

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Brad L. Austin to Trey Graham at 13:49:29.00. Subject: RE: This Friday. (1 page)	03/24/1998	Personal Misfile
002. email	Daniel C. Montoya to Jeff Trandahl at 09:50:10.00. Subject: RE: gays in the military. (1 page)	04/10/1998	b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
OPD ([Don't Ask, Don't Tell])
OA/Box Number: 250000

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/28/1998 - 06/25/1998]

2015-0017-F

ab1568

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]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: SUNTUM_M@A1@CD@LNGTWY (SUNTUM_M@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-JAN-1998 23:19:17.00

SUBJECT: 1998-1-12 McCurry Briefing

TO: newsdesk@usnewswire.com@INET@LNGTWY (newsdesk@usnewswire.com@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: 62955104@eln.attmail.com@INET@LNGTWY (62955104@eln.attmail.com@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: usia01@access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY (usia01@access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WOZNIAK_N@A1@CD@LNGTWY (WOZNIAK_N@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (NSC)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: TCSmith@dol.gov@INET@LNGTWY (TCSmith@dol.gov@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: NAPLAN_S@A1@CD@LNGTWY (NAPLAN_S@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (NSC)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: TDIXON@PR_L=AVUOEOb@MRP@LNGTWY (PR_U=TDIXON@PR_L=AVUOEOb@MRP@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: LIZIK_C@A1@CD@LNGTWY (LIZIK_C@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OA)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: HAAS_L@A1@CD@LNGTWY (HAAS_L@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: GRAY_W@A1@CD@LNGTWY (GRAY_W@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (NSC)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: CUTLER_L@A1@CD@LNGTWY (CUTLER_L@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) ()
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BARTHOLOW_T@A1@CD@LNGTWY (BARTHOLOW_T@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OA)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BARBUSCHAK_K@A1@CD@LNGTWY (BARBUSCHAK_K@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OA)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET@LNGTWY (backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: princej@panet.us-state.gov@INET@LNGTWY (princej@panet.us-state.gov@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SUNTUM_M@A1@CD@LNGTWY (SUNTUM_M@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William H. White Jr.@EOP (William H. White Jr.@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Woyneab M. Wondwossen@eop (Woyneab M. Wondwossen@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Glen M. Weiner@eop (Glen M. Weiner@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Waldman@eop (Michael Waldman@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr@eop (Thurgood Marshall Jr@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul A. Tuchmann@eop (Paul A. Tuchmann@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barry J. Toiv@EOP (Barry J. Toiv@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: terri tingen@eop (terri tingen@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa Tamagni@eop (Lisa Tamagni@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tracy F. Sisser@eop (Tracy F. Sisser@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael J. Sullivan@EOP (Michael J. Sullivan@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Darby E. Stott@eop (Darby E. Stott@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Aviva Steinberg@eop (Aviva Steinberg@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maria E. Soto@eop (Maria E. Soto@eop [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard Socarides@EOP (Richard Socarides@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian D. Smith@eop (Brian D. Smith@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jake Siewert@eop (Jake Siewert@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: June Shih@eop (June Shih@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ruby Shamir@eop (Ruby Shamir@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Judithanne V. Scourfield@eop (Judithanne V. Scourfield@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Roger V. Salazar@eop (Roger V. Salazar@eop [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Virginia N. Rustique@eop (Virginia N. Rustique@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles F. Ruff@eop (Charles F. Ruff@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Victoria Radd@eop (Victoria Radd@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter O'Keefe@EOP (Peter O'Keefe@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sally P. Paxton@eop (Sally P. Paxton@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kristen E. Panerali@eop (Kristen E. Panerali@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan Orszag@eop (Jonathan Orszag@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Neera Tanden@eop (Neera Tanden@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark D. Neschis@eop (Mark D. Neschis@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael V. Terrell@eop (Michael V. Terrell@eop [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Reuben L. Musgrave Jr.@eop (Reuben L. Musgrave Jr.@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan Murchinson@eop (Jonathan Murchinson@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tamara Monosoff@eop (Tamara Monosoff@eop [PIR])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cheryl D. Mills@eop (Cheryl D. Mills@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: R. Scott Michaud@eop (R. Scott Michaud@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne E. McGuire@eop (Anne E. McGuire@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Doris O. Matsui@eop (Doris O. Matsui@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura S. Marcus@eop (Laura S. Marcus@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa J. Levin@eop (Lisa J. Levin@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph P. Lockhart@eop (Joseph P. Lockhart@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher J. Lavery@eop (Christopher J. Lavery@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Heidi Kukis@OVP@EOP (Heidi Kukis@OVP@EOP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah S. Freeman@eop (Sarah S. Freeman@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Allison J. King@eop (Allison J. King@eop [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David E. Kalbaugh@EOP (David E. Kalbaugh@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jon P. Jennings@eop (Jon P. Jennings@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michele Jolin@EOP (Michele Jolin@EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: david t. johnson@eop (david t. johnson@eop [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maureen A. Hudson@eop (Maureen A. Hudson@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard Hayes@eop (Richard Hayes@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter D. Greenberger@eop (Peter D. Greenberger@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason S. Goldberg@EOP (Jason S. Goldberg@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jessica L. Gibson@eop (Jessica L. Gibson@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeremy M. Gaines@eop (Jeremy M. Gaines@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carmen B. Fowler@eop (Carmen B. Fowler@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie A. Fernandes@eop (Julie A. Fernandes@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rahm Emanuel@eop (Rahm Emanuel@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dorinda A. Salcido@eop (Dorinda A. Salcido@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Diane Ikemiyashiro@eop (Diane Ikemiyashiro@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elliot J. Diringer@eop (Elliot J. Diringer@eop [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Suzanne Dale@eop (Suzanne Dale@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michelle Crisci@eop (Michelle Crisci@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven A. Cohen@eop (Steven A. Cohen@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrei H. Cherny@ovp@eop (Andrei H. Cherny@ovp@eop [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph W. Cerrell@OVP@EOP (Joseph W. Cerrell@OVP@EOP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bradley M. Campbell@EOP (Bradley M. Campbell@EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Allison Balderston@eop (Allison Balderston@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Katharine Button@EOP (Katharine Button@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lanny A. Breuer@eop (Lanny A. Breuer@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: antony j. blinken@eop (antony j. blinken@eop [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David S. Beaubaire@eop (David S. Beaubaire@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kris M Balderston@EOP (Kris M Balderston@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robin J. Bachman@eop (Robin J. Bachman@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eli G. Attie@OVP@EOP (Eli G. Attie@OVP@EOP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lori Anderson@eop (Lori Anderson@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lori E. Abrams@eop (Lori E. Abrams@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: usnwire@access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY (usnwire@access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: INFOMGT@A1@CD@LNGTWY (INFOMGT@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (SYS)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: US@2=WESTERN UNION@3=@5=ATT.COM@*ELN\62955104@MRX@LNGTWY (I=US@2=WESTERN UNION@3=@5=ATT.COM@*ELN\62955104@MRX@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: julie_green@ed.gov@INET@LNGTWY (julie_green@ed.gov@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WEINER_R@A1@CD@LNGTWY (WEINER_R@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (DON)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SMITH_BD@A1@CD@LNGTWY (SMITH_BD@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: RILEY_R@A1@CD@LNGTWY (RILEY_R@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OA)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MOFFETT_J@A1@CD@LNGTWY (MOFFETT_J@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: JOHNSON_WC@A1@CD@LNGTWY (JOHNSON_WC@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OA)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: GRIBBEN_J@A1@CD@LNGTWY (GRIBBEN_J@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: DICKEY_L@AI@CD@LNGTWY (DICKEY_L@AI@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: CROWLEY_P@AI@CD@LNGTWY (CROWLEY_P@AI@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (NSC)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BARTHOLOME_M@AI@CD@LNGTWY (BARTHOLOME_M@AI@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
(OA)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: wh-outbox-distr@clinton.ai.mit.edu@INET@LNGTWY (wh-outbox-
distr@clinton.ai.mit.edu@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: COGDELL_C@AI@CD@LNGTWY (COGDELL_C@AI@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: meglynn@usia.gov@INET@LNGTWY (meglynn@usia.gov@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Debra S. Wood@eop (Debra S. Wood@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lowell A. Weiss@eop (Lowell A. Weiss@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Angelina Walker@ovp@eop (Angelina Walker@ovp@eop [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dag Vega@eop (Dag Vega@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: June G. Turner@eop (June G. Turner@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Serena C. Torrey@eop (Serena C. Torrey@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Amy W. Tobe@eop (Amy W. Tobe@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Virginia M. Terzano@ovp@eop (Virginia M. Terzano@ovp@eop [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sylvia M. Mathews@eop (Sylvia M. Mathews@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan H. Schnur@OVP@EOP (Jonathan H. Schnur@OVP@EOP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Diane A. Stumpf@eop (Diane A. Stumpf@eop [ONDCP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Todd Stern@eop (Todd Stern@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elisabeth Steele@eop (Elisabeth Steele@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik@eop (Douglas B. Sosnik@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Craig T. Smith@eop (Craig T. Smith@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua Silverman@EOP (Joshua Silverman@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert M. Shireman@eop (Robert M. Shireman@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas S. Sheorn@eop (Douglas S. Sheorn@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brooks Scoville@eop (Brooks Scoville@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: G. Timothy Saunders@EOP (G. Timothy Saunders@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Evan Ryan@eop (Evan Ryan@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter Rundlet@eop (Peter Rundlet@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nelson Reyneri@eop (Nelson Reyneri@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nicole R. Rabner@eop (Nicole R. Rabner@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julia M. Payne@eop (Julia M. Payne@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carole A. Parmelee@eop (Carole A. Parmelee@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter R. Orszag@eop (Peter R. Orszag@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael A. O'Mary@eop (Michael A. O'Mary@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman@eop (Elizabeth R. Newman@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven J. Naplan@eop (Steven J. Naplan@eop [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sean P. Maloney@eop (Sean P. Maloney@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa M. Murray@eop (Melissa M. Murray@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kevin Moran@eop (Kevin Moran@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Megan C. Moloney@eop (Megan C. Moloney@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elisa Millsap@eop (Elisa Millsap@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Estela Mendoza@eop (Estela Mendoza@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrew J. Mayock@eop (Andrew J. Mayock@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tanya E. Martin@eop (Tanya E. Martin@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael D. Malone@eop (Michael D. Malone@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura D. Schwartz@eop (Laura D. Schwartz@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne H. Lewis@eop (Anne H. Lewis@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sara M. Latham@eop (Sara M. Latham@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jim Kohlenberger@OVP@EOP (Jim Kohlenberger@OVP@EOP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Catherine T. Kitchen@eop (Catherine T. Kitchen@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William R. Kincaid@eop (William R. Kincaid@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie E. Mason@eop (Julie E. Mason@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James M. Teague@EOP (James M. Teague@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leanne I. Johnson@EOP (Leanne I. Johnson@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas D. Janenda@EOP (Thomas D. Janenda@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Russell W. Horwitz@eop (Russell W. Horwitz@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Donald Goldberg@eop (Donald Goldberg@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dario J. Gomez@eop (Dario J. Gomez@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Adam W. Goldberg@eop (Adam W. Goldberg@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Grace A. Garcia@eop (Grace A. Garcia@eop [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ben A. Freeland@eop (Ben A. Freeland@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen E. Finney@eop (Karen E. Finney@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen C. Fahle@eop (Karen C. Fahle@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards@eop (Anne M. Edwards@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dorian V. Weaver@eop (Dorian V. Weaver@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel W. Burkhardt@eop (Daniel W. Burkhardt@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lanny J. Davis@eop (Lanny J. Davis@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anna E. Cushing@eop (Anna E. Cushing@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julianne B. Corbett@eop (Julianne B. Corbett@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nanda Chitre@eop (Nanda Chitre@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David K. Chai@eop (David K. Chai@eop [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Phillip Caplan@eop (Phillip Caplan@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barbara D. Woolley@eop (Barbara D. Woolley@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patrick E. Briggs@eop (Patrick E. Briggs@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alexander L. Boyle@eop (Alexander L. Boyle@eop [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marsha E. Berry@eop (Marsha E. Berry@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Beverly J. Barnes@eop (Beverly J. Barnes@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kyle M. Baker@eop (Kyle M. Baker@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patrick Aylward@eop (Patrick Aylward@eop [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brenda M. Anders@eop (Brenda M. Anders@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeannetta P. Allen@eop (Jeannetta P. Allen@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sharolyn A. Rosier@EOP (Sharolyn A. Rosier@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

