

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. report	re: Hillary's Positions (36 pages)	10/03/2000	Personal Misfile
002. report	re: Hillary Rodham Clinton (2 pages)	10/04/2000	Personal Misfile

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Domestic Policy Council
Eric Morse (Subject Files)
OA/Box Number: 21191

FOLDER TITLE:

HRC Record [2]

2011-0619-S

rc386

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. report	re: Hillary's Positions (36 pages)	10/03/2000	Personal Misfile

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Domestic Policy Council
Eric Morse (Subject Files)
OA/Box Number: 21191

FOLDER TITLE:

HRC Record [2]

2011-0619-S

rc386

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. report	re: Hillary Rodham Clinton (2 pages)	10/04/2000	Personal Misfile

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Domestic Policy Council
Eric Morse (Subject Files)
OA/Box Number: 21191

FOLDER TITLE:

HRC Record [2]

2011-0619-S

rc386

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

To: Eric Morse

From: Elizabeth Cendon

Re: 3 (w/ cover)

Copyright 2000 The Washington Post
The Washington Post

View Related Topics

September 3, 2000, Sunday, Final Edition

SECTION: A SECTION; Pg. A02

LENGTH: 752 words

HEADLINE: Clinton Urges Raise in Minimum Wage; Campaigning for Wife in Upstate N.Y., President Makes Plain His Agenda for Fall

BYLINE: Ellen Nakashima , Washington Post Staff Writer

DATELINE: SKANEATELES, N.Y., Sept. 2

BODY:

On this Labor Day weekend, on President Clinton's last dash of summer vacation, the president called on Congress to give workers a \$ 1 raise in the minimum wage and on New Yorkers to elect his wife to the Senate.

And as Hillary Rodham Clinton campaigned for the Senate seat, he campaigned for a place in the hearts of New Yorkers, as the couple basked today in the affections of tens of thousands at the New York State Fair.

Clinton's actions reflect how he'll be spending his final fall in office, squaring off with a Republican-controlled Congress over his legislative agenda and making the case for his wife, for Vice President Gore to be his successor and for the Democrats to regain control of Congress--and shaking every last hand in the crowd.

On Tuesday, he will gather with congressional Democratic leaders in a Rose Garden ceremony to press for the Democrats' legislative goals: a patients' bill of rights, a Medicare prescription drug benefit, stricter gun control, and money for better schools and teachers.

He wants Congress to send him a minimum-wage bill as its first order of business. "Even at this time of unprecedented prosperity," he said in his radio address today, "millions of Americans still are working every day for the minimum wage."

More than 10 million Americans work for the minimum wage. Seventy percent are adults, 60 percent are women, half work full time. In many cases they are the sole breadwinners, raising a family on \$ 10,700 a year, he said. Clinton wants to raise the minimum wage \$ 1 over two years. A dollar raise would give them \$ 2,000 more a year, not much, but enough to buy a family of four groceries for seven months or pay their rent check for five.

Last week House Speaker J. Dennis Hastert (R-Ill.) sent Clinton a letter offering a compromise on the minimum wage. But no deal has been struck.

This weekend the Clintons are taking a little break here in the Finger Lakes region. He cut short a round of golf this morning to squeeze in the visit to the state fair in Syracuse.

Though weary from trips to Nigeria, Tanzania, Egypt and Colombia, Clinton showed no sign of flagging as he worked the crowd outside the Exposition Hall, shaking hands, kissing babies and swooning middle-aged women, signing autographs, occasionally breaking into a jog like a quarterback entering the

field, clapping his hands as people cheered.

The Syracuse area may be Republican country, but the folks at the state fair today were pro-Hillary. "Lazio is a downstater," one woman said referring to Rep. Rick Lazio, Hillary Clinton's opponent. "He can stay out."

"Take four more years!" one man shouted at Clinton. "Come back!"

No visit to the state fair would be complete without a sausage sandwich and a stop at the Dinosaur Bar-B-Que stand, owned by a biker couple, Jan Stage and Mike Rotella. There, Hillary Clinton ordered a Gianelli sausage sandwich, which the president pointed out Lazio failed to do during his visit at the state fair.

Enjoying himself, Clinton hoisted himself onto the counter, helped his wife up beside him, and the two dug into their sandwiches, under a sign that read: "Ribs So Good, You'll Slap Yo' Pappy!"

"I love it up here," Clinton said. "I love state fairs."

He also loves politics, and this weekend he managed to do two fundraisers for his wife, who is spending as much time as she can in upstate New York, where her opponent has a natural advantage.

In Syracuse on Friday night, Clinton told 110 people who had paid \$ 1,000 each to feast on "Dinosaur" barbecue that "to an extraordinary extent, **Hillary** has played a substantive, positive role" in the administration's work in **education**, health care and family care.

"I think she can have an enormously beneficial impact for New York all around the country and all around the world," he said.

He charged that Lazio's campaign is "basically trying to do reverse plastic surgery on her."

But for the most part, he tried to keep things light, thanking the neighbors for allowing portable toilets to be put up on their property, thanking the neighbors across the street--who were standing on the lawn--for putting up with the sound--"You get to hear my pitch for free." And then, in what he conceded was a "flat pander," he noted that he has, for the past 27 years, eaten barbecue for a living.

"I come from a place where barbecue is not food, it is a way of life," he said. "It is a philosophy of human nature. I have rarely had any as good as this."

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: September 03, 2000

FOCUSTM

Search: General News;hillary w/10 education

To narrow this search, please enter a word or phrase:

FOCUS

Example: House of Representatives

[About LEXIS-NEXIS](#) | [Terms and Conditions](#) | [What's New](#)
Copyright © 2000 LEXIS-NEXIS Group. All rights reserved.

Copyright 1997 The Christian Science Publishing Society
The Christian Science Monitor

December 1, 1997, Monday

SECTION: FEATURES; ARTS; Pg. 9

LENGTH: 981 words

HEADLINE: Kids Take a Stand on Having Arts in School

BYLINE: Gloria Goodale, Special to The Christian Science Monitor

DATELINE: LOS ANGELES

HIGHLIGHT:

The Getty Center, hosting 'Kids Congress,' leads a push to reintegrate arts education

BODY:

Kids need art.

That's the message that the Getty Center, a private foundation fostering appreciation for the visual arts and humanities, is sending as it prepares to open to the general public on Dec. 16. As its final splashy pre-opening event, the Getty Education Institute (GEI, one of five institutes making up the center) recently hosted a three-day "Kids Congress on Art."

With the aim of allowing youngsters to express their own views about the importance of art in their education, the congress involved middle-school delegates from all 50 states (and a Japanese Army base) along with adults active in the arts and in support of art education.

"We tend to make a lot of decisions based on what we think's important," muses Leilani Lattin Duke, director of the GEI. "A lot of times we forget to ask the kids what they think."

A number of children came from schools currently without arts education, but many were articulate about what the arts meant to them.

As Florida eighth-grader Shelly Petrequin puts it, many children have to choose between band, sports, or art. "Most of the kids never have any art at all," she observes quietly, but adds with conviction, "and they're so important! The arts tell about who you are, about what's really going on in the world, and they help people understand each other."

Indeed, when the institute conceived the idea for the congress two years ago, it asked schools across the country that wanted to participate to each prepare a banner that would illustrate values or qualities of its community. The aim was to illustrate the value of arts being integrated into a school curriculum.

Thousands of schools from all over the United States vied to be chosen; the final entrants were chosen randomly. After the opening congress ceremonies, the banners were hung along the tram path leading up the hill to the Getty Center, where they will remain throughout the center's first year.

South Dakota delegate Lacey Hunter says the experience of gathering information as her school prepared the banner changed the way she saw her community. "We took a lot of walks and usually you're just rushing and you don't see things, but we slowed down and actually looked around."

