



Published by ACCURACY IN MEDIA, INC.

4455 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 330  
Washington, DC 20008 Tel: (202) 364-4401  
Fax: (202) 364-4098

E-mail: ar@aim.org  
Home Page: http://www.aim.org

\$1.50

April-A 1998

XXVII-7

## BURYING THE TRUTH ABOUT BELLA

The liberal media have grudgingly admitted that Ronald Reagan was right when he called the Soviet Union an Evil Empire that tried to subvert non-communist governments throughout the world and replace them with communist regimes that would take guidance from Moscow. The media have been less willing to come to grips with the fact that the Soviet Union strategy of subversion relied heavily on nationals in the targeted countries who were either Communist Party members or fellow travelers who followed the party line.

**The media's romance with the extremist left surfaces every time any American who played a prominent role in advancing Moscow's subversive strategy dies. They get prominent obituaries in the liberal media with never a reminder that while they claimed to be fighting for greater freedom and democracy, their real objective was to advance totalitarian communism. We saw this recently when Bella Abzug, the former New York Congresswoman famous for her big hats and radical politics, passed away at age 77.**

Here is Peter Jennings' tribute to Abzug on ABC's "World News Tonight" on March 31.

One of the country's most colorful and determined political characters has died. Bella Abzug was actually so much more than the woman in the wide-brimmed hat, though it was hard to miss her. She was a civil rights attorney from New York City who became an outspoken activist and leader in the movement for women's rights, and for the rights of anyone she felt was getting a raw deal. Ms. Abzug was a member of Congress in the early 1970s. She often said a woman's place was in the House. On her very first day there she proposed a resolution to withdraw all American forces from Vietnam. She was always ready to stir up an establishment that she said needed more women....Well, she was forthright...."I'm a very serious woman," she always said, "with a decent sense of outrage."

**The New York Times honored Abzug with a huge obituary, beginning on page one, a separate column and an editorial that altogether were equivalent to one full page. The front-page headline identified her as "Congresswoman and Founding**

**Feminist." The headline on the column read: "Feisty, Funny, Fearless and Faithful to her Principles." It described her as "the classic New York liberal, fighting against the Vietnam War and Richard Nixon, pushing for abortion rights, gay rights and feminism," whose opinions over the past 30 years never changed.**

The Times obituary acknowledged that she was a "leftist and an agitator." It even used the word "Communist" once. It said that as a lawyer she represented people "accused of Communist activities" and that she became "an anti-war activist." It mentioned that she was a founder and chief lobbyist of "Women Strike for Peace." It said nothing about the political coloration of that organization, which was heavily infiltrated by the Communists.

### Bella The Red

Bella Abzug is reported to have been a Communist student leader at Hunter College, which she attended from 1938 to 1942. From the outbreak of World War II in 1939 until Hitler invaded the Soviet Union in June 1941, the Communist Party line was that World War II was a "phony war." "Peace marches" were staged to protest U.S. aid to Britain and France. Young Bella Abzug is said to have participated in those demonstrations. The litmus test for hard-core Communists in those days was whether or not they followed the sudden radical shifts in the Party line on the war. Abzug was mentioned in The New York Post of March 18, 1941 as one who "generally followed the Communist Party line." Murray Baron, a founder of the Liberal Party of New York, described her in 1979 as one who had "followed every zig and zag of the Communist Party line" since her student days.

There were many other organizations besides "Women Strike for Peace" that Abzug joined but which the obituaries overlooked. At least six of them were identified as Communist

---

*The historical material on Bella Abzug is largely taken from Vol III of the Biographical Dictionary of the Left by Francis X. Gannon, Western Islands, 1972.*

fronts. One was the National Lawyers Guild, which was described by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as “the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party.” The Committee said the NLG had never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and its members, including those charged with espionage.

**In 1948, after the Communists had staged a coup and taken over Czechoslovakia, Bella Abzug journeyed to Prague as a representative of the National Lawyers Guild to attend the Third Congress of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, a Soviet front group. At this Communist conference she co-sponsored a resolution denouncing “persecutions directed against the leaders of the American Communist Party by the government of the U.S.A.”**

Other Communist fronts to which Abzug belonged were the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, an organization of Americans recruited by the Communist Party to fight on the Loyalist side in the Spanish Civil War, the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, the Citizens Committee of the Upper West Side and the Civil Rights Congress, the CRC.