January 12, 1998

PRESS BRIEFING
BY MIKE MCCURRY

The Briefing Room

1:22 P.M. EST

MR. MCCURRY: Thanks to General McCaffrey for that. Where in the world do you want to start first?

Q Iraq.

MR. MCCURRY: Iraq.

Q What is the United States' reaction to Iraq's announcement that he will bar -- stop the rest of his team from carrying out their activities?

MR. MCCURRY: We have heard provocative statements from the government of Iraq on the constitution of U.N. inspection teams over and over again, and they have been made -- met with the same resolved response of the international community that has been expressed repeatedly by the United Nations Security Council.

Now, that said, what the government of Iraq says and what it does is very often different. And successful inspections have been conducted by UNSCOM and we will wait to hear from Chairman Butler as he reports to the Security Council what's actually going to be the status of inspections as they go forward. But we are clearly watching the progress that the inspection teams are making. We have a very significant force deployed in the region in furtherance of the President's determination to see that the United States can pursue its objectives in the region. And beyond that, I don't know -- I think it's a watchful period that we're going to be in as we see what happens as the inspections go forward.

Q When did Butler make that report?

MR. MCCURRY: He is expected, I believe, to report in coming days, and then if I'm not mistaken, he's scheduled to meet and Tehran with officials from the government of Iraq within the next week -- Baghdad, Baghdad. Tehran has been on our mind recently, too.

Q Mike, wasn't the Ritter team composed specifically to provoke a reaction from the Iraqis?

MR. MCCURRY: The Ritter teams is composed as the United Nations sees fit. They draw on scientific technical experts from around the world, and the United Nations really has to tell you how they make the composition of those teams up. They break into units from time to time. There is a significant U.N. presence in Iraq now, and they constitute their teams differently depending on what the circumstances of an inspection are. So you really have to go to the U.N. and let them tell you what -- how they conduct their individual inspections.

Q But the Iraqis have complained about Ritter bitterly for many months now. Isn't this a predictable reaction from the Iraqis?

MR. MCCURRY: I believe, as Mr. Ritter has indicated, he has been there for six years and has worked with many of these same people, and it's not quite clear what their complaints or their objections are based on.

Q Mike, you said that this is a watchful period as these inspections go forward, so it's your understanding and your belief that these inspections would continue to take place even if the Iraqis were, for example, blocking one team?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, you've seen them try to provoke a response from the international community in the past. They have blocked inspections in the past. We've been there, done that. We'll have to see what kind of response we have in the days going forward.

Q But if I could follow up, what I'm saying is, if the inspections proceed with Iraq saying no to one team, aren't they dictating the terms of the inspections?

MR. MCCURRY: We've made it clear over and over again, and the United Nations has made clear, that the constitution of these inspection teams is not at the whim of the government of Iraq. The United Nations is the sole determinative of how those teams are constituted, and that will remain the case.

Q But you call these provocations; do these provocations continue? And is it your view that at the end of the day we will always get our way?

MR. MCCURRY: They continue, the provocations and the difficulty with which the United Nations has to conduct its operations continues. But that's been true really for years.

Q Do you think the American public will say that that's a policy that we should continue to pursue?

MR. MCCURRY: I think the American public is very supportive of the significant deployed force we have in the region, which is there to maintain options available to the President and to the United Nations.

Q But if I may just be allowed one more -- but you know there is some portion of the public that believes the administration is not acting firmly enough, that Saddam is getting away with murder.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, he is getting away with willful violations and harassment of U.N. objectives there. And the U.N. has responded to that and we have pursued what we think is a concentrated diplomatic effort to address the behavior that we've seen, working with others and doing it through the U.N.'s authorized inspection team there.

But at the same time, the President has made clear that we are determined to see the objectives of the world community fulfilled there because those are significant U.S. interests as well, and he has never ruled out other options that may or may not be available.

Q Will the President be making any phone calls to world leaders to generate a unanimous U.N. Security Council resolution if it comes down to that?

MR. MCCURRY: He has been in contact with counterparts from time to time on this subject. I'm not aware that his foreign policy advisors have recommended that he do anything now in response to this, but we are watching very carefully the progress that the Chairman of the U.N. Inspections Committee makes as he both supervises the inspections that need to occur and as he conducts his own dialogue with the government.

Q Do you know, has there been any progress at all on the inspection of the Presidential palaces, irrespective of this current decision to block the --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, you should direct that question, more appropriately, to the United Nations, but I suspect that's a subject that Chairman Butler wants to pursue in his visit.

Helen?

Q Has the President heard anything, any report from his Asian delegation?

MR. MCCURRY: He has. Let me tell you a little bit about that. Mr. Bowles convened this morning kind of an update review of a team that's been meeting on and off during the period of our work on the Asian financial situation consisting of, among others, the National Economic Advisor, Gene Sperling; the National Security Advisor, Sandy Berger; Secretary Albright; Secretary Rubin; Dan Tarullo from the National Security Council working on international economic issues; and others.

They were able to get a phone report from Deputy Secretary Summers in Asia on the status on some of his work. He has been in Singapore and arrived this morning, our time, to Jakarta, and expects to begin his meetings with Indonesian officials probably late tonight, our time, which would be the beginning of the work day in Jakarta. This was reported to the President. When he arrived here, he got an update from some of the same members of that working group. And he's following very carefully and closely the work that the IMF is doing in region, and the work, obviously, that the Deputy Secretary of the Treasury is doing.

Q Sounds like you're very concerned if you have that high level a meeting.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, it's on an off during this period. We've had roughly that same contingent of officials monitoring this, sometimes in person, sometimes through their chief deputies, depending on what other subjects they're covering. But it's a significant issue because the regional economic stability of Asia is something that impacts directly on the American people, with so much of our commerce directly tied up with the work that we do in that region, that there are millions of American families that are affected by economic conditions in Asia. Thus, it's very appropriate for the President and many of his key advisors to be involved in this.

Q How serious is the problem, the Asian money problem?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, it's quite serious. As you know, in some sense, the markets have been telling us. At the same time, we believe that a very strong and potentially effective program of response has been developed through the International Monetary Fund. And the United States will continue to work with other industrialized nations and with the IMF to address exactly the things that we think have led to instability in the markets because, ultimately, the program that they've developed, the reforms they've recommended, the economic changes that some of these nations will make and many have indicated they are willing to make, will be the source of a return to long-term economic stability in the region.

Q But does the renewed instability in Asian markets indicate that perhaps those initiatives aren't working?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, it indicates that there's a lot of work that needs to be done by the governments that need to fulfill the obligations that they've rendered to the International Monetary Fund. And there's work that needs to be done by international monetary officials and then the governments acting independently to work with these governments to encourage them to implement the type of economic reforms that will lead to stability.

Q Is the White House concerned about Congressional opposition to U.S. participation in these bail out programs? Senator Faircloth is having a Wednesday meeting for congressional staffers against it. Senator D'Amato has made statements against it. Jim Leach is going out this week to the region to investigate.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we encourage members to explore for themselves the reality of what is happening in those economies and the significant interest we have in seeing the success of the international programs that have been developed carried out, because that is, ultimately, we believe, very important to the livelihoods of millions of Americans, certainly millions of constituents that many of those critics represent.