The banner for Shelly Petrequin's school, Lecanto Middle School, depicts the endangered local manatee, an animal that provokes much discussion about environmental issues among Floridians.

Vermont representative Kyle Thomas takes it one more step, saying that the arts are actually more

practical than a lot of subjects he is required to take in school. "You don't use a lot of those other things, but you'll always use what you learn in art."

As for many of his schoolmates who don't see the value of arts classes, Kyle is equally pragmatic. "That's their choice, but they should at least know what the arts offer."

Actor John Lithgow echoes ideas expressed by many of the students. "Art is indispensable; it is not merely a fun learning tool. We can't do without art. No people ever has. We need it at least as much as we need food," says the performer. "We need our stories. We need to tell them and hear them be told."

Mr. Lithgow continues, "Stories shape our experience. They are like emotional exercises that make us feel human." Lithgow relates the experience of his high school years, in which he began each day with two periods of art instruction. He says it developed in him a habit of openness to new things, what he calls a habit of learning. "That habit of mind, of starting the day with art, is still who I am today," he adds.

In addition to sharing views, the participants sent a resolution on the importance of arts **education to Hillary** Rodham Clinton and received a personal video response.

Getty president Harold Williams spells out what he believes the arts have to offer as part of a fully integrated curriculum. "The next generation will need to be able to interpret visual images for whatever work they do," he observes, adding that he sees the arts as the most basic tool for all the creative, inventive work that will be necessary to keep our culture alive into the next century.

The GEI has positioned itself at the forefront of the push to reintegrate arts into school curricula nationwide with its comprehensive discipline-based arts-education (DBAE) program. It offers supports to teachers working to combine the arts with a larger academic curriculum, among them summer training programs for teaching DBAE at Getty-funded regional institutes around the country. More than 1,000 teachers from 400 districts take courses at these institutes, reaching upwards of a million students nationally. At least 36 states have adopted curriculum frameworks based on a DBAE approach.

While there are those who voice the argument that the arts are a frill that cash-strapped school districts can ill afford, many in the business community are raising their voices in support of a broader-based education.

Says James Houghton, retired chief executive officer of Corning Inc., "The practice and study of the arts is far from peripheral and can be a major building block in giving American business the broad competencies needed as we enter the 21st century." He concludes that the nation's success will depend entirely on the skills of its work force and that a sound grounding in the arts can only enhance those skills.

Looking at the student banners now flanking the Getty tram station, one can see why. Each banner shows the collaborative spirit of dozens of children as they analyzed their communities, pinpointed the highlights, and came together to create a single unified vision of their home. These are valuable life lessons that point to a single conclusion:

Kids need art.

GRAPHIC: PHOTO: SCHOOL DELEGATES: Los Angeles Mayor Richard Riordan greets students at the Kids Congress on Art, which had representatives from all 50 states and featured adults active in the arts. **BY BART BARTHOLOMEW**

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: November 30, 1997

FOCUSTM

Search: General News;hillary w/10 education

To narrow this search, please enter a word or phrase:

FOCUS

Example: **House of Representatives**

[About LEXIS-NEXIS](#) | [Terms and Conditions](#) | [What's New](#)

Copyright © 2000 LEXIS-NEXIS Group. All rights reserved.

Copyright 1997 Times Mirror Company
Los Angeles Times

View Related Topics

July 17, 1997, Thursday, Valley Edition

SECTION: Metro; Part B; Page 3; No Desk

LENGTH: 427 words

SERIES: VALLEY 200: To commemorate the bicentennial of the San Fernando Mission and the San Fernando Valley, for 200 days we will feature people --some famous, some notorious-- who left their mark on the area.

HEADLINE: PRINCIPAL WORKS FROM GRASS ROOTS UP

BYLINE: DUKE HELFAND

BODY:

She has won accolades for turning a lackluster elementary school into a powerhouse learning center.

She has earned the respect--and the enmity--of fellow educators for tirelessly promoting her beloved campus.

She has even become a national spokeswoman for school charter reform, making speeches at education conferences across the country.

As principal of Vaughn Next Century Learning Center in Pacoima, Yvonne Chan rarely shies away from a good challenge--and the publicity it promises.

Chan, 52, is equal parts educator, politician and spitfire saleswoman--raising money to build classrooms, haggling with Los Angeles Unified School District administrators over finances, always searching for new ways to improve the school, which serves students through the fifth grade.

Vaughn is among a handful of charter schools in the school district. Such campuses set their own educational agendas and enjoy a large degree of freedom from the rules and bureaucracy that govern most public schools.

Under Chan's direction, Vaughn was one of the first schools in the district to reduce class sizes for first through third grades. The school also has juggled schedules, extending the school year and allowing all students to attend simultaneously.

The school's innovations have drawn interest from reporters, **education** reformers, even **Hillary** Rodham Clinton. The first lady visited the campus in February 1996 and touted the school as a model for improving education.

Now Chan, a first-generation Chinese American who lives in Northridge, is embarking on her latest projects. One of them involves building a campus learning center that will allow the school to extend class-size reduction to fifth grade by early next year, she says.

"I'm going to be here until all this happens," Chan said. "You always need someone at the grass-roots level to make sure that this happens."

GRAPHIC: PHOTO: Yvonne Chan

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: December 21, 1998

FOCUSTM

Search: General News;hillary w/10 education

To narrow this search, please enter a word or phrase:

FOCUS

Example: House of Representatives

[About LEXIS-NEXIS](#) | [Terms and Conditions](#) | [What's New](#)
Copyright © 2000 LEXIS-NEXIS Group. All rights reserved.

Copyright 1997 The Washington Post
The Washington Post

View Related Topics

March 12, 1997, Wednesday, Final Edition

SECTION: A SECTION; Pg. A09

LENGTH: 876 words

HEADLINE: First Lady Reprises Old Role; Little Rock Journey Spotlights Education

BYLINE: John F. Harris, Washington Post Staff Writer

DATELINE: LITTLE ROCK, March 11

BODY:

First lady Hillary Rodham Clinton was back on home turf today. The faces were familiar, and so was the subject.

There was even an echo, as she stumped in Arkansas on behalf of the Clinton administration's proposal for national educational standards and testing, of her old role as a public point person on behalf of her husband's agenda.

Fourteen years ago, **education** was the issue on which **Hillary** Clinton established her reputation as a full partner with her husband, then the governor of this state, in crafting policy. These days, she and aides take pains to say, she is not crafting the policy, but her appearances here and earlier in Washington this week make plain she plans to be unabashed in promoting it.

For the first lady, the fight over educational standards is a chance to confront old foes. Social conservatives, many of whom bridle at suggestions for an expanded federal government role for **education**, are also the people who bridled most at the expanded role **Hillary** Clinton sought for the office of first lady early in the first term.

On other occasions, she has blamed vilification from what she called "right-wing" advocacy groups for some of the problems she and her husband have faced in promoting policies. One purpose of her public appearances, she said in a Monday gathering with reporters, is to create enough support from the general public to counteract conservative complaints that this is "an attempt to micromanage what goes in the classrooms of America."

So far, she said, the administration's plan to have voluntary testing of fourth-graders in reading and eighth-graders in math has not excited loud protest. "We just don't see it," Clinton said. "It may burn up some radio talk show host's phone line."

But the voices of dissent are just beginning to clear their throats. Some critics believe that the voluntary tests, to be drafted by the Education Department, could be a precursor to more intrusive efforts by the government to set curricula and wrest control in other ways from localities and parents.

"What's voluntary the first time ends up being mandatory the next time," said Michael P. Farris, who heads an advocacy group for parents who teach their children at home and who became a hero of social conservatives after his unsuccessful run for Virginia lieutenant governor in 1993. "There will be a coercion that follows -- either direct coercion or implied."

But even a critic like Farris said he has no problem with the first lady taking a prominent role in the

policy debate. Given her past involvement with education and the welfare of the young, he said, "it's a more natural fit than health care."

