Bush Abortion Story Squelched; But Larry Flynt Almost Tells All

This was a media story — not a political story. Reason: its initial impetus — the presidential election — had passed.

Now, however, the new Administration’s anti-choice actions suggest, as media pundits might say, that this story may yet find its legs.

Everyone in the media knows this story. But no one, as far as we can tell, has seen fit to print it or pursue it in a meaningful way. Our colleagues apparently won’t even ask the subject to confirm or deny it. They, or their bosses, seem to feel no need to tell their audiences a key and shocking allegation that has, however, been widely circulated on the net.

This is the story: About 1970, George W. Bush, then in his twenties, impregnated a girlfriend. He arranged for her to have an abortion at a Houston hospital.

Our media colleagues knew about this allegation back in October, before the election. So this is a tale about how the mainstream press, and particularly CNN — which unwittingly broadcast a précis of it, then deleted it from its archives — suppressed an account that might have harmed the Republican candidate.

Story Is a Repeat

Long-time PROBE readers will recall, of course, that in the previous presidential election — Clinton versus Dole — we reported, exclusively, that about 1970 Dole arranged for an abortion for a young woman whom he may have impregnated — and who was not his wife. Yet, both before and after 1970, Dole campaigned for public office as an implacable pro-lifer, a foe of Roe v. Wade. Abortion was legal then in Kansas, where the alleged procedure took place. Our source was the ob-gyn who performed the abortion, who said he knew and recognized Dole when he brought the woman to the hospital.

Dole later denied all, although he had declined to discuss the allegation before the ’96 election (PROBE, Dec. ’98).

“Boys will be boys!” some of our colleagues in the mainstream media remarked at the time. But none of them published our allegation — which eventually was backed by a second source.

Unlike the present instance, however, many media outlets did investigate the story.

The Washington Post, has — or has had — in its files an exclusive tape-recorded interview with the alleged Dole abortion doctor, in which he described the 1970 event in detail. But the Post was lobbied strongly by Elizabeth Dole to suppress the story — and it did. One other reason for the Post’s reluctance, we later were told by a knowledgeable source, was that at just that time, in 1996, two of its top editors were involved in messy divorces; they felt strongly that this type of dirty laundry should stay hidden in the bin.

For these reasons, of course, we were very interested in

Flynt Recounts Story That CNN Censored

Larry Flynt was interviewed by station KGO radio journalist Bernie Ward late last October. The interview was transcribed and posted verbatim on tattoolman@ccsnignal.com. What follows is drawn from it.

After he dropped his bomb on CNN’s Crossfire, Flynt said:

“I could hear in my earpiece someone screaming ‘There’s nothing I can do about it. We’re live!’ They were in a panic because I had said what I said.”

Did this surprise you? Ward asked.

No, said Flynt.

Media is Fearful

“I’ve talked to the leading mainstream media people all over the country about this story,” Flynt explained. “They don’t want to be accused of sabotaging the election going into the home stretch — which is the wimpiest excuse I’ve ever heard a journalist make!”

Is the press afraid, for legal reasons, to ask Bush whether the
Letters
Researcher Comments
On Gonzalez Report

I read your article on Nicholas Gonzalez and, though in general agreement, I think you were somewhat off the mark regarding several points.

First, Nutrition & Cancer is not an "obscure" journal; it publishes peer reviewed articles by many well-established scientists. It was obscure because the field of nutritional carcinogenesis is very young, beginning in earnest only in the 1970s. It is now coming into its own and is doing quite well, thank you! We receive over 20 new submissions per month from all over the world, reject about 30%, and publish six issues a year. The citation rate for the journal is growing each year, and it is at present the only forum devoted to the exchange of ideas and research in nutritional carcinogenesis.

Secondly, the paper I published in Life Sciences was hard core science. But it was designed as the beginning, not the end of a series of investigations. If you look carefully at the paper you will see that (1) the enzyme preparation had no effect on the growth of the primary tumor or on the incidence of rats with lung metastases. (2) However, the 2% pancreatic enzyme preparation plus the magnesium supplement had the lowest volume of pulmonary metastases of all the groups. (3) The results were summarized as follows:

"The results of the study suggest that when fed in the diet, oral PPP [porcine pancreas preparation] does not inhibit the growth and/or metastatic dissemination of the R13762 rat mammary tumor, and may even enhance metastatic dissemination at high levels" (author's emphases).