But at the same time, there will be a vigorous debate on this. I think members of Congress made that clear. And we will

welcome being a part of that debate because we think the case for active involvement by the United States is a very good one. We have longstanding, deeply-held interests in that region that we have pursued very actively for many, many years now, and we're not about to give up what we think is the important sense of presence and strategic interest that we have in that region.

Among other things, in addition to having the Treasury Secretary in the region meeting with economic officials, as you know, the Defense Secretary is there now to remind governments in that region and the peoples of that region that we will remain engaged with them, and that the security of the Asia Pacific region is of vital U.S. strategic interest as well.

Q Mike, does Summers have any assurance from Soeharto, from any of the other officials in Indonesia, that they are taking the reform steps that the U.S. is demanding? And what is the level of concern here? As a follow-up, what is the level of concern here about social unrest in Indonesia and serious problems like that spreading even further to other Asian countries?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, without betraying the confidence of discussions that the President has had, he had a very good conversation with President Soeharto on exactly that subject. I think it's safe to say that we believe Deputy Secretary Summers' meetings would be constructive and useful. And we would not have believed that if there wasn't at least some indication that the government of Indonesia takes seriously the program of activity it has pledged to the IMF.

As to the internal political situation in Indonesia, that's really a matter for the people of Indonesia and for the leaders of Indonesia. They have elections scheduled in March, and it's up to them to make those determinations. But the conditions upon what they would be able to exercise their judgments and make those kinds of decisions are certainly enhanced if there is a return to economic stability in the region, which is in our interest and ultimately in their interest.

Q Are Asian governments moving too slowly to implement the kinds of reforms --

MR. MCCURRY: There are a number of different governments in the region that have made different sets of arrangements with the IMF and we are working case by case to address many of those situations. The Deputy Treasury Secretary will be in a number of places other than Indonesia, and we will work all those governments in the region to fulfill the kind of program that we think has the maximum chance of success.

Q Is the administration working on a fall-back position if the pace of reform is not satisfactory?

MR. MCCURRY: You've heard the Treasury Department describe what is sort of a second line of defense that is available, but at the moment we are encouraging people to make use of the IMF facilities that have been constructed and that are available.

Q Mike, with regard to the IMF facilities, it wasn't enough in South Korea. The United States agreed to put in another \$1.5 billion because of their liquidity crunch. Is the United States standing ready to provide more funds from the U.S. Treasury for any of these countries that fail to proceed?

MR. MCCURRY: Do you want to see if I can move markets around the world? I can't answer that other than to say that we are in a position to work through the IMF and with other countries to address the type of economic market conditions that come about when there is a lack of long-term economic stability. But I think we've been pretty clear that we can't talk about specific commitments, but we can talk about the type of work that has been designed by the IMF and by the governments involved.

Q Over the weekend, Bruce Babbitt's interview with the Times, I think it was, was published, in which he said, "I've made a lot of mistakes" in this Indian casino business. Does the President still have complete confidence in him? And does the President believe that Babbitt handled the matter properly?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes, and yes, although he did instruct the Chief of Staff to explore the matter further and to get a better understanding. I would also point out over the weekend the Secretary of the Interior was applauded for his management of difficult water issues in the West, and he continues to do extraordinarily good work in addressing the nation's environmental resource management questions, even as he handles some of these other issues that have been raised.

Q Well, help me out. Is this old that the President had instructed the Chief of Staff to explore the matter further?

MR. MCCURRY: That happened quite some time ago. We reported on it here.

Q May I just -- when is the Chief of Staff going to report to the President, conclude his investigation?

MR. MCCURRY: It happened some time ago.

Q Why can't he ask that?

Q Mike, is there any concern at the White House --

Q I'm unclear, Mike --

MR. MCCURRY: The point of what we told you back a

couple months ago was that the Chief of Staff did explore this, did talk to the Interior Secretary, and did report back to the President. I think we covered that in some detail.

Q So your answers did not come after the Babbitt interview, this was something that came before?

MR. MCCURRY: No, no. This came up quite some time ago, and we --

Q So after the Babbitt interview, the President is still satisfied with the situation?

MR. MCCURRY: I haven't talked to him specifically about the New York Times interview, but I'm not aware of any change in his thinking.

Q Mike, is there any concern at the White House that this devastating ice storm in the Northeast may just be a precursor of a totally wacky weather year that's going to throw all the budgeting of emergency assistance funds --

MR. MCCURRY: You mean, with the arrival of El Nino and we've got a front coming in over this -- look, it's hard to talk about how isolated meteorological effects reflect overall climate changes. But we do know that there has been significant overall climate change and that is a source of concern. It does take us back to the need to pursue the kinds of regimes we talked about with other members of the world community.

A little update -- as you know, I think the President declared several counties in upstate New York disaster areas. And while we haven't received any official requests from the governors of Vermont, New Hampshire and Maine, there are some preliminary damage assessments that are being done by FEMA in those states now that develops the kind of material that could be in support of a request for disaster assistance if one came, and we're working very closely and cooperatively both with the state government in New York and then with the governors and emergency response officials in the states that have been affected.

I believe also we've got some FEMA presence out in the Pacific Northwest, too, that's been looking at some of the storms there.

Q But the question was, are you sure that FEMA has enough money to deal with whatever might happen for the rest of the year?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, they've had a difficult year, but they've been able to, I think -- they got a supplemental, didn't they, Barry?

MR. TOIV: No, not for this fiscal year.

MR. MCCURRY: Not for this year. Last year, in the period when they've had to deal with floods, earthquakes, fires, they've had difficult taxing of their resources, they've been able to get the kind of supplementary appropriation from Congress that's helped them do the work that's so important.

Q Can we go back to Iraq for a second? You folks have insisted for many months now that Saddam Hussein is in a box, and yet you just said a minute ago that he's getting away with willful violations and harassments of the U.N. weapons inspection team.

MR. MCCURRY: I did not say that. I said that we would be watching very carefully to see what he does. He has from time to time failed to fully comply --

Q You did say that.

GENERAL MCCAFFREY: Well, he's failed to fully comply with the stipulations that have been placed on him by the U.N. That's been true now for six years.

Q Right, so how is he -- I don't get how he's in a box.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, he is motivated we believe in part by a desire to escape from the effect of the economic sanctions that are still placed upon him. Those sanctions remain in effect and there's absolutely no indication that there's any change in the posture of the world community to keep those sanctions in effect.

Q Let me follow up if I may. To the extent that the American people care whether or not Saddam Hussein is in a box, they care because of the threats that you folks have articulated about weapons of mass destruction --

MR. MCCURRY: Absolutely.

Q So how is it -- has anything changed since late October until today in terms of our ability to find out what he's doing in chemical or biological weapons?

MR. MCCURRY: In a sense, yes, because -- I don't know the exact number, but at the time in October he had expelled certain U.N. inspectors from Iraq that had led the United Nations to withdraw the entire inspection team. We were in the middle of a significant problem at that point; inevitably Saddam backed down, the teams went back in, they've done hundreds of inspections since. But they are continuing to work on a problem that has not produced all the answers

that they want or that they find sufficient. And there is going to continue to be that effort and they're going to continue to be pressed. And no doubt when Chairman Butler reports on his meetings, at that point we're going to have to make some assessments about what other steps need to be taken.

Q If the American team is pulled out, if the American team is kicked out, is it the position of the United States that all the teams should leave again?

MR. MCCURRY: The position of the United States is at that point supportive of the United Nations. When that's happened in the past, the response of the United Nations and of the Chairman of the U.N. Special Commission has been quite swift and quite appropriate in our view.

Q Mike, the Iraqis allege that Scott Ritter is a spy.

MR. MCCURRY: He has said that is ridiculous and so have many others. And the United Nations has made clear that he is hired because of his technical background. He is someone who is indisputably and expert. And he works for the United Nations. He's not -- he is a U.S. national, but he works under the direction and the supervision of the United Nations at this point.

Q And does not work for U.N. intelligence at any level?

MR. MCCURRY: He's very clear that he does not. He has said so himself and others have said so as well.

Q Mike, to what degree was the White House aware of complaints from gay rights group about a legal loophole in the '86 Privacy Communications Act where a sailor was essentially outed from the don't ask, don't tell policy and AOL apparently violated its own privacy standard by giving information to naval investigators which led to --

MR. MCCURRY: Chip, I saw that story this morning and I have to confess to you I failed to make an inquiries at the Pentagon about what their reaction is. I can -- we can see if we can take that and see if the Pentagon has said anything on that today.

Q On a totally unrelated matter, what is the White House position on Senator Kennedy's proposal to raise the minimum wage?

MR. MCCURRY: The Senator has made a number of interesting and important proposals and a number of them are being looked at at this point. You know, historically, this President's commitment to seeing that the minimum wage is a meaningful wage for people who are working. Very often -- people are working hard and very often doing so and staying off forms of public assistance, and we have had an interest -- we've successfully achieved an increase in

the minimum wage, but at this point that's an idea that we have to be looking at carefully and have to be thinking about as we think of other things that we are pursuing with respect to macroeconomic policy.

Q If I could just follow up, do you anticipate that that would be something that's possibly going to be included in the President's State of the Union?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm only anticipating at this point that it will remain under review.

Q Mike, the Northern Ireland peace talks resume today in Belfast. Do you think they have any chance of success given the recent violence there? And secondly, do you foresee any direct U.S. involvement in the talks in the weeks and months ahead?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, do I see any prospect for success? Yes, because the peoples of Ireland are so manifestly committed to peace and are so upset about the tragic return to violence that they've seen. At the same time that there has been violence and there's been a return to the kind of troubles that people in both families lament, there has also been very determined work by the government of the U.K. and the Republic of Ireland to advance common thinking about how progress can be made at Stormont. And the United States government applauds the work that both governments are doing to table a proposal. We think that that demonstrates the seriousness of purpose with which they take the talks, and we encourage the parties themselves to make best use of this inclusive process to address the issues that members in all sects face.