Edward Kelly, a former Little Rock school superintendent who now runs the Prince William County public schools in Northern Virginia, agreed. In Arkansas, Kelly recalled, Hillary Clinton was "a strong voice," who was instrumental in building public support by making the case that "education is absolutely critical" to the state's future economic success.

In Arkansas, her husband appointed her to an educational task force. Ultimately, the state passed a tax increase to pay for additional educational spending, but linked it with testing of teachers to reassure the public that instructional quality was high.

The problem with the Clintons' effort this time, Kelly warned, is that it promises to be less substantive than what they did in Arkansas. While some conservatives worry that testing may be the start of something big, Kelly said many educators worry it is just the latest example of something small. "We've got plenty of data from existing tests that can tell us how our kids are doing, the question is what are we going to do about it," Kelly said. "There's a feeling of 'Ho, hum, here we go again, another national movement.'"

The first lady's day trip to Arkansas -- 17 hours round-trip -- had something none of her previous domestic trips have: reporters. The change is part of her plan gradually to increase her public profile and identification with policy issues. This follows more than two years of relative retreat following the defeat of the administration's plan to overhaul health care in 1994.

Since then, the first lady has taken an activist role on some lower-profile issues, such as "Gulf War Syndrome" and promoting "microcredit" programs of small loans for low-income people trying to start businesses. But this week represents her most visible effort to sell a proposal at the heart of her husband's second-term agenda.

By holding a lengthy news conference on Monday to answer questions about her and her staff's role in Democratic fund-raising, the first lady helped assure this controversy did not shadow her homecoming today.

She began the day by viewing damage left from recent tornadoes. A trailer park she visited in nearby Benton was reduced to rubble -- looking more like a landfill than a former neighborhood of 60 trailers.

This evening, at an event to promote scholarships for single parents, the first lady said the task of finding jobs and education for the needy has become more urgent: "With the president's signature on welfare reform, we no longer have a national safety net. We have a big challenge ahead of us."

GRAPHIC: Photo, reuter/jeff mitchell, First lady Hillary Rodham Clinton and FEMA official Raymond "Buddy" Young walk through a tornado-battered mobile home park near Little Rock.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 12, 1997

FOCUS™

Search: General News;hillary w/10 education

To narrow this search, please enter a word or phrase:

FOCUS

Copyright 2000 The Washington Post
The Washington Post

View Related Topics

September 10, 2000, Sunday, Final Edition

SECTION: MAGAZINE; Pg. W10

LENGTH: 8481 words

HEADLINE: The Last Chance Presidency; He's outlasted friends and enemies alike. But Bill Clinton still feels he has a lot to prove -- and time is running out

BYLINE: John F. Harris, Washington Post Staff Writer

BODY:

Still his airplane. The indignities of commercial travel, or hustling jets from rich friends, were still a few months away. So Bill Clinton made him-self comfortable aboard Air Force One on a Saturday night in June as the great plane streaked across the continent -- away from the gaggle of entertainment moguls and celebrities who had loudly cheered him during a sprint of fundraising appearances in Los Angeles, toward the empty, spouseless, second-story apartment otherwise known as the White House living quarters.

His shoes were off, his feet were on the couch. One hand held a Diet Coke, leaving the other free to point, wave and chop the air. The mood and moment were perfect for lecturing his way from one coast to the other.

And he had an appreciative audience. Sharing the ride was Commerce Secretary Bill Daley, who just days before had been tapped by Vice President Gore to be the latest head of his campaign. For a year, the operating assumption of Gore and his campaign had been that the disgraced incumbent was a terrible burden to be overcome. Daley's view, as he had expressed it privately to friends, was, "Anyone who thinks that is an idiot." Why not reap the benefits of association with -- and advice from -- the most successful Democratic politician of this generation?

Why not indeed, is Clinton's view. His airborne discourse that night was an especially spirited rendition of a performance he has delivered hundreds of times this year -- usually in private with friends or aides, but occasionally blurted out publicly in some

after-dinner speech or interview when his certitude got the better of him. It is Clinton's new self-appointed role: consultant in chief.

The president ran down the list of names then in play to be the vice presidential nominees for both Gore and George W. Bush, clinically dissecting the merits and problems of each. He told Daley: Here's the argument you need to make against Bush, unfolding the attack line by line, phrase by phrase. And here's the argument Gore needs to make for himself, line by line, phrase by phrase.

Then Clinton turned to his own role. Come autumn, Clinton said, he would be in the thick of battle against congressional Republicans over the budget. Normally, when vice presidents run for the top job it's best for the sitting president to recede into the shadows. But by the particular logic of this year -- happy coincidence! -- the best thing for Gore would be for Clinton to keep a high profile as a fully engaged president, activist to the end, framing the debate on behalf of Democrats.

"I can help here," Clinton said.

I can help here. It says much about Bill Clinton's drive for self-justification that a president who never commanded a majority in a presidential election, who endured a succession of personal scandals that culminated in impeachment, whose character is disapproved of by a large majority of Americans -- even by those who say they support his presidency -- finds it perfectly reasonable to presume that he would be a splendid asset to any other politician fortunate enough to be associated with him.

It says something about America on the brink of the post-Clinton era that he may well be right.

Bill Clinton has outlasted everyone. Those who despise him, no less than those who adore him, now operate in a political landscape in which Clinton methods and Clinton values reign. This is a place where judgments are never final, and reality is always pliable, where it really does depend on what the meaning of is is. A great president or a disgraced one? A peacemaking statesman or a perjurer whose home state authorities are seeking to have disbarred? A tempered idealist or a money-chasing, poll-obsessed cynic? There is no right answer, only an argument that goes on and on -- rest assured it will not end on January 20, 2001 -- and that Clinton devoutly believes he is winning bit by bit.

Which may be more than wishful thinking. Almost exactly two years after Clinton's survival looked to be in doubt -- on that September morning when he told a White House prayer breakfast that he had reached "rock bottom truth" and announced that he was beginning spiritual counseling -- he is on his way to arguably the most successful and energetic final year in the history of the modern presidency.

Truman left office despised. Eisenhower left beloved, but in slumber. Kennedy was killed, Johnson crushed, Nixon evicted, Ford and Carter both defeated. Reagan at the end was drifting into senescence, and Bush was staggering from forces he neither anticipated nor understood. Now comes Clinton, whose ordeals were more searingly personal than those of his predecessors. And he is not slumping to the finish line but sprinting.

"In terms of personal credit," Clinton said in an interview for this story, "you know, presidencies go through several incarnations, many of which occur after they're long gone. I have had the opportunity just in my service as president to read about administrations, including administrations that most Americans don't know much about. And I see all the time there is this sort of constant process of reassessment about every period in our history. So I'll leave that to history."

But not just yet. For now, he's a man in a hurry. The finish line isn't a goal to be reached so much as an enemy to be defied. "I'll make a little confession," he said. "The only thing that I am feeling about this last year is that I just want to keep working, I never want to sleep."

He didn't get much sleep, in any event, on the day of our conversation early last month. It began at 6 a.m. when he left the White House for a day trip to tour forest fires in Idaho. After a four-hour flight, he found himself on a small helicopter receiving an airborne tour of the fire zone.

Clinton began the helicopter ride in a lively spirit. His manner was at once more imperial, and more colloquial, than he shows in public. "I'm cold. Are you cold? It's cold in here," he honked, his Southern accent a bit thicker than I'm used to hearing. "Let's do something about the temperature!" It was like he was doing a Lyndon Johnson impersonation. By his feet was a

garment bag with a change of clothes, but Clinton said he didn't care if the clothes he was wearing got a little wrinkled. "What the heck is this doing here? Let's get that out of here." He munched on a bagel and a banana, and listened as Forest Service Chief Mike Dombeck gave a tour. Clinton had many questions: How fast do the fires move? Isn't it true that more logging would do nothing to curb fires? Dombeck remarked on the enormous energy contained in the lightning bolts that start many fires. "That's a good argument," the president cracked, "for getting off the golf course" in a storm.