**She worked as a lawyer for the CRC, which the Subversive Activities Control Board said was “an organization created by the Communist Party to utilize defense of civil rights for Party purposes and raise and maintain mass defense and bail funds for Party use.” Flying the false flag of civil rights, this outfit raised large sums of money from Americans who didn’t realize that they were funding a Communist organization. Herbert Romerstein, an authority on the Communist Party and its many fronts, says the CRC was “a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Communist Party.”**

## **Bella The Politician**

When Abzug ran for Congress in 1970, her Republican opponent was radio talk show host Barry Farber. Farber challenged her to join him in condemning the Soviet treatment of the captive nations under its control. She remained silent. Farber also criticized her position on Israel. Following the Communist Party line, Abzug supported a resolution condemning Israel as an “imperialist aggressor” at the far-left New Politics Conference in 1967. The Socialist Party opposed her for having shown “a general unwillingness to be outspokenly critical of Communist actions threatening the peace and freedom of the world.”

**The Socialists also pointed out that she had opposed allowing anti-Communist Vietnamese to come to the U.S. as refugees if the Communists won in Vietnam. She said they “deserved the punishment that awaits them.” The punishment that awaited thousands of them was death at the hands of Abzug’s comrades. She advocated policies that would have hastened and broadened the bloodbaths that swept Vietnam and Cambodia in the wake of the Communist victories in 1975. Her first action when she entered Congress in 1971 was to introduce a resolution calling for the withdrawal of all American troops from Southeast Asia within six months. That would have meant the abandonment not**

**only of our Vietnamese, Cambodian and Laotian allies, but also our POWs.**

Abzug claimed to be fighting for greater freedom and democracy, but as a faithful follower of the Communist Party line dictated by the Kremlin, she was supporting an international conspiracy whose goal was to crush freedom throughout the world. Wherever it succeeded, replicas sprang up of the tyranny that caused so much death and misery in the Soviet Union, its former European satellites, China, Cuba, Cambodia, Vietnam and North Korea.

## **Adulatory Excess**

None of the obituaries in the establishment media so much as hinted that Abzug was ever driven by devotion to the Communist cause. The New York Times came the closest of any when it described her as “a leftist and an agitator” and noted that she “represented people accused of Communist activities by Senator Joseph McCarthy’s Congressional committee and its counterpart in Albany.”

**Even The Washington Times gave no hint that Abzug was anything more than a left-wing Democrat. The conservative New York Post gave her one of the most fawning obituaries. It described her as “a lifelong crusader for civil rights, for an end to the Vietnam War and later for women’s rights.” Its sole negative comment was that she was “tart-tongued.” It quoted Sen. Moynihan, who ended her career in politics by defeating her in her race for the Senate in 1976, as saying, “Bella was a national treasure.” Gloria Steinem said, “President of the United States is the least she should have been.”**

With the Cold War and the Vietnam War raging, Congresswoman Abzug demanded that the U.S. end the draft and abolish the Selective Service System. She also wanted hearings held on U.S. war crimes in Vietnam, and she voted against appropriations for the House Committee on Internal Security. If Bella Abzug’s dreams had been realized, Gus Hall would be ruling the United States as general secretary of the Communist Party and Bella would probably be languishing in an Alaskan gulag.

## **Why They Do It**

The New York Times ran a feature story on April 6 about a group home in Los Angeles populated by senior citizens who retain their passion for communism and keep a bust of Lenin in the library. This inspired Michael Kelly, a former Times reporter, to write a column to explain how that story made the front page of The New York Times.

**Kelly wrote, “If a Times reporter found a brave little band of aging Nazis, who kept a bust of Hitler in the living room and who declared that fascism would rise again, and wrote this up cute—well this simply could never happen. But a Times reporter writes Mr. Darnov and Ms. Foreman and company up cute—and the editors say: That is cute. Put it on A-1. Why did they do this extraordinary thing? They did it because to them it**

**is not extraordinary. They did it because they think it really is heartwarming that the Sunset Hall folks are sustained by their old faith, and they assume that it will be heartwarming to their readers as well.”**

Kelly notes that nary a word was said about the mass murders recently tabulated in Stephane Courtois’s “Black Book of Communism.” Nor about “the Gulag, the Cultural Revolution, the jailing and the torturing and the expelling of Jews and Christians and intellectuals and democrats. Yes, the Moscow spy machine that ran the American Communist Party as an

espionage center, that nearly destroyed the American labor movement and that corrupted and crippled American liberalism...”