We also went on to say "... the model used in this study only roughly mimics the metastatic process as it occurs in humans ..." and "PPP was incorporated in the diet as in the early King studies ... However, in clinical settings the PPP is administered between meals rather than during meals so that the exogenous enzymes are not used in the digestion process" (they do not mix with endogenous enzymes).

The point here is that the study was not definitive in nature, and the model system used did not mimic the real life situation to the degree that one would like. So to say that this study discredits the Systemic Enzyme Therapy hypothesis is grossly overstating the case, in my opinion.

Let me clarify my position: I'm all for "alternative" approaches, if they work. Conventional methods also have their drawbacks and their efficacy is minimal in some cases, i.e., pancreatic and metastatic lung, colon, breast, and prostate cancer. So I say, keep an open mind and test these things in a systematic manner. Taking sides is ridiculous, and just provides people like Saul Green and Victor Herbert with something to do in their retirement. I say they both should take up fishing and allow analysis of alternative methods by competent non-partisan scientists to go forward.

—Leonard A. Cohen, Ph.D.
American Health Foundation, Valhalla, N.Y.

Cohen is the editor of Nutrition & Cancer. The PROBE statement that Cohen cites above was taken directly from his 1996 abstract of the study: "Compared to untreated controls, the group receiving the pancreatic preparation (20% and 2%) exhibited an increased pulmonary metastatic burden both in the mean number of metastatic lesions and mean volume of the metastatic lesions." He then goes on to say: "However, when the metastatic lesions were segregated into three groups (large, medium, small), the group with 2% enzyme and magnesium++ exhibited a significantly decreased number of large lesions compared to all other groups, including untreated controls. We reported the first sentence, with the major, over all findings. —D.R.Z.

I, too, find your decision to mention the religious affiliation of some owners and managers of cigarette companies very troubling [PROBE, October]. The simple reason is that their religious beliefs have nothing to do with making cigarettes. If these people were involved in something remotely religious (looking for Noah's Ark) then your comments would be appropriate, but in this case your mention of religion can only be construed as anti-Semitic (even if you didn't want it to be).

I'm glad you printed Sally Olds' letter [PROBE, Nov.-Dec.], but that doesn't correct the damage you may have inadvertently done. As in many cases of prejudice, the person who is so inclined rarely if ever notes their own intent.

—John E. Dodes, D.D.S., President, N.Y. Chapter, Natl. Council Against Health Fraud
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Note to Our Readers
In our November-December special issue, we promised that the next PROBE would appear in January. We were more tired than we realized. This issue, date-lined (January) February 1, is our first for the new year. —D.R.Z.
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Biologist Describes Fear and Loneliness In His Public Fight Against Animal Rights

"Terrorism works."

This is the unfortunate conclusion, a decade later, of a prominent animal researcher who was targeted by animal rightsers — particularly the shadowy Animal Liberation Front (ALF) and its in-your-face partner, the People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA). The researcher is biologist Adrian R. Morrison, Ph.D.

He asserts in a newly-published personal memoir that his office was trashed, and he was attacked — but not because of the animal experiments that he was doing. Rather, explains Morrison, of the University of Pennsylvania, the ALF and PETA targeted him because he helped research colleagues whom they had attacked, and particularly because he took a leadership role in publicly opposing the Animal Rights Movement.

Specifically, Morrison says, ALF and PETA were incensed by his support of psychologist Edward Taub, Ph.D., of Silver Spring, Md., whom they had charged with cruelty and torture of animals in the contentious, highly publicized Silver Spring Monkeys case (PROBE, June 2000).

Publication Is Explained

Morrison’s essay appears in the current, winter issue of the journal Perspectives in Biology and Medicine (vol. 44, no. 1), published by Johns Hopkins University Press.

The journal’s editor, physiologist Robert L. Perlman, M.D., of the University of Chicago, says they rarely publish first-person accounts. But Morrison’s is important, Perlman told PROBE, because most animal researchers are threatened by Animal Rights, but few have had the experience of being attacked directly. Also, few have been willing to stand up in public to condemn these hostile acts.

Mink Liberator Caged

The Animal Rights attack on animal research that Adrian Morrison fought in the ’90s led to the passage of federal legislation: The Animal Enterprise Protection Act of 1992. Late last year, the first person charged under this law was sentenced to two years in prison for releasing thousands of animals from cages at mink farms across the U.S.