Within minutes, though, the chatter trailed off. While Dombeck was still talking, the president's eyes closed behind the sunglasses he was wearing. He was asleep.

He woke up a few minutes later and picked up right where he left off with more questions and comments about the burned expanse below.

Air Force One landed back in Washington 14 hours after taking off. But Clinton wasn't going home. Instead, another helicopter was waiting to take him on an hour flight to a fundraiser in Charlottesville. He didn't return to the White House until nearly 1 a.m., 19 hours after the day began.

This day was noteworthy only because it was routine. While his aides circulate their resumes, Clinton circulates himself. His days are a comic juxtaposition of the grand and the trivial. Ennobling moments come hard up against embarrassing ones. He jets overseas for international summits (seven trips and 13 countries so far this year), then jets back home to raise money for obscure members of Congress (some \$ 75 million at 115 events for various Democrats between the first of the year and the end of the Democratic convention). He phones Jerusalem to talk with Prime Minister Ehud Barak about Mideast peace, then dials his lawyer, David Kendall, to talk about the Little Rock proceedings to strip his law license. One day brings a searching sermon on education, and what America will be like a hundred years from now. Another brings a reminder from the world's most powerful man that Americans should be sure to handle their food safely this holiday weekend to avoid salmonella.

With just four months left in his presidency, he remains the Jupiter of our national space. He dominates any appearance as effortlessly as on the day he arrived. He is so dominant, in fact, that even his wife, Hillary Rodham Clinton, now running for the Senate from New York, has had to weigh carefully how often he should be allowed to appear on her behalf.

Both of his would-be successors labor in his shadow. Al Gore thought his problem would be that voters would assume he is another Bill Clinton. It turns out his more likely problem is that many voters have appraised his clumsy reinventions -- the tinny, artificial voice he brings to the artifices of politics -- and concluded: This guy is no Bill Clinton; now there is someone sincerely good at artifice. George W. Bush, meanwhile, is running a campaign that amounts to a daily salute to the incumbent. While the Republican promises to restore the lost honor of the presidency, he crafts a centrist strategy that is lifted expressly from Clinton's book on how to command the middle ground in American politics.

Part of the mythology about Clinton is that he is the Great Compartmentalizer, capable of putting unpleasant subjects out of mind while he concentrates on the business at hand. This was always fiction, "pure bunk," in the words of a former aide who once helped promote it. He and many colleagues now acknowledge that during the Monica Lewinsky scandal Clinton often seemed utterly lost to the world, overcome by a combination of rage toward his opponents and recrimination toward his own weak self.

It turns out the real compartmentalizer is the public itself. The Clinton years have enveloped all America in one dysfunctional family. Things that once seemed extravagantly weird -- a president who goes to pastoral therapy sessions once a week to recover from his sex addiction; a first lady who moves out of the White House to run for office in a state where she never lived -- now seem routine. And everyone has learned to avert their gaze from those

sides of Clinton they prefer not to see.

Those who hate Clinton can't bear it. Not only has he survived, he has mastered the office of the presidency as thoroughly as any occupant since Franklin D. Roosevelt. Never mind if you agree with his ends. Think only of sheer competence. The public can see part of it: the casual fluency he shows at news conferences, or the ease with which he trumps congressional Republicans in public relations battles over legislation. There is much that remains unseen: the way Clinton has merged his polling and policy operations, so that he almost never gets caught flat-footed by an emerging issue or controversy. Or the way that Clinton, no matter how controversial at home, moves nimbly among foreign heads of state, clearly the dominant figure at any summit. It strains memory now to think of the first-term Clinton, how callow he seemed, how often his fumbling White House was swamped by Washington and left timid and confused by events overseas.

Set aside, if you prefer, sheer competence. Think only of appearance. Clinton's hair is full gray now, and his weight still goes up and down. But the combined visual effect is one of maturity and command. Alone among modern presidents, he actually looks better at the end of his term than he did at the beginning. The conclusion is inescapable: This is a man with an endless capacity for recovery and growth -- by far his most appealing characteristic -- and he is in tangible ways a better president than he was before.

But those ready to glorify Clinton can't face another truth: In maddening ways, he is unchanged, a recidivist to the end. His sense of selfish grievance -- by far his most unappealing characteristic -- still erupts with dreary frequency. Clinton is the Old Faithful of whining. In late July, shortly after a new poll showed Hillary Clinton running behind her GOP opponent in New York, Clinton moaned in an interview with a Miami Fox TV affiliate, "Everybody that always hated me all those years and were so mean to me, they've all transferred all their anger to her now. It's almost as if they've got one last chance to beat me."

And there is the familiar flight from reality over Lewinsky. He has apologized for the affair ad infinitum but to understand how Clinton really feels you must listen to the apologies very carefully. What he did was a "personal mistake," he concedes, but as events recede he becomes more defiant than ever that he does not bear responsibility for its public consequences. He paid a judge's \$ 90,000 fine for providing false testimony under oath, he says, to get the matter over with, not because he lied. He settled the Paula Jones case, he said at an April news conference, because the appeals court that would have heard the matter was politically biased against him. And then there was his interview in May with WAMU's Diane Rehm, when she asked what effect the White House years had had on his marriage: "Oh, I think it's been good for ours, because I got to live above the store." His own aides rolled their eyes: What planet is he on? Of course, it was this penchant for denial that some friends believe led to the scandal in the first place.

And the scandal led to the imperative of 2000: to try to cleanse the stain by having the most hyperkinetic final year in office that any president has ever had. Clinton may not have exorcised his demons -- the vanity or the compulsiveness -- but he does seem to have harnessed them to a higher purpose. He wants to negotiate Mideast peace, elect Hillary, beat Republicans on the budget, solve Northern Ireland, elect Gore, travel to Vietnam, raise money for his library, win back the Congress.

Bill Clinton, as ever, wants it all.

The news was bad, and it was greeted by an explosion of presidential profanity and indignation. "They're trying to destroy my last year in office," he hissed.

This thunder was provoked when an adviser reported back to Clinton on a conversation with a

man who under other circumstances has been an important administration ally: AFL-CIO President John Sweeney. The labor leader told the Clinton emissary that union political strategists believed that they now had the votes to defeat the president on his most important legislative priority of the year, and one of the most important of his presidency: a vote on whether to extend permanent normal trading status to China. Labor's vehemence was well understood; the vote cut straight to the fissure in the Democratic Party over trade. But Clinton was feeling unappreciated. Think of all he had done for working Americans, he railed, and think of how much he had riding on this vote over China. And he was being killed by his friends.

As it happened, Sweeney's optimism was premature. Clinton won the May trade vote, and by a surprisingly wide margin. The presidential outburst was noteworthy, though, in several ways. It was a reminder that the stereotype about Clinton -- that he is a risk-averse leader who allows politics to trump all -- can be unfair. His first instinct is to avoid conflict. But in this case, as in several previous episodes in his presidency, Clinton defied the most expedient course and took on a fight with a powerful constituency in his own party. And Clinton's line about the union wrecking the last year of his presidency underscores something else: He is in the midst of what surely counts as one of the most methodically, and self-consciously, organized closing acts in White House history.

"Legacy" is a word that Chief of Staff John Podesta has banned from the Clinton White House, lest Clinton be perceived as a lame duck trying to score last-minute points on some historical ledger. Even so, several current and former White House aides say Clinton has approached the year with an acute sense of history and of the fact that the window is swiftly closing on the chance to make it.

What was once perhaps a chaotic and random White House operation has become among the most controlled. So in late 1999, White House senior adviser Douglas Sosnik (who has since departed for a job with the National Basketball Association) began at Clinton's instruction to prepare a detailed final-year road map. The process began with a question for the boss: What was important?