Q Mike, The Washington Post had a story this morning that it's being said that Mack McLarty is going to leave the administration after the Summit of the Americas. Is there anything to that?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, you know, Mack has extended his stay here at the President's request and done an extraordinarily good job as an ambassador and envoy in that region. The President knew that 1997 would be a very significant year for our policy in Latin America and I think, using his powers of persuasion, encouraged Mr. McLarty to remain here so that he could help lead the agenda that we pursued last year. Now, that was all about preparing -- doing the work that we did in the President's travels through a lot of our other diplomacy last year to prepare us for the second Summit of the Americas in Santiago coming up in a few months.

What Mr. McLarty's plans will be beyond that will be up to him. But I know that he probably yearns for the life that he thought he was going to get after the end of the first term and as the President managed to subvert by getting him to stay.

Q In other words, he's leaving. (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: I think I said that very elegantly.
(Laughter.) You'd have to check with him.

Q Speaking of the President's powers of persuasion, has he had any luck convincing Senator Feinstein to run for governor of California?

MR. MCCURRY: I think he thinks very highly of her. But if they talked recently and had a conversation about -- talked to her recently and had a conversation about politics in California, I imagine that he would want me to keep it between the two of them.

Q But were she to run, his efforts out there would be pretty --

MR. MCCURRY: I think that people who know politics in California say nothing but that she would be a very strong candidate.

Q How about Panetta?

Q Can you confirm that the President's deposition with Paula Jones' attorneys will not be taken here at the White House?

MR. MCCURRY: I can't say anything about that subject.

Q Well, if the President were to travel from the White House grounds on Saturday, am I correct that a travel pool would necessarily go with him?

MR. MCCURRY: Usually, when he tries to travel around here people know about it pretty quickly, so I imagine they would.

Q Mike, one loose end on Iraq. If the American team --

MR. MCCURRY: Without necessarily saying that's what is going to happen. I don't, frankly, know the answer and I'm not even sure that there is an answer at this point. But the court would be the only one who would properly determine what kind of public comment can be made.

Q Well, our information is flatly it has been decided it will not be here at the White House.

MR. MCCURRY: You're giving out the scoop in public? What are you doing?

Q This isn't a big scoop. It's not like a big huge story -- don't you think?

MR. MCCURRY: I personally don't think so. But I'll leave you to make your own judgment. (Laughter.)

Q Has the President seen or talked to Bennett lately?

MR. MCCURRY: He's talked to him from time to time. I don't know -- I mean, they've had to have talked during this discovery period.

Q But doesn't he have to prepare for a deposition?

MR. MCCURRY: Normally, if you're going to give a deposition, you prepare with your attorney. I can't imagine the President wouldn't.

Q How did the President react to being in the same room with Paula Jones?

MR. MCCURRY: His attorney has addressed that. I don't really have anything to add to what he said.

Q Did you find out if Robin Williams was at Camp David with the President this weekend?

MR. MCCURRY: I do believe that's true. And I think they were up with some of the other cast members. And the President and the First Lady are going to be doing some more entertaining and socializing up there. So I wouldn't be surprised if they go up from time to time.

Q Why?

MR. MCCURRY: The main reason is they want to use -- they want to make more use of Camp David. They found it hard go up there when their daughter was still here because she'd be away from her friends and they didn't use it as much as they'd like. But they like being up there. I imaging they'll go up there more often.

Q Do you know what other members of the cast joined Robin Williams?

MR. MCCURRY: No, and I'm not -- to be honest with you, I think the President is entitled to invite who he wants to go up there to be his private social guests and I don't intend to report on the guest list on such occasions.

Q Why?

MR. MCCURRY: Because I think it's just good -- I mean, they do -- they have during -- when they screen movies and do stuff over at the residence all the time and we don't pester them about it and I don't intend to.

Q Well, just to tie up a loose end on that for interest of those who watch Show Biz Today -- (laughter) --

MR. MCCURRY: What time does that come on? (Laughter.)

When's that on?

Q It comes on at 5:30 p.m. Eastern. (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: At 5:30 p.m. Eastern. (Laughter.)

Q What time is that Central Time? (Laughter.)

Q Are you anchoring that now? (Laughter.)

Q No, I'm not. (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: You never know, Wolf, they might have already announced it. (Laughter.)

Q To the best of my knowledge. Do they have a movie theatre at Camp David? Where do they watch these kinds of movies at Camp David?

MR. MCCURRY: They have -- I think they do. I defer that -- I'm sure they do because I think previous Presidents have very often gone up there and shown movies and that sort of thing.

Q The Republicans have proposed appropriating money to fund 100,000 new teaching positions and I'm wondering what the White House reaction to that is and why you haven't proposed that yourselves.

MR. MCCURRY: We're in favor of teachers and we are in favor of thinking about --

Q -- 100,000 new ones on the street?

MR. MCCURRY: -- thinking about ways in which we might do it. And, who knows. He's a very clever fellow, that Congressman Paxon. Maybe he caught wind of some things that we were thinking about.

Q Forget McLarty. Are you leaving anytime soon?

MR. MCCURRY: If you let me out of here, I will, yes. (Laughter.)

Q No, I mean in the White House staff.

Q Hold on. Can we just finish the teachers thing?

MR. MCCURRY: No, I dropped a hint there. You've got to pursue it on your own.

Yes?

Q The race panel is headed to Phoenix this week where one of the things they're going to do is take up the concerns of

Native Americans. There's been a lot of criticism that that's late in coming and incorporating them into the discussion. Can you comment on that?

MR. MCCURRY: There are many communities that the President has been reaching out and talking to. In fact, if I'm not mistaken, John Echohawk is one of the participants in the session that we're having this afternoon with the President. I think the President does see this effort to understand and embrace the diversities in American, one that extends to many, many different kinds of constituencies and communities. And while there are some unique aspects to race that involve the relationship between black and white America, I think we've said all along that the rich diversity that's going to be America in the 21st century requires an approach and a willingness to listen to and hear many, many other communities. And so the President's session today is one such opportunity, and there will be others.

Q Mike, does the President support the DNC's action over the weekend to allow non-citizen residents in the U.S. to contribute to the party?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes, he does.

Q Did he say during the campaign, though, that contributions ought to be limited to those who can vote in elections?

MR. MCCURRY: He sees, as the DNC said, I think, yesterday, sees these people as likely potential new voters soon.

Q Does he feel like he made a mistake a year ago when he endorsed the DNC's --

MR. MCCURRY: Presidents don't make mistakes, they have

--

Q Mistakes are made. (Laughter.)

,

MR. MCCURRY: They have further thinking that is bought to a subject.

Q Seriously, Mike, he gave a speech and said --

MR. MCCURRY: No, I think the President agrees with a lot of what was said yesterday, that the unintended consequences of that policy has been to make some communities feel like they are not worthy participants in the political process. And I think the President feels that was a bad outcome of a policy that was well intentioned. And when the DNC approached the White House about the change in the subject, I think the President understood the rationale.

Q How much money can he get from them?

MR. MCCURRY: The DNC can tell you more about it. I don't know.

Q The United States has had very little luck convincing the French and the Russians in the Security Council to take stronger action against Iraq. Is today's incident going to be something that the United States takes into the Security Council and uses as an avenue of argument to convince them to take stronger action now?

MR. MCCURRY: It will certainly be cited by the United States as reasons why we have to remain very firm and determined in dealing with the government of Iraq. That is not lost on the governments of France and Russia and others in the Security Council. They understand the provocations that Saddam has rendered, and they also have joined unanimously with the U.N. in supporting Security Council Resolutions 1134 and 1137. And that remains the stated position of those governments, and we will continue to work to pursue the objectives that are expressed in those recent unanimous declarations of the world community.

Q But isn't this exactly what the United States warned the French and the Russians was going to happen if they didn't take stronger action?

MR. MCCURRY: We've had a number of conversations with those governments stressing the need to remain resolved and united as we address this real issue.

Q There is a line of thinking that Saddam feels more ability to maneuver this month because of the Muslim holiday of Ramadan. Would you disabuse him of that notion?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes.

Q Well said. (Laughter.)

Q I'm just wondering after today if the President has run out of items to preview for State of the Union, or are they planning more --

MR. MCCURRY: No, we've got all kinds of boxes under the tree.

Q If you could tell us, is there anything more this week that he's going to unveil?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know. What is the status of our leaks these days? (Laughter.) Let's go call Rahm and find out where he's -- no, I think there's not -- I'm not anticipating this week additional discussions of things that have budgetary impact. The President in the State of the Union is going to be talking about a lot of things that are fundamentally important to the country. He

will be talking later in the week about race in America and the struggle for civil rights, and acknowledging some of the heroic leadership of those that are going to receive the National Medal of Freedom. And that's the kind of thing that in a sense previews parts of what I think he wants to lay before Congress in January.

Q I was talking about policy initiatives.

MR. MCCURRY: In policy initiatives, I'm not aware at the moment of any, but who knows? You're all good reporters.

Q On the budget, you said this morning you would look into the report about the division of the revenues from a national tobacco settlement --

MR. MCCURRY: What I got back on that was pretty much the same answer that I gave you when we talked about the general question of tax incidence that would be reflected in the budget. We really are not going to be in a position to get into the specifics until the budget is delivered to Congress in February, although we would say that we credit the states' attorneys general for the very important work they did in bringing litigation, and it would stand to reason that we would want to share the proceeds from any settlement with the states. But exactly what the percentage would be or how we would do that, we're not at liberty to discuss until the President unveils his budget.