**Communism has been discredited and is dying. But the Establishment media look upon Americans who fought for it as brave and admirable people who deserve our respect. What does it matter if they were wrong? If anyone is to be criticized or condemned, they feel, it is those wicked anti-communists like Senator McCarthy who criticized them and didn’t think they could be trusted to run our government.**

## **CLINTON’S APOLOGIES: THE MISSING CONTEXT**

There are many things for which President Clinton should apologize to the American people—from selling slots on Ron Brown’s trade missions for \$50,000-and-up contributions to the Democratic National Committee, to lying about his many extra-marital affairs. He could have avoided a lawsuit that has caused him no end of trouble if he had been willing to apologize for having dropped his pants and exposing himself to Paula Jones. But Bill Clinton is not big on apologizing here at home.

On his trip to Africa, however, the President was in an apologetic mood. In Uganda he declared that the United States had “not always done the right thing by Africa.” He said, “Going back to the time before we were even a nation, European-Americans received the fruits of the slave trade. And we were wrong in that.” The lead headline in The Washington Post the next morning was, “Clinton Says U.S. Wronged Africa.” The New York Times headline read, “In Uganda, Clinton Expresses Regret on Slavery in U.S.”

**The Washington Times story was unique. Its headlines read, “Clinton nears slavery apology, Museveni says Africans at fault.” The story by Warren Strobel said that two days earlier President Yoweri Museveni of Uganda had described such an apology for slavery as “rubbish.” President Museveni had said when asked about a slavery apology, “African chiefs were the ones waging war on each other and capturing their own people and selling them. If anyone should apologize it should be the African chiefs. We still have those traitors here even today.”**

### **Mindless Massacres: Misplaced Blame**

We didn't see this in any other report. Nor did we see the context found in Keith Richburg’s book, “Out of America: A Black Man Confronts Africa.” (See AIM Report, July-A 1997). Richburg, who had covered Africa for The Washington Post, wrote that he was lucky that his ancestors came to America, even though they came as slaves. He wrote: “Would I be better off if this great tragedy, this crime of slavery, had not occurred? What would my life be like now?” His answer, as he viewed the corpses of the victims of one of Africa's many massacres, was, “There but for the grace of God go I.”

The massacre in Rwanda in 1994 was the subject of Clinton’s second apology. Speaking in Rwanda on March 25, he said,

“We did not act quickly enough after the killing began. We should not have allowed the refugee camps to become safe haven for the killers. We did not immediately call these crimes by their rightful name: genocide.” Mr. Clinton excused his own inaction, saying: “It may seem strange to you here, but all over the world there were people like me sitting in offices, day after day after day, who did not fully appreciate the depth and the speed with which you were being engulfed by this unimaginable terror.”

**The press reports recalled that the U.S. opposed intervention in Rwanda because we had been traumatized by our experience in Somalia. The New York Times added that Clinton administration officials had ignored advance warnings from Rwandan Army officers and the U.S. Embassy that widespread violence was being planned. It also ignored a CIA study warning that if fighting began, as many as 500,000 people might be killed. Even after hundreds of thousands had been slaughtered, Washington blocked the efforts of the UN Security Council to send 5,500 soldiers to intervene.**

### **Bill Ignored Hillary's Good Advice**

On the eve of the presidential trip, “60 Minutes” aired a segment on a terrorist group called the Lord’s Resistance Army, LRA, which is said to have kidnaped 10,000 children in northern Uganda. The boys are used in battle as shields and soldiers. The girls are enslaved, raped and given away as “wives.” The segment focused mainly on the kidnaping of 139 girls from a Catholic school. The nuns managed to obtain the release of 109 of the girls. They had been forced to stomp one of their classmates to death because she had tried to escape.

**Mrs. Clinton devoted one of her syndicated columns to this tragic situation while in Africa. In it, she appealed to all nations to pressure Sudan to take action to halt the LRA's kidnaping and abuse of Ugandan children. We saw no sign that the President acted on her advice. It might have been more productive if he had done so, pressing for action to halt these modern Sudanese slavers instead of apologizing for American participation in the slave trade centuries ago and his failure to try to halt the Rwandan massacres. Those apologies could neither free any slaves nor save any lives. Exposing the crimes of the LRA and pressing for action to stop them might.**