Clinton had a long list of legislative proposals, from HMO reform to gun control to increasing the minimum wage, but most of these fell in a second-tier category: It would be fine if they passed, but hardly a disaster if they didn't. The China trade vote was the paramount exception, a must-win issue. For once, a Clinton legislative effort was not conducted with the equivalent of an end-of-semester all-nighter. For weeks, Clinton worked over wavering House members of his own party, lecturing them in small groups in the Yellow Oval Room of the White House, bending their ears in phone calls.

Several foreign affairs issues -- sketched in a memo from national security adviser Sandy Berger -- likewise fell in the no-nonsense category. A president who was once uncomfortable with foreign policy, aides say, has developed over time -- like many of his predecessors -- a preference for this part of the job. And foremost among his ambitions is the Middle East. Clinton, according to several people close to him, sees the intractable rivalries and hatreds of the region as filled with redemptive possibilities, a noble use for his powers of seduction and persuasion. He once made this point publicly, during the height of the Lewinsky scandal, when he said that laboring to close the gaps between Israel and Palestinians was part of his "personal journey of atonement." In the months before July's Camp David summit, which brought the two sides closer than ever but ended without agreement, Clinton worked the issue assiduously, usually without publicity. There were 30 presidential phone calls between January and July to Barak and Palestinian Authority Chairman Yasser Arafat.

"I think he believes all things are doable," says former senator Dale Bumpers, who has been friendly with Clinton since their days as Arkansas pols. "I think he thinks he is a great facilitator, and that he can use that for good, and I agree with him . . . Most of us at the end of our political careers start to realize, this is history-making time, and I think he's afflicted with

that."

There were other questions as Clinton and his team planned out how they wanted this chapter of history to read. Where did Clinton want to travel? (A planned November trip to Vietnam was a priority.) What could he do to help Gore, Hillary and congressional Democrats? (Raise money, lots of it.) How much time would Clinton need for legal battles, including the fight over disbarment and an ongoing probe into 1996 fundraising? (One adviser says that while legal matters don't require vast amounts of time, they do take "far more psychic energy" from Clinton than he lets on; aides have learned to cushion his schedule accordingly.)

All this planning took place with an awareness that the natural cycles of politics were working against an eighth-year incumbent. Aides carefully looked at the calendar for dates when all eyes would not be on the presidential candidates, when Clinton would be able to "break through" and attract news coverage. The planning also took into account a more personal factor: Perhaps no president has ever sought the office more intensely, or savored the emotional rewards that come with it more exquisitely.

"We wanted to plan a year that would allow him to inhale the job," recalls Sosnik.

Some old advisers marvel that he is still so interested in inhaling. Few people have endured more during Washington's war over Clinton these past eight years than former White House deputy chief of staff Harold Ickes. He has been called to testify under oath 35 times before sundry congressional panels and in grand jury proceedings and depositions. Weary himself, Ickes notes of his former boss: "He doesn't seem tired, he doesn't seem worn out, there's no sense of ennui."

One person who has worked for the administration offers this guide to understanding Clinton's presidency: Think of this not as year eight but rather as year two of the fourth consecutive presidency Clinton has occupied. There was the first presidency, when he was surrounded by Arkansas loyalists and young campaign aides still swooning from their first political crush. This was the presidency of the successful 1993 budget bill and, disastrously, health care reform. That led to the repudiation of the 1994 elections, which led in turn to the second Clinton presidency, the one in which Republican consultant Dick Morris held sway, refashioning Clinton for reelection. This led logically to the reign of Chief of Staff Erskine Bowles, a conservative businessman, who trekked regularly to Capitol Hill to strike deals with Republicans. Then came scandal, and the third Clinton presidency, sending Clinton back into the embrace of congressional Demo-crats as survival became the all-consuming goal. Now Clinton is in stage four, the Last Chance Presidency.

At times, while his aides juggle job interviews and goodbye parties, Clinton appears to be the only person in this White House not coasting. "There's nothing, when you put it in front of him, that he doesn't want to do," says Jim Steinberg, who recently departed as deputy national security adviser. As Clinton himself told me, "I can rest starting at noon on January 20th."

It is revealing to look at the people around Clinton now. The star-struck young aides, like George Stephanopoulos before his disillusionment, or the longtime associates, like Morris or Mack McLarty, or the personal friends, like Bowles -- those sorts of people are nearly all gone. Overwhelmingly, the senior White House is made up of Washington operatives, like Chief of Staff Podesta, or his deputy, Steve Ricchetti, both veteran lobbyists. The anonymous Sosnik spent far more intimate time around Clinton than the famous Stephanopoulos ever did. But he was never under any illusion about his real role, basically that of a lawyer to a client. In year eight, romance has been replaced by professionalism.

Also realism. In their clinical detachment, some aides wonder if his admirable energy is approaching a worrisome frenzy. In June, Clinton was preparing with aides for a news conference later that day. Usually, Clinton nibbles a healthful raisin bagel during such sessions. But this time he was shoveling down food, a full meal in moments. Perhaps he was

just hungry. But here is how you have learned to think if you are a veteran of the Clinton White House: Uh-oh. He eats like that when he's out of control. And when he's out of control bad things happen. So as the meeting broke up, one aide confessed to wondering: What new surprise is hurtling toward us now?

Hillary Clinton, the new Senate nominee, had just finished her acceptance speech at the New York Democratic Party Convention in Albany this past May when she and her husband met with supporters at a reception. His presence in Albany was a last-minute surprise. His aides told reporters he had decided only that morning that he simply could not miss this occasion. And now Clinton told the crowd that the thing that had been holding him back before was a previous commitment he had made to the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund. "So I told that group, 'I've been with you a long time, and if you let me go hear my wife give a speech, I'll do any event you want, anywhere in America,'" Clinton said.

Here is a fine specimen of Clinton phraseology. Words are for him the currency in a negotiation with reality, in which a statement can qualify as true so long as it is not demonstrably false. In fact, he had been waiting for more than a week for word on whether he would be allowed to go to Albany. Hillary Clinton's two most important advisers, Mark Penn and Mandy Grunwald, had been against it, sources familiar with the deliberations say, feeling that his presence would send a not-so-subliminal message that her campaign is really about him. Other aides, including press secretary Howard Wolfson, felt just as strongly: It looks weird when a candidate's spouse does not show up at an event that most normal couples would attend together. The candidate sided first with the stay-away side, brooded some more, then reversed herself.

The very existence of such a debate underscores the transcendent weirdness of the New York campaign. The paradox is that even as she has moved physically apart from the president, the campaign has underscored, and strengthened, their closeness.

To the astonishment of many who work with both of them, the relationship is by all appearances as strong as it has ever been. They talk constantly, aides say, often several times a day. He is informed about and often the decisive adviser on every aspect of her Senate campaign. One old Arkansas friend of his isn't surprised that the relationship has seemingly rebounded so swiftly from the Lewinsky catastrophe. "This is a relationship that thrives on distance," says the friend. With Hillary in New York, this theory goes, the president can nurture the idealized portrait that he has always had of her virtues. And now that she is immersed in a project that is truly her own, say people close to her, she more than ever appreciates and benefits from the extraordinary political mind that first attracted her to him.

For her major speeches, he sometimes takes hours out of his schedule to help with her presentation. Drafts of the text, an adviser recalls, go back and forth between New York and Washington. "B, what do you think of this?" she asks. He scribbles up the page with notations, then adds, "I love you, B."

"I'm not kidding," the adviser who told me this added hastily.

It is true, however, that the Senate campaign's origins lie emphatically in the year of scandal. The story line Hillary Clinton has promoted is that she was taken aback when New York Democrats in early 1999 began talking her up as a possible candidate. But this notion of her being drafted into service is contradicted by a White House adviser, who recalls the Clintons in the fall of 1998 talking in dead earnest about her running. It was plain then that her heart was set on it from the moment incumbent Daniel Patrick Moynihan made clear he was retiring -- and well before even a murmur of public speculation had been heard.