Q So are you saying the Wall Street Journal is wrong, or just that you're not in a position to confirm --

MR. MCCURRY: No, I sort of said that we weren't going to confirm what they had.

Q Can I come back to the DNC for a second? Are you saying that the President no longer supports a unilateral ban on this, or any ban?

MR. MCCURRY: I'll direct you to the DNC on that. He is supportive of the work that they did over the weekend.

Q The President's position on the acceptance of money from legal aliens, it's one thing to say we no longer will unilaterally do it, but still support legislation.

MR. MCCURRY: Legal permanent residents, I believe is the term we prefer.

Q Okay. Does he still support legislation that would ban them, or he no longer supports that either?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't believe that is part of the pending legislation that we've expressed support for.

Q He supported it in '96.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I'll ask him what his views are on that specific question.

Q Mike, it's reported today that Dennis Scolabrini (phonetic), the FBI agent who testified on behalf of Billy Dale at the Travelgate trial says he was harassed by Clinton aides in retaliation. What is your response?

MR. MCCURRY: If I understand correctly, that is a sealed deposition and we'll honor the court's decision to seal whatever testimony he gave.

Q On to weapons of mass destruction and proliferation -- the conference committee has come out with a report talking about it, saying the problem is worsening, criticizing the White House, saying a lot of talking really hasn't backed it up. Has the White House been effective in this?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not familiar with the report. I don't know specifically what area of concern they raised. But we spent most of this briefing talking about the various extensive work that the United States is doing, including the hard work that 37,000 young men and women are doing in the Gulf to pursue our concerns about weapons of mass destruction. And I think it's fair to say that there's not a question in the post-Cold War pantheon of foreign policy that the President takes more seriously than efforts by countries that are outliers in the world community to acquire weapons of mass destruction. We've spent a lot of time on that issue here and the President certainly has done a lot of hard work on the issue. But I'll see if anyone knows of the report in particular.

Q Do you expect the President to address the issue of employer based pensions prior to the State of the Union?

MR. MCCURRY: Expanding retirement income security opportunities for Americans, which it increasingly in the next century is going to depend on shoring up Social Security, making sure the people have got a variety of private sector based employer provided pension arrangements, and encouraging Americans to make their own savings and their own arrangements for retirement. It's going to be a very real key part of work. We've already done a great deal to address and underpin the strength of the private sector pension insurance system and I expect in the -- that we will want to say some more on that subject. I wouldn't rule out that there will be a -- some focus on that in the weeks ahead, but I don't know whether prior to January 27th.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

MR. MCCURRY: Thank you, Helen.

END

158 P.M. EST

#452-01/12

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Daniel C. Montoya (CN=Daniel C. Montoya/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:29-JAN-1998 17:39:30.00

SUBJECT: fwd: McVeigh Wins Permanent Injunction

TO: paul_yandura (paul_yandura @ hud.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rsorian (rsorian @ osaspe.dhhs.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: palmerl (palmerl @ us.ibm.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: HMolina451 (HMolina451 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey_Levi (Jeffrey_Levi @ compuserve.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dkinch (dkinch @ health.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dc (dc @ nrharural.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: zguerra (zguerra @ admissions.caltech.edu @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: agarner72 (agarner72 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ktuerff (Ktuerff @ 4env.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeff.Trandahl (Jeff.Trandahl @ clerk.house.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard Socarides (CN=Richard Socarides/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: joneill (joneill @ hrsa.dhhs.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MARTINB (MARTINB @ dmbb.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marklacy (Marklacy @ flash.net @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gjones1 (gjones1 @ os.dhhs.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Harveyapc (Harveyapc @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: sean.m.grimes (sean.m.grimes @ bankamerica.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rdupaix (rdupaix @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
FYI -

dcm
----- Forwarded by Daniel C. Montoya/OPD/EOP on 01/29/98
05:36 PM -----

LAGomez @ efaches.navfac.navy.mil
01/29/98 02:56:00 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Daniel C. Montoya
cc:
Subject: fwd: McVeigh Wins Permanent Injunction

Original Text
From: <SLDN1@aol.com>, on 1/29/98 2:31 PM:
To:

PRESS RELEASE CONTACT: Kevin
Winston
January 29, 1998
(202) 667-0901

Rich Klein

(212) 969-3061

JUDGE GRANTS PERMANENT INJUNCTION PREVENTING DISCHARGE OF CHIEF OF BOAT

Ruling Marks First Time Court Rules That Navy Violated Limits on
Investigations
Under "Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue?"

WASHINGTON, DC - Later today, District Judge Stanley Sporkin of the U.S.
District Court for the District of Columbia will issue a permanent
injunction

preventing the discharge of Senior Chief Petty Officer Timothy R. McVeigh. The Navy reserves the right to appeal the injunction to the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals.

C. Dixon Osburn, Co-Executive Director of Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, stated, "This is a huge victory for McVeigh. What Judge Sporkin's ruling means is that after reviewing the merits of the case, he has determined that the Navy violated the Electronic Communications Privacy Act as well as the limits on investigations under "Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue." This is the first time that a federal court judge has said that the Navy has failed to follow its own rules and regulations under "Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue."

McVeigh, who was recommended for discharge because he allegedly used the word "gay" to describe his marital status on an America Online user profile, filed a lawsuit last week against the government. His suit claims that the Navy unlawfully obtained information about him from America Online without a warrant or court order as required by the 1986 Electronic Communications Privacy Act (ECPA), and breached the limits on investigations under the Pentagon's "Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue" policy.

In a ruling granting the preliminary injunction on Monday, January 26, 1998, Judge Sporkin, a Reagan appointee, stated, "The Navy violated the very essence of "Don't Ask, Don't Pursue" by launching a search and destroy mission." Judge Sporkin further stated in his ruling, "Suggestions of sexual orientation in a private, anonymous email account did not give the Navy a sufficient reason to investigate to determine whether to commence discharge proceedings. In its actions, the Navy violated its own regulations."

With respect to the merits of McVeigh's claim that the military solicited a violation of the Electronic Communications Privacy Act by AOL, Judge Sporkin warned that in the era of "big brother" it is incumbent on the federal government to observe all the limits and safeguards to an individual's privacy guaranteed by federal law.

The case, which has caught the attention of the online industry, watchdog, and civil rights groups, is the latest in a long line of controversies surrounding the military's policy on gays.

?In granting this permanent injunction, the Court is sending a strong and clear message that military commanders cannot go snooping for evidence that troops are gay,? stated Osburn. ?There are limits. And those limits must be followed.?

McVeigh?s case was strengthened last week when America Online, after admitting that it released McVeigh?s identity to a Naval paralegal, blasted the military for flouting Federal law by ignoring proper legal procedures to obtain such information.

Additionally, the author of the ?Don?t Ask, Don?t Tell, Don?t Pursue? policy, professor Charles Moskos of Northwestern University, after reviewing the facts of the case, criticized the military in a declaration filed in federal court. ?It is my opinion that the Navy violated the ?Don?t Ask, Don?t Tell? policy in the McVeigh case by launching an investigation without there being credible evidence that Senior Chief McVeigh had engaged in homosexual acts or had openly stated that he was a homosexual.?

SLDN is a 501(c)(3) organization. All contributions are tax-deductible to the extent allowed by law. If you would like to support the work of SLDN in other ways, please visit our web site at <http://www.sldn.org/scripts/sldn.ixe?page=helpsldn>.

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879) id <01ISYBOJ803K00AURU@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for montoya_dc@a1.eop.gov; Thu, 29 Jan 1998 14:58:27 -0500 (EST)

Received: from storm.eop.gov (storm.eop.gov) by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879) id <01ISYBOFLIY800CYR6@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for montoya_dc@a1.eop.gov; Thu, 29 Jan 1998 14:58:22 -0500 (EST)

Received: from ches02.efaches.navfac.navy.mil ([138.145.175.3]) by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-7 #6879) with SMTP id <01ISYBNKJ78Q000NFY@STORM.EOP.GOV> for montoya_dc@a1.eop.gov; Thu, 29 Jan 1998 14:57:41 -0500 (EST)

Received: by ches02.efaches.navfac.navy.mil with VINES-ISMTP; Thu, 29 Jan 1998 14:57:25 -0500 (EST)

X-Incognito-SN: 410

From: LAGomez@efaches.navfac.navy.mil, "Letitia A Gomez"@STORM.eop.gov

Errors-to: LAGomez@efaches.navfac.navy.mil

X-Priority: 3 (Normal)

X-Incognito-Version: 4.11.23

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Richard Socarides (CN=Richard Socarides/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-FEB-1998 16:07:50.00

SUBJECT: Report out Thursday shows 27% increase in 1997 of alleged violations of don't ask, don't tell

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Virginia Apuzzo (CN=Virginia Apuzzo/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sean P. Maloney (CN=Sean P. Maloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Monica M. Dixon (CN=Monica M. Dixon/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maria Echaveste (CN=Maria Echaveste/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ann F. Lewis (CN=Ann F. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura S. Marcus (CN=Laura S. Marcus/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph P. Lockhart (CN=Joseph P. Lockhart/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael D. McCurry (CN=Michael D. McCurry/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: KERRICK_D (KERRICK_D @ AI @ CD @ VAXGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (NSC)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sylvia M. Mathews (CN=Sylvia M. Mathews/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert N. Weiner (CN=Robert N. Weiner/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kay Casstevens (CN=Kay Casstevens/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph D Eyer (CN=Joseph D Eyer/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stacie Spector (CN=Stacie Spector/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr (CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Amy W. Tobe (CN=Amy W. Tobe/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barry J. Toiv (CN=Barry J. Toiv/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: LUZZATTO_A (LUZZATTO_A @ AI @ CD @ VAXGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (NSC)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John Podesta (CN=John Podesta/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Miriam H. Vogel (CN=Miriam H. Vogel/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Marjorie Tarmey (CN=Marjorie Tarmey/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Dawn L. Smalls (CN=Dawn L. Smalls/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