Justin Clayton Samuel, 21, also was ordered to repay mink farmers $364,000 for their losses.

The Animal Enterprise Protection Act makes crimes against certain animal facilities a federal offense. Its purpose is to discourage the disruption of commerce involving animals, and to protect animal owners from terrorism by people and groups opposed to the use of animals in research and business.

A bill to strengthen the penalties for animal rights crimes is due to be introduced in the new Congress, according to the Foundation for Biomedical Research, a Washington, D.C. organization that favors the scientific use of animals, and supports the bill.

Drug Companies Didn’t Help

Much has since changed, Morrison writes. But one thing remains constant: his colleagues’ disinclination to confront the animal rightsists for their attack on biomedical research. The scientists’ motivation, he says, is fear, and their preference to let someone else take up the cudgel.

Morrison is critical of large wealthy organizations’ failure to help, particularly the drug companies that rely heavily on animal research. He notes that these companies do contribute several million dollars annually to the Foundation for Biomedical Research in Washington, D.C., which is a defense organization.

"But expecting companies to contribute more is wishful thinking. I am certain," Morrison adds, "that the depredations of the Animal Rights Movement are simply calculated as part of the [drug companies'] cost of doing business."

Morrison acknowledges that recent federal regulations on the care and treatment of laboratory animals is beneficial. He notes that a “community of concern” for experimental animals has grown up in the U.S. But he worries that there still are no provisions for dialogue between this community and the creative scientists whose work is essential to medical progress. He warns:

"There is a distinct danger that animals — and more to the point, the bureaucracy associated with their care — can become more important in the minds of regulators . . . than the humans the animals are destined to relieve from suffering."
Squelched...
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Bush’s possible use of abortion to extract himself — and a woman — from a potentially unpleasant situation, given that he, like Dole, is vehemently “Pro life.”

We made a few phone calls to Texas last spring and summer, but came up empty-handed. A colleague who has more resources did a better job:

Larry Flynt, the publisher of Hustler, the porn magazine, sent three investigators to Texas early last year. They dug around for eight months, Flynt said on October 20, on CNN’s Crossfire, where he briefly described their findings.

The program’s host, Robert Novak, said to Flynt, live, according to a pirated transcript:

“Mr. Flynt, never let it be said that we censor any of our guests here on Crossfire . . . . You said you wanted to talk about the election. Tell us what you wanted to say!”

Flynt: “[W]e've been looking into George W. Bush’s background. And we’ve found out that early in the ’70s, he was involved in an abortion in Texas. And I just think it’s sad that the mainstream media, who’s [sic] aware of this story, won’t ask him that question” — Is that true? — “when they were able to ask him the drug question without any proof at all. And we’ve got lots of proof on this [abortion] issue!”

Novak didn’t delve further into Flynt’s allegation. The interview quickly ended.

Chat Room Was Next

A few minutes later, however, Flynt was in CNN’s telecast Chat Room. He was asked:

“[H]ow [do] you plan to protect yourself from a lawsuit by claiming to have the goods on G.W. Bush?”

Flynt: “Because we have [the goods], and the truth is an absolute defense.”

Then Flynt side-stepped. Asked when he was going to publish this information, he said:

“When I said that we had the proof, I am referring to knowing who the girl was, knowing who the doctor was that performed the abortion, evidence from girlfriends of continued on following page

Allegation Dismissed

There in fact have been a few mentions of Flynt’s allegation in the mainstream media. They are in pundits’ space, not in news columns. All of the ones we found are the same: They sneer at Flynt. They ridicule his allegation as “unproven.” They dismiss it.

As gossip writer Liz Smith (Newark Star Ledger, Nov. 6), asserted, “There is no evidence that Bush even knew about the pregnancy.”

Flynt, however, had already said that one of his key sources, who provided him with an affidavit, was the girl friend of George W.’s boss; it was this woman, moreover, who allegedly took her to the hospital to have the abortion. Under these circumstances, if true, it is very hard to believe Bush never learned his girl friend was pregnant.

Recounts...
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allegation is true? Ward asked. Flynt said no. Reporters had asked Bush about his use of cocaine without having any evidence at all — and he had “sidestepped” the issue.

So, what had Flynt found?

“He [W] was working for his father’s campaign . . . . for the Senate . . . . and a fellow by the name of Robert Chandler was the campaign manager. He [W] got a girl pregnant during this period of time, and she had an abortion.