The president offered only encouragement. In the wake of the scandal, the scales in the

marriage were weighted heavily in her favor. "His view was that whatever she wanted, he was going to give her," says a former White House aide. "This was a project for them to work on together."

The project has shown something else: In a way that unsettles some of her admirers, Hillary is more like Bill than many people imagined. Her approach toward even longtime Clinton loyalists has become frankly utilitarian; several of these people say that when they told her they thought running for Senate was a bad idea, she turned cold before their eyes. Even her chief of staff, **Melanne Verveer**, was cast into a secondary orbit, sources say, after arguing that Hillary had nothing to gain by making the race.

If there is a compartmentalizer in this marriage, it is her, not him. One White House aide recalls conversations with her in the thick of the sex scandal, in which she analyzed defense strategies with the incisive detachment of a lawyer discussing a client. Diane Blair, the Arkansas political scientist who was Hillary's best friend before her death from cancer this summer, once told a White House aide that the first lady had never discussed Clinton's adultery with her during countless conversations in the year of Lewinsky.

There is a popular view, which many of her advisers once endorsed, that Bill and Hillary represent two distinct poles in the Clinton Enterprise. She is the ideologue, eager to win but motivated principally by the higher cause; he is the compromiser, eager to do good but motivated principally by the imperative of victory. But it is Bill Clinton's brand of politics that is the animating force of her campaign.

Nothing illustrates this more than a tense episode early this year when she was deciding who to hire as her media adviser. The job had been all but offered, several sources say, to a veteran Chicago political consultant named David Axelrod. The president himself then weighed in with another idea: Hire Mark Penn. He was already signed on as pollster for both Hillary's campaign and the White House. Clinton believed he should take on an additional role in shaping her campaign's message.

"That was her decision," Clinton said in our conversation, acknowledging that he had been thoroughly familiar with it. "She's got the best of both worlds because [Axelrod] is working for the state party."

The significance of Penn is that he, more than any other adviser, is the architect of the president's successful effort to define and occupy the political center. Penn believes that swing voters are moved not so much by a candidate's inspiring rhetoric or compelling personal biography, but by concrete issues whose popularity is scientifically ascertained through exhaustive polling. It is a data-driven approach to politics, wonderfully suited to a president who inhales data, and over the years the smooth pol and the rumped pollster have established a remarkable communion.

But whether that communion can be transferred successfully to Hillary is another matter. The May convention speech was a perfect example of why her Senate campaign has left some longtime supporters despondent. It was a collection of issue slogans -- I support a patients' bill of rights, I support a prescription drug benefit for Medicare, I support targeted tax cuts for education -- delivered in a voice raised to a shout. It was as if someone had called the Democratic National Committee and said, "I can't tell you the name of the candidate, but fax me a stump speech right away!" There was scarcely a word about her biography, her values, her personal reasons for running.

"We have lost the real Hillary in this campaign," says one campaign adviser.

The president emphatically rejects this, constantly professing admiration at her emergence as a politician in her own right. He confesses that he sometimes bobbles his own role as supportive spouse. In July, an old Arkansas colleague turned adversary leveled a lurid

allegation that Hillary Clinton had hurled antisemitic slurs at him 26 years ago. Clinton called the New York Daily News to defend her. "It may not have even been the right thing to do," he said in our interview, "because all it did was sort of give more visibility to a charge that was hokum."

His old aide Harold Ickes, who is informally advising her campaign, says the occasionally awkward reversal of roles between Bill and Hillary has led to a new dimension in the relationship. "There's a deeper appreciation," he says. "She understands now how good he is, and how difficult it is to do what he does."

If the 2000 campaign has strengthened Bill Clinton's relations with Hillary, it has grievously strained his relationship with his other partner, Vice President Gore. Episodically over the past year there have been reports from anonymous Clinton sympathizers describing the president's anger at Gore's attempts to distance himself from Clinton's scandals by ostentatiously volunteering how upset he was by the Lewinsky affair.

But Clinton's predominant emotion, several White House aides say, is one of bewilderment. He is genuinely confused by Gore's clumsy efforts at disassociation, and he is baffled by Gore's deficiencies in the theater of politics. "I think Clinton is just incredibly frustrated," says one longtime political adviser. "He's thinking, 'Why doesn't he say it like this? Here's what the ads should say.'"

Clinton and his team are also irritated by what, from their vantage point, looks like an effort to prematurely end the Clinton presidency. The one consistent theme of the Gore team's complaints is that Clinton, with his ability to command the spotlight, is stepping on the vice president's message. "They think that we're getting the eight seconds on the evening news that they should be getting," said a senior White House official before Gore's nomination. "They don't realize they're not getting the eight seconds anyway."

From the Gore camp's vantage point, Clinton's performance epitomizes the selfishness of the man. But if anything, this year Clinton has shown a concern for others that some doubted he had. He has willingly shared his political talents -- for endorsements, fundraising or behind-the-scenes advice -- with any Democrat who has asked (and with some who didn't).

"He is fully conversant with every race," says Sen. Robert Torricelli of New Jersey, who heads the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee and has traveled extensively with Clinton this year. "He knows the polls, he knows the issues. There is almost no level of detail with which he is not familiar." Torricelli recalls flying recently on Air Force One to raise money for Demo-cratic Sen. Ron Wyden of Oregon. Clinton spent the flight giving Wyden a discourse on how to win his own campaign.

As for Hillary Clinton, she acknowledged her own debt to her husband in her speech in Albany. In a line that aides insist she added to the speech spontaneously -- and which left some of them aghast -- Hillary turned to her husband and said, "I would not be standing here tonight if it were not for Bill."

At a commencement speech at Carleton College in June, an aide slipped the president a note saying that Syria's Hafez Assad had died. Clinton rubbed his eyes, deep in thought. For that moment he was leader of the world. Ten minutes later he was something else: a politician so repellent that one young woman walked straight past the outstretched hand he extended to each graduate. The woman said later she cannot abide Clinton. The president, confidants say, especially hates it when young people reject him (a year before when several graduates at the University of Chicago would not shake his hand, aides say, he stewed for days).

These jarring contrasts come all the time. One Monday afternoon came news that a legal

ethics panel in Arkansas had announced it would seek to have Clinton disbarred for his misleading testimony under oath in the Paula Jones case. On Wednesday came triumph: Clinton had succeeded in his top legislative priority of the year, when the House of Representatives deferred to his request to give permanent trading status to China. And that night came eulogy: 13,000 Democrats gathered at MCI Center for a massive fundraiser and a celebration of his legacy.

If everyone could agree that Clinton is a talented, and lucky, rascal who screwed some things up and did pretty damn well with others, we probably could agree to end our national argument over him. The Clintons believe it is the right wing that won't let the argument die. But the hagiographic video tribute at MCI Center made clear how incapable Clinton himself is of calling a truce. The president can't be a decent guy, he must be a saintly one. His achievements can't be scattershot and satisfactory; they must be epochal. So the debate drones on, and Clinton wears a halo one moment and horns the next.

These days, the prospect of being stripped of his law license horrifies him. For several days before the judicial ethics committee's decision to pursue disbarment came down, Clinton had been predicting the very action the panel took (its recommendation has forced a trial scheduled in Little Rock for later this year). The panel was biased, he told aides, since everyone on the panel who knew or had supported him had been hectoring into recusing themselves from the vote. "This is a setup deal," Clinton insisted, according to a friend who talked with him.