The Servicemembers Legal Defense Network will release its annual review of the cases under don't ask. don't tell for 1997 on Thursday. Among other things, it will again show an increase in alleged violations. They will be briefing us on the report before its release -- on Wednesday, February 18 at 4pm in room 180 OEOB and you are welcome to attend. We will be developing talking points after that briefing. DOD is receiving a separate briefing from them tomorrow.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Dag Vega@EOP@LNGTWY@LNGTWY (Dag Vega@EOP@LNGTWY@LNGTWY [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:18-FEB-1998 12:43:01.00

SUBJECT: NBC: Nightly News, 2/17/98

TO: jgibbons@ostp.eop.gov@INET@LNGTWY (jgibbons@ostp.eop.gov@INET@LNGTWY [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Waldman@eop (Michael Waldman@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Virginia M. Terzano@ovp@eop (Virginia M. Terzano@ovp@eop [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua Silverman@EOP (Joshua Silverman@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christa T. Robinson@eop (Christa T. Robinson@eop [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alison Muscatine@eop (Alison Muscatine@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie E. Mason@eop (Julie E. Mason@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel J. Gunia@eop (Daniel J. Gunia@eop [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeremy M. Gaines@eop (Jeremy M. Gaines@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul K. Engskov@eop (Paul K. Engskov@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards@eop (Anne M. Edwards@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven A. Cohen@eop (Steven A. Cohen@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: darby_E._stott@oa.eop.gov@INET@LNGTWY (darby_E._stott@oa.eop.gov@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lori_Anderson@OA.EOP.GOV@INET@LNGTWY (Lori_Anderson@OA.EOP.GOV@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barry J. Toiv@EOP (Barry J. Toiv@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gene B. Sperling@eop (Gene B. Sperling@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura D. Schwartz@eop (Laura D. Schwartz@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven J. Naplan@eop (Steven J. Naplan@eop [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kevin Moran@eop (Kevin Moran@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Russell W. Horwitz@eop (Russell W. Horwitz@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason S. Goldberg@EOP (Jason S. Goldberg@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen E. Finney@eop (Karen E. Finney@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rahm Emanuel@eop (Rahm Emanuel@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michelle Crisci@eop (Michelle Crisci@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jill M. Blickstein@eop (Jill M. Blickstein@eop [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Message Creation Date was at 18-FEB-1998 11:58:00

NBC Nightly News
Aired on February 17, 1998, 6:30 pm ET

Introduction
Reported by Tom Brokaw

TOM BROKAW, anchor:

President Clinton tells the nation why the United States must take
action
against Saddam and take action soon.

President BILL CLINTON: I want you to hear directly from me what is at
stake
for America in the Persian Gulf.

BROKAW: IN DEPTH tonight, the endgame; what happens if nothing changes
after

a military attack?

Back to the future: This baby boy, born yesterday, seven years after his twin. How did that happen?

And HOME OF THE BRAVE. A prisoner on a death march in a brutal war. Thousands die, but a stunning coincidence saved his life.

Announcer: From NBC News world headquarters in New York, this is NBC NIGHTLY NEWS with Tom Brokaw.

BROKAW: Good evening.

GRAND JURY IN MONICA LEWINSKY CASE HEARD
FROM FORMER CLINTON AIDE TODAY
Reported by TOM BROKAW

TOM BROKAW, anchor:

Meanwhile, the grand jury looking into the president's relationship with Monica Lewinsky heard today from Steve Gooden, who served for three years as Clinton personal aide. Gooden had no comment as he left the courtroom today.

CLINTON LAWYER'S ASKING FOR DISMISSAL OF PAULA JONES CASE
Reported by TOM BROKAW

TOM BROKAW, anchor:

Other news tonight, President Clinton's lawyers are asking a judge to dismiss Paula Jones' sexual harassment suit. They say there is no proof that she was a victim of job discrimination.

PRESIDENT CLINTON WARNS AMERICAN PEOPLE AND IRAQ OF
WHAT IS TO COME IF DIPLOMATIC EFFORTS ARE NOT SUCCESSFUL
Reported by TOM BROKAW and CLAIRE SHIPMAN

TOM BROKAW, anchor:

President Clinton made his strongest warning yet to Saddam Hussein and his strongest argument yet to the American people about why it may be necessary to order the military strike against Iraq. But he did stop short on two important counts: He didn't talk about the possibility of civilian casualties, and he

failed to set a deadline. After a long run-up, however, it does now appear that the critical moment is coming on very fast. NBC's Claire Shipman is at the White House tonight. Claire:

CLAIRE SHIPMAN reporting:

Tom, that's right, but even after all of the tough talk today, the United States just tonight has sanctioned a last-minute diplomatic effort by the secretary general of the United Nations. The president went to the Pentagon to make certain US troops are ready for battle, and to explain to the country

in stark terms what might happen if Saddam Hussein does not back down and the US does nothing.

President BILL CLINTON: He will then conclude that he can go right on and do more to rebuild an art--an arsenal of devastating destruction. And some day, some way, I guarantee you, he'll use the arsenal.

SHIPMAN: It was a tough message meant for consumption both at home and in Iraq.

President CLINTON: Let there be no doubt we are prepared to act.

SHIPMAN: But as the Clinton administration argued for military action, the secretary general of the United Nations, Kofi Annan, is prepared for a last-ditch diplomatic journey to Baghdad. Officials say he's expected to travel on Thursday with US support.

Mr. BILL RICHARDSON (US Ambassador to the UN): His mission could be a positive one, but we reserve the right to an alternative conclusion.

SHIPMAN: But privately, US officials worry his trip might muddy the situation. NBC News has learned that in a phone call with Kofi Annan today, President Clinton told the secretary general that he is in danger of jeopardizing his strong relationship with the United States and his own reputation. The president urged Annan not to give any ground on the authority of UN weapons inspectors.

But US officials said tonight they do think a diplomatic solution is more likely now, if only slightly. They think Annan has heard their concerns, and they also say the US might support a compromise proposal--one idea being

discussed, for example, that other diplomats take part in the inspection of presidential palaces. As long as the real authority remains with the official UN weapons inspectors, the US says it might go along.

Now, the Russians are also saying today that the Iraqis may be ready to back down, and US officials are interested in that, but they say the Russians have been wrong before. And officials here continue to worry that Kofi Annan might get dragged into some kind of murky compromise agreement with the Iraqis that the US would not support, and so they say the US remains fully prepared to act militarily. Tom:

BROKAW: Thanks very much. Claire Shipman at the White House tonight.

ARAB STATES SURROUNDING IRAQ DENYING PUBLIC SUPPORT TO US DESPITE THEIR SUPPORT IN GULF WAR Reported by TOM BROKAW and FRED FRANCIS

TOM BROKAW, anchor:

And the United States does continue to have problems with Arab states in the Gulf, the same nations that were so supportive during Operation Desert Storm. Today, Bahrain, a major staging area for US forces during the war last time, said, 'Not this time.' And NBC's Fred Francis is in Bahrain tonight.

Fred, what's the story there?

FRED FRANCIS reporting:

Well, the Bahrainis got cold feet, at least for the moment, Tom, and that hurts the United States politically more than militarily. Politically, one military officer said that leaves only the aircraft carrier, Kuwait, as the only dependable ally. Militarily it doesn't represent a lot. Only 36 war planes here at the moment, they can be moved on to Kuwait. In the end, though, some feel that the Arabs nation will practice their own version of the Pentagon's don't ask, don't tell. If the shooting starts, they will quietly let the United States use some of the bases, and they won't talk about it publicly, Tom.

BROKAW: But publicly, why are they so opposed to the idea of using them now,
Fred?

FRANCIS: Tom, they think that Saddam's only defense is a good offense, and they're concerned that tonight Saddam still has some Scud missiles hidden, and he may lob those missiles down here. He's done it before, Tom.

BROKAW: All right, thanks very much. Fred Francis tonight in Bahrain, which--they said, No staging of American military attacks against Iraq this time.'

If the US attacks, what will really happen to Saddam? We'll have answers tonight, IN DEPTH, later on.

And up next, Texas tragedy. A guilty verdict in the cadet love triangle murder.

Ms. KRISTEN CLARK: It's a shame. It really is. Three lives are totally destroyed over nothing.

BROKAW: Once a promising future, including the Naval academy. Now, life in prison.

And would you believe this baby is seven and a half years old? Technically that's true. We'll tell you how.

AMERICAN MILITARY PLANNERS HAVE DETAILED PLANS OF
PRIMARY TARGETS IN POSSIBLE MILITARY STRIKE AGAINST IRAQ
Reported by TOM BROKAW and JIM MIKLASZEWSKI

TOM BROKAW, anchor:

Obviously, American military planners have been working on a plan for a long time on what they would hit in Saddam's Iraq. And as NBC's Jim Miklaszewski tells us tonight from the Pentagon, they are going after more than just remote weapons sites.

Jim, what do you have for us?

JIM MIKLASZEWSKI reporting:

Well, Tom, the US military has already picked out its targets for possible air strikes, and it only took seven years to put it all together. Some of the most serious military threats to Saddam Hussein are headed for the Persian Gulf today. They're not supersonic bombers, they're supersensitive spy planes, that would help the American military hit targets that would hurt Saddam Hussein the most, intended to destabilize his regime. In fact, for the past seven years, since the end of the Gulf War, a high-flying network of surveillance planes and spy satellites has photographed nearly every square inch of Iraq and watched nearly every move of Saddam's military, giving war planners a clear picture of what to expect and what to hit.

General JOHN SHEEHAN (US Marine Corps, Retired): You know what his Republican Guard response capability is, you know what kind of surface-to-air missiles he has, so you can work that particular problem. So when you do collapse his command and control, you can do it a lot faster.

