liv-
ing for the past two decades. 
I’m sure this writer is one of 
these guys bleeding with com-
passion for the “homeless.”

How would his fans like it if he 
said that jail is fine for the home-
less, 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 girl-
friend, 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
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?

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 leftist-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 Guttmann 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