“We’ve been able to locate the doctor who performed the procedure . . . . [at a] hospital in Houston . . . . We have affidavits from four of her friends stating that they knew about the affair, the pregnancy, and the subsequent abortion.

“The only thing which we [do] not have, which we needed to break the story, was the girl to come out. And she would not come out. Whether she was afraid, or whether she was paid off, I don’t really want to speculate . . . .

Ward asked if the woman denied this had happened. Flynt replied:

“No, no, no. She doesn’t deny that. We know she had the abortion. We know that she was Bush’s girlfriend at the time . . . . The last conversation my investigators had with her, she said, ‘I don’t have anything bad to say about George W.’”

Third-Hand Denial Offered

The woman’s only contradictory public statement is third-hand, through “friends”; it is in the October 26 “Drudge Report”:

“How could I have aborted George Bush’s child?” she is alleged to have said. “We never once had intercourse! . . . . This is outrageous.”

Among news people, Drudge is not considered reliable. Flynt told Bernie Ward on the air that one of the woman’s girlfriends was seeing W’s boss at the time. She was the one who took her to the hospital for the abortion.

Ward, like other colleagues who have commented on the continued on following page
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her at the time, who knew about the romance and the subsequent abortion. The young lady does not want to go public and, without her willingness, we don’t feel that we’re on solid enough legal ground to go with the story, because should she say it never happened, then we’ve got a potential libel suit. But we know we have enough evidence that we believe completely.

One of the things that interested us was that this abortion took place before Roe vs. Wade in 1970, which made it a crime at the time. I’d just like the national media to ask him if abortion is okay for him and his family, but not for the rest of America. We’re not looking at it as a big issue, we’re looking at it as a situation of people not being told the truth. I think the American people have a right to know everything there is to know about someone running for President.

This report appeared on the web on October 22, on today@american-politics.com.

The following Tuesday (October 24), radio broadcaster Bernie Ward interviewed Flynt on station KGO, in San Francisco, and later posted the transcript on linkorei:on com. Ward had gone to CNN’s website, and discovered that, contrary to what host Novak had told Flynt — CNN had deleted the Flynt segment from its server. They later deleted the entire Crossfire.

Meanwhile, however, several people had downloaded the interview. They later reposted it on their own sites. These moves were reported on the American Politics Journal website american-politics.com. It also reported that CNN was refusing other press outlets’ request for the Crossfire transcript.

A CNN spokeswoman explained last month from Washington that Flynt’s charges were “totally unsubstantiated and potentially harmful,” and so were deleted. “It was up to CNN to set matters straight,” she explained.

If they’ve done so, they’ve not told Crossfire’s viewers. Other than censoring themselves, there has been no indication on CNN that it has made any effort to verify or deny Flynt’s account.

CNN’s cowardice did not, however, win it any favor from the Far Right. Quite the contrary!


“There were no... apologies to Bush by the folks at CNN for the ad hominen attack on his good name and reputation that they were all too happy to air.”

Which of course they were not!

Last month, Flynt declined PROBE’s request for comment. However, a spokeswoman for his company, in Los Angeles, told PROBE by phone that there have been no new developments since the Bernie Ward interview. Flynt, she said, has no present plans to publish his findings. Flynt would not provide the girlfriends’ affidavits, which PROBE requested.

PROBE does not have the access to President Bush that the mainstream media enjoy. *

# # #

Our thanks to S.W. for calling this story to our attention!

— D.R.Z.

Progress Reported

Doctors and their patients point out — correctly — that doctors can’t cure, and indeed can do little for sufferers of some diseases. Pancreatic cancer, is one of the worst.

The New England Journal of Medicine (Sept. 14.) has published a report from NIH on an experimental treatment for kidney cancer, a refractory malignancy that kills 30,000 Americans each year: In 19 such patients, who had run out of other options, oncologist Richard W. Childs, M.D., and his colleagues transplanted blood stem cells from immunologically similar siblings. These cells attacked the patients’ cancer cells, shrinking the tumors or wiping them out. Nine of the 19 patients were still alive, up to three years later. Four were free of cancer.
RU-486 Tempers Abortion Woes

The development of RU-486, the first modern chemical abortifacient, is a technical achievement. But the way this drug is seen and used, and the way it shapes its users' feelings and beliefs, is culturally determined, an anthropologist says, based on her study of women's experiences with Le RU at a clinic in Lille, France several years ago. RU-486 already was in clinical use there.