MIKLASZEWSKI: Specifically, the US military would go after Saddam's personal army, the Republican Guard, his command and control, even secret police headquarters scattered throughout Iraq. The US has help. In the northern no-fly zone at Mosul, British intelligence photos reveal one of Saddam's largest palace sites, complete with communication facilities and hardened bunkers. CIA officials tell NBC News it's a suspected storage site for biological weapons and is on the target list. But all that high-tech surveillance is not foolproof.

Mr. ELIOT COHEN (Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies): If Saddam, say, suddenly moves a kindergarten into a biological weapons site a few hours before a bomb hits, it's very unlikely that our intelligence will pick that up.

MIKLASZEWSKI: Former CIA director James Rosey warns that one bombing campaign alone will not likely get rid of Saddam.

Mr. JAMES ROSEY: This is not something for which there is likely to be any

immediate gratification. This is tough.

MIKLASZEWSKI: Now, publicly, Pentagon officials deny that any bombing campaign would be aimed at overthrowing Saddam. But they admit that the kinds of targets selected could in fact help push him from power. Tom:

BROKAW: Thanks very much, Jim Miklaszewski tonight at the Pentagon.

QUESTIONS RAISED AS TO WHETHER US MILITARY STRIKE WILL HELP OR HURT SITUATION WITH IRAQ

Reported by TOM BROKAW and ANDREA MITCHELL

TOM BROKAW, anchor:

NBC NEWS IN DEPTH tonight. As the US military gears up to hit Iraq, the question is, what can these American attacks really accomplish? Or is it mission: impossible? In 1991, Operation Desert Storm cost American taxpayers \$ 7.4 billion. American warplanes dropped 88,500 tons of bombs. Of course, Saddam was kicked out of Kuwait as a result. And yet today, he remains in power in Iraq, still thumbing his nose at UN weapons inspectors and the world. So what will happen this time if the US begins bombing? Our IN DEPTH report tonight on the endgame from NBC's Andrea Mitchell.

ANDREA MITCHELL reporting:

The US strikes, but then what? When the smoke clears, who will win? Who will lose? Scenario number one: Saddam survives, but severely weakened by the US bombardment. That's the administration's best hope, except that even in defeat, Saddam can be very dangerous.

General NORMAN SCHWARZKOPF (Retired Former Gulf War Commander): He was considerably weakened, very weakened, after the Gulf War. What you saw was immediate repression within his own country against any elements that chose to rise up against him.

MITCHELL: Much more likely, experts say, scenario number two: results of the bombing mixed, civilian casualties high, no proof we've taken out the weapons of mass destruction. The US declares victory, but loses prestige, and the economic sanctions on Iraq crumble.

General SCHWARZKOPF: The United States is going to be viewed by a large portion of the world as the pariah, and I'm afraid that other nations are going to say because the United States has done this, we feel that we can disregard the sanctions. And if that happens, Saddam has won.

MITCHELL: Saddam could become even more of a hero elsewhere in the region, to young Palestinians, like those demonstrating against the US today in the West Bank, and to terrorist organizations like Hamas. And even more of a menace to his enemies.

Mr. PAUL WOLFOWITZ (Former Undersecretary of Defense): Every time he survives something, he sends the message to his enemies, I outlast my enemies, and if you are on the wrong list when I'm still around, you'll be in trouble.' It's like a mafia don. I mean, it's a power game.

MITCHELL: Least likely of all, scenario number three: the US targets Saddam and kills him. But is that really the best outcome?

General SCHWARZKOPF: Even if we got him, his heir apparent, his son, is considered to be much worse than he is and much more brutal.

MITCHELL: And without Saddam, experts believe Iraq could dissolve into civil war, like Lebanon or Bosnia--three warring ethnic groups; Kurds in the North, Sunni Muslims in central Iraq, Shiites in the South.

Mr. EDWARD DJEREJIAN (Former Ambassador to Israel and Syria): This disintegration will threaten Iraq's neighbors--all of its neighbors in the Gulf--Turkey, Syria, Iran--and could lead to consequences that we simply cannot see very clearly.

MITCHELL: Worst of all, even some administration supporters warn the US won't get a second chance to attack Iraq if the first air strikes don't get Saddam or his weapons. So military and diplomatic experts say the US must hit Saddam very hard or not at all. Andrea Mitchell, NBC News, Washington.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)

CREATOR: Dag Vega@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX

CREATION DATE/TIME:18-FEB-1998 11:59:00.00

SUBJECT: NBC: Nightly News, 2/17/98

TO: ABERNATHY_P (ABERNATHY_P@A1@CD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: ANDERSON_L (ANDERSON_L@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: BERNAL_D (BERNAL_D@A1@CD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: BLICKSTEIN_J (BLICKSTEIN_J@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: COHEN_SA (COHEN_SA@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: CRISCI_M (CRISCI_M@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: EDWARDS_A (EDWARDS_A@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: EMANUEL_R (EMANUEL_R@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: ENGSKOV_K (ENGSKOV_K@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: FINNEY_K (FINNEY_K@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: GAINES_J (GAINES_J@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: GIBBONS_J (GIBBONS_J@A1@CD) (STP)
READ:NOT READ

TO: GOLDBERG_JS (GOLDBERG_JS@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: GREEN_J (GREEN_J@A1@CD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: GUNIA_D (GUNIA_D@A1@CD) (OA)
READ:NOT READ

TO: HILLIARD_B (HILLIARD_B@A1@CD) (NSC)
READ:18-FEB-1998 13:51:25.52

TO: HOLSTEIN_E (HOLSTEIN_E@A1@CD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: HORWITZ_R (HORWITZ_R@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: KUKIS_H (KUKIS_H@A1@CD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: LEWIS_PF (LEWIS_PF@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: LI_G (LI_G@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: MARSHA_T (MARSHA_T@A1@CD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: MASON_J (MASON_J@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: MORAN_K1 (MORAN_K1@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: MUSCATINE_A (MUSCATINE_A@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: NAPLAN_S (NAPLAN_S@A1@CD) (NSC)
READ:NOT READ

TO: O'DONNELL_T (O'DONNELL_T@A1@CD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: ROBINSON_C (ROBINSON_C@A1@CD) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: SCHAEFER_V (SCHAEFER_V@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: SCHWARTZ_L (SCHWARTZ_L@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: SILVERMAN_J (SILVERMAN_J@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: SPERLING_G (SPERLING_G@A1@CD) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: STOTT_D (STOTT_D@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: TABERSKI_D READ:NOT READ	(TABERSKI_D@A1@CD)
TO: TERZAN_V READ:NOT READ	(TERZAN_V@A1@CD) (VPO)
TO: TOIV_B READ:NOT READ	(TOIV_B@A1@CD) (WHO)
TO: WALDMAN_M READ:NOT READ	(WALDMAN_M@A1@CD) (WHO)
TO: gamble-bennett READ:NOT READ	(gamble-bennett@dol.gov@inet)
TO: Brenda M. Anders READ:NOT READ	(Brenda M. Anders@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Megan C. Moloney READ:NOT READ	(Megan C. Moloney@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Jonathan Murchinson READ:NOT READ	(Jonathan Murchinson@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Joseph P. Lockhart READ:NOT READ	(Joseph P. Lockhart@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Jake Siewert READ:NOT READ	(Jake Siewert@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Jordan Tamagni READ:NOT READ	(Jordan Tamagni@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Beverly J. Barnes READ:NOT READ	(Beverly J. Barnes@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Brian D. Smith READ:NOT READ	(Brian D. Smith@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Elizabeth R. Newman READ:NOT READ	(Elizabeth R. Newman@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Julia M. Payne READ:NOT READ	(Julia M. Payne@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Julianne B. Corbett READ:NOT READ	(Julianne B. Corbett@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Jeffrey M. Smith READ:NOT READ	(Jeffrey M. Smith@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: June Shih READ:NOT READ	(June Shih@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Lowell A. Weiss READ:NOT READ	(Lowell A. Weiss@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Estela Mendoza READ:NOT READ	(Estela Mendoza@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Jonathan A. Kaplan READ:NOT READ	(Jonathan A. Kaplan@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Jonathan Orszag READ:NOT READ	(Jonathan Orszag@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr READ:NOT READ	(Thurgood Marshall Jr@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Kara Gerhardt READ:NOT READ	(Kara Gerhardt@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Elisabeth Steele READ:NOT READ	(Elisabeth Steele@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Jennifer Ferguson READ:NOT READ	(Jennifer Ferguson@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Mark D. Neschis READ:NOT READ	(Mark D. Neschis@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Eleanor S. Parker READ:NOT READ	(Eleanor S. Parker@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Matthew I. Fraidin READ:NOT READ	(Matthew I. Fraidin@OVP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: David K. Chai READ:NOT READ	(David K. Chai@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Ruby Shamir READ:NOT READ	(Ruby Shamir@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Nanda Chitre READ:NOT READ	(Nanda Chitre@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Amy W. Tobe READ:NOT READ	(Amy W. Tobe@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Lawrence J. Haas READ:NOT READ	(Lawrence J. Haas@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: David S. Beaubaire READ:NOT READ	(David S. Beaubaire@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Lisa J. Levin READ:NOT READ	(Lisa J. Levin@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Peter A. Weissman (Peter A. Weissman@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: William A. Halter (William A. Halter@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Eli G. Attie (Eli G. Attie@OVP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Patricia M. Ewing (Patricia M. Ewing@OVP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sara M. Latham (Sara M. Latham@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Melissa M. Murray (Melissa M. Murray@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jonathan E. Smith (Jonathan E. Smith@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:
Message Creation Date was at 18-FEB-1998 11:58:00

NBC Nightly News
Aired on February 17, 1998, 6:30 pm ET

Introduction
Reported by Tom Brokaw

TOM BROKAW, anchor:

President Clinton tells the nation why the United States must take action
against Saddam and take action soon.