On the day the ethics panel's decision came, Clinton was set to talk with NBC's Tom Brokaw. In the space of just one answer, Clinton displayed the full rainbow of his self-justifying strategies. First came denial, as Clinton reiterated that he never lied in the Paula Jones case. Then selflessness: He knew he would "always be at a severe disadvantage" defending himself "because I will not personally involve myself in any of this until I'm no longer president." In fact, "the only reason I agreed even to have papers filed" by lawyers was to uphold precedent. Finally, victimhood: Other cases involving "more significant kinds of conduct" than he engaged in had led to "nowhere near this kind of decision."

He came into office as the Man From Hope, and Clinton plainly hopes to leave that way as well. But there is one theme that has snaked darkly around and under the optimistic image Clinton seeks to project to the world. It is grievance.

In September two years ago, Clinton summoned his Cabinet to apologize for the Lewinsky affair, and he made a startling admission: He had been angry nearly every day of his presidency.

I told him in our interview that I was astonished to learn that he had harbored this much resentment, and asked him if he did still. "I'm not by nature an angry person," he said, adding, "I work on it all the time."

Then he launched into the second unprompted discourse on the Whitewater scandal in the interview. "I think that this whole Whitewater business will be looked upon by any rational observer in history as an absurd episode in American history which didn't amount to a hill of beans," he said. "And that the coverage of it as if it were serious required people essentially to suspend all ordinary notions of proof and common sense . . . And now we know, after all this time, that Whitewater thing was a total sham."

The specificity with which loyal Arkansas friends detail years-old resentments suggests something of Clinton's view. In an interview, Jim Blair, the Clinton friend who got unwanted fame as the person who helped Hillary with her commodities trades, dissected New York Times articles that ran more than eight years ago.

White House aides say Clinton himself still engages in similar exercises. Earlier this year he

knew all the best nuggets in a book by Jeffrey Toobin that was critical of Ken Starr. And when The Washington Post assigned a writer from the anti-Clinton American Spectator to review the book, he howled indignantly in conversations with his press secretary, Joe Lockhart, and political consultant James Carville. "What more do you need to know?" said Clinton, who with Hillary has long believed this newspaper has a vendetta against them over Whitewater.

One former aide who remains on good terms with Clinton says it is nearly impossible to overstate the sense of victimhood he feels. He loved the revelations about Newt Gingrich's affair, not out of any special animus toward the fallen speaker, but as proof of the vast hypocrisy he sees all around him in Washington.

"I think it still bothers him," says Paul David Leopoulos, an old Arkansas friend. "He was not allowed to be president. They changed all the rules for him."

His eruptions, however, come with less vehemence than before. Every aide and confidant interviewed for this article said Clinton seems far more at peace.

"I think he believes people are starting to understand him more and give him credit," says Rahm Emanuel, a former aide still in steady touch with Clinton.

Clinton said his sense of grievance is abating, in part because of the spiritual counseling sessions he attends. And he is becoming philosophical about one of the abiding mysteries of his career: Why should a centrist politician, whose first instinct is to try to get along with everyone, inspire such hostility? "It's not the dislike, it's the intensity factor," says Blair, recalling the pattern established when Clinton was first elected in Arkansas. "He does not understand it, and it has always bothered him."

Clinton's usual answer is that conservatives are envious of his success. "They railed against entitlements, but they thought they had an entitlement to govern," he said. I've heard him give this explanation dozens of times, but in our interview he offered other theories that showed more detachment. Some of the criticism of him is "based on a certain critique of the '60s . . . I think a lot of them genuinely felt that I represented a lot of things in the culture that they didn't like." He can joke about it now, saying he sometimes feels like the guy who slips and falls off the edge of the Grand Canyon, goes to Heaven and asks God, "Why me?" And God replies: "Son, there's just something about you I don't like." Clinton laughed. "So you've got to allow for that."

Clinton can allow for it, friends say, because there is something liberating about full exposure. After all, what can people say about him now? That he's having sex with an intern? What can they do about it? Impeach him?

Clinton acknowledged as much. "I think part of it is -- when you go through any difficult period it either breaks you or makes you better," he said. "I just wake up every day with this enormous feeling of gratitude. I'm grateful -- I'm grateful to my wife and to my daughter. I've got my family back. I'm grateful to the people who work with me, who stuck with me. And I'm enormously grateful to the American people for continuing to support what I was trying to do for them. To me, every day is a gift now."

When White House aides bring family and friends to tour the West Wing -- which they are allowed to do after 8 p.m. -- it is not uncommon for the president to still be there, shaking hands with some aide's aunt from Moline, or some intern's college roommate from Durham. When Clinton is not there, it usually means he is out. Several times a week, his motorcade cruises through Washington on its way to some fundraiser; often there are two or three fundraisers on a single night.

Still, a former close White House aide to Clinton, contemplating the empty house that greets the president at the end of each workday now that his wife is in New York, surmises, "I think he's really lonely."

If so, it is not the loneliness of solitude, or of Nixonian confessions to the portraits in the White House hallways. In his determination to squeeze all out of this final year, Clinton has apparently resolved to never be by himself.

Many close friends and loyal aides are gone, no longer close or no longer loyal. But Clinton is surrounded by new friends and aides, a great many of whom, like fundraiser Terry McAuliffe, he did not even know when he became president. "I really don't think Bill Clinton has any true friends," says one person who has known and worked with Clinton for two decades. Instead, by this reckoning, he has a constantly shifting universe of companions. Even those who have remained, like his Arkansas chum Leopoulos -- who on a White House visit this spring stayed up talking with Clinton until 5 a.m. -- say he can be marvelous company, but almost never shares what is really going on inside his head.

The ebullient McAuliffe, one of the world's most upbeat men, is perhaps Clinton's most frequent companion these days. He may talk to the president more than any person save Hillary. They stay up late watching movies, or talking until 2 a.m., as they did one night in July, about plans for the Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles, for which McAuliffe was the chairman.

And even when he is alone he is not. There is still the phone. He tracked down Skip Rutherford, an Arkansas crony helping organize the Clinton library, on his cell phone while Rutherford was driving to a Little Rock mall. He tracked down Rahm Emanuel on the beach -- by calling his wife's cell phone. No explanation of how the operators got the number. When the phone rings at 11 p.m. or midnight, or later, Clinton's friends know who it will be. Bill Daley, Gore's campaign chief and an early-to-bed type, says that when Clinton wakes him up at 11 p.m., "I can't remember the next day what I said."

The fact that Clinton is never alone, however, does not demolish a theory held by many of the friends and aides: They believe he is in many ways a solitary man.

"All the activity is his way of coming back" from the shame of scandal, says a longtime aide. "It's his way of getting back up in his head, where he's happiest, and not having to confront the way he feels."

"He's always been like that," says Leopoulos. Though he was constantly in Clinton's home growing up, it was not until he read a magazine article in 1992 that he learned that Clinton's adoptive father was an alcoholic who sometimes turned violent. Why didn't you ever say anything, he asked Clinton. "This is for me to deal with," Clinton replied.

Other people point to the fluidity of his inner circle. Why is it that someone like McAuliffe, who never knew Clinton before he became president, should be his best friend? Why is it that there are so many people to whom Clinton was once close, whether George Stephanopoulos or Dick Morris, who now have no relationship with him at all?

In fact, it is rare for someone to drop out of Clinton's universe completely. But people move constantly between inner and outer orbits. Bruce Lindsey, the Arkansas aide who was the keeper of all secrets during the early days, is still at the White House but less frequently by Clinton's side. The Lewinsky scandal changed many dynamics. Vernon Jordan, while still friendly with Clinton, is hardly the omnipresent figure he used to be, say White House officials. Erskine Bowles, the former chief of staff who was deeply shaken by Clinton's lie to him about Lewinsky, fell a notch or two last year when he told the Clintons he would not help them finance their new house in Westchester County. Instead, McAuliffe stepped in with last-minute help to secure the loan.