The researcher is Elaine Gerber, Ph.D., and the study is the dissertation for her doctorate, awarded by UCLA in 1999. She interviewed more than 30 women in depth in the clinic before, during, or just after their RU-486 terminations.

Gerber predicts that RU-486's use in the U.S., which has just begun, may similarly reflect and change American women's culturally determined sense of their bodies and themselves. In the U.S., now, a woman either is or is not pregnant. It's either/or. Partly, of course, this expresses her biologic status, but much of the meaning for the woman and for society has been shaped by the bitter conflict over legal abortion, Gerber says. This either/or view also is based on the fact that most surgical abortions are performed late in the first trimester, by which time the abortus is a baby-like fetus with a head, appendages, and a clearly palpable heartbeat.

No Fetus Seen

By contrast, RU abortions are performed much earlier: before 50 days after the last menstrual period in both France and the U.S. There is no "fetus" then, Gerber points out, just blobs of blood and other tissues.

French women are instructed to look for and handle these pregnancy products, and bring them back to the abortion clinic, so that doctors can be assured — and can assure them — the pregnancy has ended. The little person depicted in pro-life propaganda, and which — dishonestly — is often the depiction of a second- or even third-trimester fetus, is simply not there.

In the RU-486 procedure, the women cramp and bleed; often, they expel the conceptus into the toilet. Gerber says.

Catherine, one of her subjects, explains: "At first I didn't want to look. But I was curious, so I forced myself . . . In fact, it didn't really affect me. Because I realized there were no arms, no legs, no heart, that it was very small . . . ."

Nevertheless, looking for, and then seeing the "products of conception," as they technically are called, was difficult for some women.

Pascaline said: " . . . You have to go to the toilet and look, and that's really hard . . . I keep thinking: Is it going to be there this time . . . ."

Natasha had already expelled the abortus when Gerber interviewed her at the clinic:

"What happened was it was all covered with blood. So I think I lost it yesterday. I'm not bleeding any more."

Seeing Is Believing

Gerber's hunch is that even for women who found it difficult or traumatic, seeing the pregnancy products in this way helped them reach closure — and thus helped them recover more quickly than they would have from a later, aspiration abortion, in which they wouldn't even see the physical results. Perhaps more important, she writes that despite the possible trauma of looking and seeing, the women's more active participation, in a much earlier but less definitive form of evacuation has changed the way they see themselves in these circumstances:

"They say they were not really pregnant. "This is not pregnancy," Dominique emphasized, "because it's not wanted. I was very happy with my two daughters, when I was pregnant."

Natalie, too, emphasized that she didn't consider herself pregnant. "When you're really pregnant," she explained, "then you're very happy — and it's great!"

Gerber was surprised to find that the women and their doctors referred to the abortus as "an egg," not "a fetus." What is more, although the women were pregnant, they regarded it — inaccurately of course — as female reproductive material.

"I find it fascinating," Gerber writes, "that French women and [health care] providers alike referred to the unwanted products of conception as . . . 'eggs,' not 'fertilized eggs,' or the 'fertilized ovum,' as might be described in the clinical literature. This is suggestive. The term 'egg' implies female reproductive material, something which has not (yet) come into contact with its male counterpart, and as such is . . . 'inherently not fertilized.'"

Continuum is Seen

In this sense, Gerber adds, these women see themselves as participating in a reproductive continuum, and they are, in fact, earlier in this process than is the case with surgical abortions.

This view describes what care providers tell women to anticipate, and what they actually see. Sabine explained that the staff had told her "it would be small (she points to part of a fin-continued on following page
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gernal). Clear. White. The placenta. Blood clots. It's the egg. It's not serious . . . . Now I am waiting; when it arrives, we'll see.”

Rachél already had expelled. She said:

“I was afraid of what I might see. But I didn't really see anything. Just clots . . . . They said it was flesh. It was white, like a white piece of bread, very small, like the blood clots, but lighter.”

The pain of an RU-486 abortion has been compared to menstrual cramps. Gerber found, however, that some women experienced this pain as far more severe — and as different from a period. Some women told her it felt more like, or worse than, delivering a baby.

It’s “much stronger than period pains.” Natasha said. “It was like contractions, coming and going in waves.”