# DAVID BROCK'S MISDIRECTED APOLOGY

**David Brock won fame on the right and notoriety on the left as the author of the book, "The Real Anita Hill," and the article, "His Cheatin' Heart," in The American Spectator that first exposed the sexual promiscuity of Bill Clinton as seen through the eyes of his state trooper bodyguards. That article begat the Paula Jones lawsuit against the Philanderer in Chief. That suit begat the Monica Lewinsky scandal. Claiming to be heartsick over having caused so much trouble for the President, Brock capped a move to the left with an open letter of apology to Clinton in the April issue of Esquire. Claiming responsibility for the President's woes, Brock abjectly begged his forgiveness.**

We haven't seen anything quite like this since many of the foreign correspondents who covered the Soviet Union in the 1930s repudiated the reporting that had convinced many of their readers that the Russian Revolution had ushered in a glorious new era. Their faith in Stalin had been shaken by the show trials that condemned so many leaders of the revolution to their deaths; it was dashed for most when Stalin signed a pact with Hitler in 1939 and invaded Poland. These correspondents confessed that their desire to see communism succeed in Russia caused them to exaggerate its successes and to conceal its failures.

**David Brock now claims that his reporting on Clinton was also driven by a hidden agenda. He says in his apology to Clinton, "I wanted to pop you right between the eyes." What he actually did was kick him in the scrotum. But there was a big difference in the confessions of the disillusioned pinko journalists in 1939 and Brock's *mea culpa*. The former confessed to having failed to report what they knew to be true. They lied to deceive their readers.**

Brock makes no such admission. He says he went to great pains to test the veracity of the Arkansas state troopers who were telling him what they had personally seen and done while serving as Gov. Clinton's bodyguards. He wrote, "I was convinced that either the troopers saw what they said they saw or they had spent months rehearsing one of the most sensational lies ever told about a sitting president. My gut told me they were telling the truth. The level of detail seemed too hard to make up. Only later did I allow for more complicated possibilities."

**How much later? Only last summer Brock wrote that the Troopergate story was not motivated by "partisan considerations." He said he believed it to be true when he wrote it and that he believed it still. This suggests that Brock has since discovered evidence of error as devastating as the shock waves caused by the Hitler-Stalin Pact.**

His apology, however, does not give us a clue as to what it might be. The liberal media were excited by his confession of error. After Esquire distributed it as a news release, Brock appeared on almost as many TV talk shows as Bill Ginsburg, Monica Lewinsky's ubiquitous mouthpiece. Of course, the hosts were curious to know just what horrendous errors he had made, and they asked him what they were.

Brock succeeded in deflecting those questions, answering by trashing his sources instead of telling what they had told him that was false. It wasn't until he ran into Tim Russert on Meet the Press that he was compelled to give a responsive answer.

**Tim Russert asked if the troopers had lied to him. Brock dodged, "I can't say that everything they told me was true." Russert persisted, "What specifically do you believe is untrue and that you would take back this morning?" Trapped, Brock replied: "There is nothing specific in the piece that I know is wrong..."**

## Brock's Paula Story Was Wrong

False! His article said Gov. Clinton "eyed a woman" named Paula at an evening reception at the Excelsior Hotel and had a trooper escort her to a room where she spent "no more than an hour" with Clinton. It said she told the trooper when she departed that "she was available to be (Clinton's) regular girlfriend if he so desired."

**The truth is that Clinton spotted Paula one afternoon working at the registration table for a conference being held in the hotel, not at an evening reception. Paula Jones has sworn that she was in the room with Clinton only 10 to 15 minutes. Her co-worker at the registration table has sworn that Paula, extremely upset, returned to her post after only 15 to 20 minutes and told her what Clinton had done.**

This is the only story in Brock's article that has been proven wrong. Ironically, Brock is now using Ferguson, the trooper who supplied it, to impugn the veracity of the two troopers who have suffered because, unlike Ferguson, they refused to bow to pressure from Clinton to get them to zip their lips.

**Brock used the story without checking it. Instead of apologizing to Clinton, he should apologize to Paula Jones. Asked on C-SPAN if he would do so, he replied: "I don't really think that I owe her an apology. In fact, I think the Jones case has turned out to be something of a disgrace, and maybe the apology should be issued from her."**

## What You Can Do

**Enclosed are cards addressed to White House correspondents Mara Liasson (NPR), Sam Donaldson (ABC) and Sen. Robert Torricelli, D-NJ, the most visible of the President's defenders in the Senate. See the Notes for the details.**

---

AIM REPORT is published twice monthly by Accuracy In Media, 4455 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington DC 20008, and is free to AIM members. Membership dues are \$35 a year. Dues and contributions to AIM are tax deductible. Corporate membership is \$100.

---