All the motion of Clinton's last year, some believe, masks a certain sorrow. "There's clearly a sense of melancholy about leaving" the White House, says Sen. Christopher Dodd of Connecticut, who is among the senators closest to Clinton. "He's counting the days, not because he's looking forward to the end." Dodd recalls watching Clinton nervously at an Irish American dinner Dodd hosted a couple months ago, not wanting the president to get trapped for long at an obligatory event. Then it became clear: "He did not want to leave," Dodd says. "He stayed for three hours."

"History," said the historian Pieter Geyl, "is an argument without end." If so, the argument over Bill Clinton will be continued for many years on the banks of the Arkansas River in Little Rock. It is there that Clinton intends to build the Clinton Center, the library with his presidential papers. And there will also be an apartment where he says he plans to spend perhaps a third to half his time. There will be programs to stimulate debate and new ideas about issues Clinton cares about, from race relations to peacemaking to youth service. The place is expected to cost \$ 150 million to build, a large chunk of which has already been raised in undisclosed large pledges collected by Clinton and McAuliffe from wealthy donors. Not surprisingly, perhaps, the people Clinton has recruited for work on the center are the die-hard defenders -- secret-keepers and loyalists like McAuliffe and Lindsey and Cheryl Mills, the young African American lawyer who argued Clinton's case against conviction on the Senate floor.

Mostly, though, the Clinton Center is the place from which Bill Clinton will launch his next campaign, the one to win the ex-presidency. Skip Rutherford, the Little Rock public relations man who is serving as a principal organizer for the center, predicts Clinton will begin the next phase of his career just as he began his terms as governor and president: by overdoing it. "He will travel, he will write, he will speak, he will campaign for people," Rutherford says. "Forget prioritizing -- he'll try to do it all."

As he has studied the ex-presidency, aides say, Clinton has tried to become closer to a man with whom his relations for a variety of reasons have long been tense, Jimmy Carter. Carter, Clinton now believes, has had the most worthy post-presidential career. Last winter, Clinton invited the Carters to a private dinner at the White House.

But as a younger and more vigorous man than the other living ex-presidents, Rutherford contends, "he will dominate the group."

It is appropriate that the Clinton Center will take root on a patch of land sorely in need of reinvention. Right now the site is a litter-strewn lot adjacent to some dingy warehouses. But it is only a quarter-mile or so down the street from the old Capitol building where Clinton twice claimed election-night victories for the presidency. While the center is being built, Clinton's papers will be stored in a former Oldsmobile dealership nearby.

It is appropriate, too, that the Clinton Center be in Arkansas. It is the place where all roads, smooth and rocky, seem to lead in Clinton's life. The place of sentimental homecomings -- like the kind the Clintons had in July, when they returned to Fayetteville, the first place they lived after their marriage, for an emotional memorial service for Diane Blair. And the place of constant indignities, where the disbarment trial looms and where some dimly remembered name can spring forth to accuse Hillary of antisemitism or Bill of sexual assault. Friends like Jim Blair and Leopoulos, outraged at how Arkansas is treating its native son, say they've encouraged Clinton to say the hell with it and move his presidential papers to Georgetown University. But he says he's not interested in such payback.

In the meantime, there is a race underway -- not Gore against Bush, but Clinton against the clock. Air Force One was on the tarmac, and aides were hovering for the interview to end. I

asked Clinton a last question: Did he think a successful close could cleanse the stains of 1998?

"No," he answered. "I think that the only thing that can cleanse a mistake ever is an apology and an atonement." Clear enough. But then he added: "To the extent that the promise I made to the American people to work like crazy for them every day I was president is a part of that, I think that the answer to your question may be, yes."

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: September 10, 2000

Search within these results:

Search

This will only search up to 1,000 documents, even if your original search retrieved more.

General News;melanne verveer

[About LEXIS-NEXIS](#) | [Terms and Conditions](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Support Identifier](#)
Copyright © 2000 LEXIS-NEXIS Group. All rights reserved.

**PRESIDENT CLINTON HIGHLIGHTS RESULTS OF ADMINISTRATION'S
INVESTMENT IN AMERICA'S EDUCATION PRIORITIES
SEPTEMBER 12, 2000**

Today, President Clinton will release a White House report on educational progress, which highlights the progress America's students are making, and will call on Congress to continue to make critical investments in education. The President will also announce the award of \$46 million in new GEAR UP grants to help disadvantaged students prepare for college and will cite a letter from 104 college presidents calling for full funding for GEAR UP. When President Clinton and Vice President Gore took office in 1992, they embarked on a strategy of improving education by setting high standards for all students, insisting on accountability for results and investing in what works to help students succeed. Since that time, this Administration has doubled the federal investment in education and training, while maintaining a balanced budget and paying down the debt. These investments have resulted in more high quality teachers in our children's classrooms, more after school and summer school programs and more financial assistance available for students to attend college.

THEN AND NOW: INVESTMENT AND PROGRESS. The report released by the President today confirms what research tells us – money matters if it is invested in the right things. More importantly, the report underscores the payoffs from the Clinton-Gore commitment to investing more in our schools, while also demanding more from them. President Clinton and Vice President Gore will continue to fight for more than just higher funding levels, they will also insist that money be spent on America's priorities, like smaller classes, high quality teachers, more after school programs and modern school buildings. The report shows that:

- Math SAT scores are at a thirty-year high. The average SAT math score has gone from 501 in 1992 to 514 in 2000, and the average verbal score has gone from 500 to 505;
- Since 1992, reading and math scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) have increased for fourth, eighth, and twelfth graders, including those students in the highest poverty schools;
- The achievement gap between low-income and minority students and their peers has decreased;
- More students are taking a rigorous high school curriculum and enrolling in higher education;
- Nearly all of the nation's highest poverty schools receive Title I funds compared to fewer than 80 percent before 1992;

PRESIDENT CLINTON WILL RELEASE \$46 MILLION IN GEAR UP GRANTS TO COLLEGE MENTORING, TUTORING, AND ACADEMIC SUPPORT TO AT-RISK CHILDREN. President Clinton proposed GEAR UP, or Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs, in 1998 and it was enacted that October with broad bipartisan support. President Clinton will release 80 GEAR UP grants totaling \$46 million. This year, the initiative's second, GEAR UP will create college opportunities for more than 700,000 at-risk children.

- **The Initiative Supports Partnerships Of Schools, Colleges And Universities, And Community Organizations To Strengthen Academics And Tutoring, Mentor Students, Share College Information Including College Visits, And Provide College Scholarships.** It also funds state efforts to promote college awareness and provide scholarships for needy students. Over 1,000 organizations are GEAR UP partners,

including colleges and universities, libraries, arts organizations, and chambers of commerce.

- **For The Second Year In A Row, Interest In GEAR UP Far Exceeded Available Funding.** This year, the Department of Education was only able to fund one application in four. Today, President Clinton will call on Congress to examine this evidence and fully fund his request and meet the urgent need. The President requested \$325 million for GEAR UP in FY 2001 but Congress plans to freeze it at \$200 million, denying up aid to 600,000 students.

CALLING ON CONGRESS TO COMPLETE WORK ON AMERICA'S PRIORITIES.

The President proposed a balanced and fiscally responsible budget that extends the solvency of Social Security and Medicare and makes investments in key priorities for the American people, such as modernizing 6,000 schools and repairing 25,000 more, meeting our commitment to hire 100,000 quality teachers to reduce class sizes, improving teacher quality, increasing accountability by turning around failing schools, and expanding after school opportunities. To pay for fiscally irresponsible tax cuts, Congressional Republicans have cut key priorities, resulting in fewer quality teachers for schools, fewer law enforcement officers and prosecutors to fight crime, reduced environmental protection, and less funding for National Science Foundation research. The President will also call on Congress to put the people's interest above the interests of big tobacco by fully funding federal tobacco litigation and letting the American taxpayers have their day in court to recover tobacco-related health care costs.