Virginie said the cramps “remind me of giving birth.”

Patient Information Is Different

This is significantly different than the information given American women by Danco Laboratories, LLC, which produces the U.S. RU-486 “early option pill” under the trade name Mifeprex. Danco compares the pain and discomfort to menstrual periods:

“Bleeding and cramping are a normal part of the process. Women may experience bleeding similar to or greater than a heavy period . . . .”

Nevertheless, the RU-486 experiences were different, and in a way preferable to surgical abortion.

Maude said: “It doesn’t feel like I’m having an abortion . . . where you have to be on a table with your legs in the stirrups and someone doing something inside you.”

Being “not really pregnant” — despite morning sickness and other clear indications that, in fact, they were — allowed women in Gerber’s study to regard RU-486 abortion as not really being abortion. It was something different; Gerber says they sometimes would refer to themselves as two weeks late, not four weeks pregnant. As Rachél told her:

“I don’t really know about the aspiration method, because I’ve never had one. But this method I think is great . . . . No one is getting into you to get something out. There’s no one touching you . . . . [It’s] more like disposing of it naturally, just you and your body.”

In short, Gerber reports, these women conceptualize unwanted pregnancies as not really pregnant. Pregnancy as they see it, is about giving birth to a wanted baby.

These women’s experiences with RU-486 reinforce their sense that they are — or were — only a little bit pregnant. What they see when they expel is less imposing and far more ambiguous than what they think of as a “baby.”

Emotions Are Calmer

Gerber says that the white-bread-like piece of tissue expelled in an RU-486 abortion is far less disturbing, emotionally, to women. RU-486 helps women correct the notion, central to the abortion debate in the U.S., that what is at issue is the killing of a baby-like fetus.

Her sense is that this understanding, if it occurs here, could relieve women’s feelings of guilt in having early, RU-486 abortions. It also might damp down the either/or view of pregnancy that fuels America’s abortion conflict.

PROBE Opinion:

Is a Politician’s Abortion Aid Fit to Print?

Reporters, and perhaps our readers, too, have raised questions about the legitimacy and legality of writing journalistic reports about a candidate’s role in helping a woman get an abortion. These are our views on the matter:

Q: Why and when is this very private matter an apt subject for the public record?
A: When a candidate behaves one way in private, and takes the opposite stance publicly for political advantage. Particularly, if this candidacy is based on his public stance, as was the case with Bob Dole and also George W. Bush. Practicing a double standard — hypocrisy — is something voters have the right to know about.

Q: You’re pointing a finger. Who’s in the wrong?
A: Not the woman, certainly. And not the man either, except insofar as he accepts — enjoys — the benefit of abortion in his own situation, but would deny it to others by making abortion illegal or otherwise hard to get.

Q: Is revelation of the woman’s name necessary?
A: It would be useful, to confirm the story. But it’s not necessary. What is more, even if a man takes a woman to a hospital or clinic, or writes a check to pay for an abortion, that does not prove that he impregnated her; she may not even know who did. What does matter is that he is helping her obtain a now-legal service that he would deny others in similar straits.

In the case of the alleged Dole abortion, we do not know who the woman was;
the hospital record was destroyed. We know the name of W.’s alleged girlfriend, which is given in internet stories. We also are aware of her husband’s alleged threat to sue if it is revealed in the media.

Q: From a journalistic viewpoint, don’t you need her confirmation on the record to print a story?

A: No. Absent her account, the journalistic rule of thumb is that you need two reliable identified or unidentified sources to publish an allegation. But you can go to print with one such source — or even none if you are foolhardy. In the Dole case, we had the word of the doctor who performed the abortion and who said he recognized Dole, who had been in his home, when the senator accompanied the woman to the hospital. We published his name. Later, we had a second on-the-record source.

Larry Flynt claims to have affidavits from four female friends of the Texas woman in question, including the one who accompanied her to the hospital. If these affidavits are detailed and consistent, our opinion is that Flynt — or anyone whom he hands this evidence to — has enough information to (a) ask Bush for comment, and (b) print the story, including Bush’s reaction.

We wish that he would publish the story. Bush’s choice of John Ashcroft as Attorney General is a pro-life political move, and a slap in the face to most Americans. Now, perhaps even more so than before the election, Americans need to know whether the President’s public and private lives are parallel, or rather contradict each other.
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