President BILL CLINTON: I want you to hear directly from me what is at stake
for America in the Persian Gulf.

BROKAW: IN DEPTH tonight, the endgame; what happens if nothing changes after
a military attack?

Back to the future: This baby boy, born yesterday, seven years after his
twin. How did that happen?

And HOME OF THE BRAVE. A prisoner on a death march in a brutal war.
Thousands die, but a stunning coincidence saved his life.

Announcer: From NBC News world headquarters in New York, this is NBC NIGHTLY
NEWS with Tom Brokaw.

BROKAW: Good evening.

GRAND JURY IN MONICA LEWINSKY CASE HEARD
FROM FORMER CLINTON AIDE TODAY
Reported by TOM BROKAW

TOM BROKAW, anchor:

Meanwhile, the grand jury looking into the president's relationship with Monica Lewinsky heard today from Steve Gooden, who served for three years as Clinton personal aide. Gooden had no comment as he left the courtroom today.

CLINTON LAWYER'S ASKING FOR DISMISSAL OF PAULA JONES CASE
Reported by TOM BROKAW

TOM BROKAW, anchor:

Other news tonight, President Clinton's lawyers are asking a judge to dismiss Paula Jones' sexual harassment suit. They say there is no proof that she was a victim of job discrimination.

PRESIDENT CLINTON WARNS AMERICAN PEOPLE AND IRAQ OF
WHAT IS TO COME IF DIPLOMATIC EFFORTS ARE NOT SUCCESSFUL
Reported by TOM BROKAW and CLAIRE SHIPMAN

TOM BROKAW, anchor:

President Clinton made his strongest warning yet to Saddam Hussein and his strongest argument yet to the American people about why it may be necessary to order the military strike against Iraq. But he did stop short on two important counts: He didn't talk about the possibility of civilian casualties, and he failed to set a deadline. After a long run-up, however, it does now appear that the critical moment is coming on very fast. NBC's Claire Shipman is at the White House tonight. Claire:

CLAIRE SHIPMAN reporting:

Tom, that's right, but even after all of the tough talk today, the United States just tonight has sanctioned a last-minute diplomatic effort by the secretary general of the United Nations. The president went to the Pentagon to make certain US troops are ready for battle, and to explain to the country

in stark terms what might happen if Saddam Hussein does not back down and the US does nothing.

President BILL CLINTON: He will then conclude that he can go right on and do more to rebuild an art--an arsenal of devastating destruction. And some day, some way, I guarantee you, he'll use the arsenal.

SHIPMAN: It was a tough message meant for consumption both at home and in Iraq.

President CLINTON: Let there be no doubt we are prepared to act.

SHIPMAN: But as the Clinton administration argued for military action, the secretary general of the United Nations, Kofi Annan, is prepared for a last-ditch diplomatic journey to Baghdad. Officials say he's expected to travel on Thursday with US support.

Mr. BILL RICHARDSON (US Ambassador to the UN): His mission could be a positive one, but we reserve the right to an alternative conclusion.

SHIPMAN: But privately, US officials worry his trip might muddy the situation. NBC News has learned that in a phone call with Kofi Annan today, President Clinton told the secretary general that he is in danger of jeopardizing his strong relationship with the United States and his own reputation. The president urged Annan not to give any ground on the authority of UN weapons inspectors.

But US officials said tonight they do think a diplomatic solution is more likely now, if only slightly. They think Annan has heard their concerns, and they also say the US might support a compromise proposal--one idea being discussed, for example, that other diplomats take part in the inspection of presidential palaces. As long as the real authority remains with the official UN weapons inspectors, the US says it might go along.

Now, the Russians are also saying today that the Iraqis may be ready to back down, and US officials are interested in that, but they say the Russians have been wrong before. And officials here continue to worry that Kofi Annan might get dragged into some kind of murky compromise agreement with the Iraqis that the US would not support, and so they say the US remains fully prepared to act militarily. Tom:

BROKAW: Thanks very much. Claire Shipman at the White House tonight.

ARAB STATES SURROUNDING IRAQ DENYING PUBLIC
SUPPORT TO US DESPITE THEIR SUPPORT IN GULF WAR
Reported by TOM BROKAW and FRED FRANCIS

TOM BROKAW, anchor:

And the United States does continue to have problems with Arab states in the Gulf, the same nations that were so supportive during Operation Desert Storm. Today, Bahrain, a major staging area for US forces during the war last time, said, 'Not this time.' And NBC's Fred Francis is in Bahrain tonight.

Fred, what's the story there?

FRED FRANCIS reporting:

Well, the Bahrainis got cold feet, at least for the moment, Tom, and that hurts the United States politically more than militarily. Politically, one military officer said that leaves only the aircraft carrier, Kuwait, as the only dependable ally. Militarily it doesn't represent a lot. Only 36 war planes

here at the moment, they can be moved on to Kuwait. In the end, though, some feel that the Arabs nation will practice their own version of the Pentagon's don't ask, don't tell. If the shooting starts, they will quietly let the United States use some of the bases, and they won't talk about it publicly, Tom.

BROKAW: But publicly, why are they so opposed to the idea of using them now, Fred?

FRANCIS: Tom, they think that Saddam's only defense is a good offense, and they're concerned that tonight Saddam still has some Scud missiles hidden, and he may lob those missiles down here. He's done it before, Tom.

BROKAW: All right, thanks very much. Fred Francis tonight in Bahrain, which--they said, No staging of American military attacks against Iraq this time.'

If the US attacks, what will really happen to Saddam? We'll have answers tonight, IN DEPTH, later on.

And up next, Texas tragedy. A guilty verdict in the cadet love triangle murder.

Ms. KRISTEN CLARK: It's a shame. It really is. Three lives are totally destroyed over nothing.

BROKAW: Once a promising future, including the Naval academy. Now, life in prison.

And would you believe this baby is seven and a half years old? Technically that's true. We'll tell you how.

AMERICAN MILITARY PLANNERS HAVE DETAILED PLANS OF
PRIMARY TARGETS IN POSSIBLE MILITARY STRIKE AGAINST IRAQ
Reported by TOM BROKAW and JIM MIKLASZEWSKI

TOM BROKAW, anchor:

Obviously, American military planners have been working on a plan for a long time on what they would hit in Saddam's Iraq. And as NBC's Jim Miklaszewski tells us tonight from the Pentagon, they are going after more than just remote weapons sites.

Jim, what do you have for us?

JIM MIKLASZEWSKI reporting:

Well, Tom, the US military has already picked out its targets for possible air strikes, and it only took seven years to put it all together. Some of the most serious military threats to Saddam Hussein are headed for the Persian Gulf today. They're not supersonic bombers, they're supersensitive spy planes, that would help the American military hit targets that would hurt Saddam Hussein the most, intended to destabilize his regime. In fact, for the past seven years,

since the end of the Gulf War, a high-flying network of surveillance planes and spy satellites has photographed nearly every square inch of Iraq and watched nearly every move of Saddam's military, giving war planners a clear picture of what to expect and what to hit.

General JOHN SHEEHAN (US Marine Corps, Retired): You know what his Republican Guard response capability is, you know what kind of surface-to-air missiles he has, so you can work that particular problem. So when you do collapse his command and control, you can do it a lot faster.

MIKLASZEWSKI: Specifically, the US military would go after Saddam's personal army, the Republican Guard, his command and control, even secret police headquarters scattered throughout Iraq. The US has help. In the northern no-fly zone at Mosul, British intelligence photos reveal one of Saddam's largest palace sites, complete with communication facilities and hardened bunkers. CIA officials tell NBC News it's a suspected storage site for biological weapons and is on the target list. But all that high-tech surveillance is not foolproof.

Mr. ELIOT COHEN (Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies): If Saddam, say, suddenly moves a kindergarten into a biological weapons site a few hours before a bomb hits, it's very unlikely that our intelligence will pick that up.

MIKLASZEWSKI: Former CIA director James Rosey warns that one bombing campaign alone will not likely get rid of Saddam.

Mr. JAMES ROSEY: This is not something for which there is likely to be any immediate gratification. This is tough.

MIKLASZEWSKI: Now, publicly, Pentagon officials deny that any bombing campaign would be aimed at overthrowing Saddam. But they admit that the kinds of targets selected could in fact help push him from power. Tom:

BROKAW: Thanks very much, Jim Miklaszewski tonight at the Pentagon.

QUESTIONS RAISED AS TO WHETHER US MILITARY STRIKE WILL HELP OR HURT SITUATION WITH IRAQ
Reported by TOM BROKAW and ANDREA MITCHELL

TOM BROKAW, anchor:

NBC NEWS IN DEPTH tonight. As the US military gears up to hit Iraq, the question is, what can these American attacks really accomplish? Or is it mission: impossible? In 1991, Operation Desert Storm cost American taxpayers \$ 7.4 billion. American warplanes dropped 88,500 tons of bombs. Of course, Saddam was kicked out of Kuwait as a result. And yet today, he remains in power in Iraq, still thumbing his nose at UN weapons inspectors and the world. So what will happen this time if the US begins bombing? Our IN DEPTH report tonight on the endgame from NBC's Andrea Mitchell.

ANDREA MITCHELL reporting:

The US strikes, but then what? When the smoke clears, who will win? Who will lose? Scenario number one: Saddam survives, but severely weakened by the US bombardment. That's the administration's best hope, except that even in defeat, Saddam can be very dangerous.

General NORMAN SCHWARZKOPF (Retired Former Gulf War Commander): He was considerably weakened, very weakened, after the Gulf War. What you saw was immediate repression within his own country against any elements that chose to rise up against him.

MITCHELL: Much more likely, experts say, scenario number two: results of the bombing mixed, civilian casualties high, no proof we've taken out the weapons of mass destruction. The US declares victory, but loses prestige, and the economic sanctions on Iraq crumble.

General SCHWARZKOPF: The United States is going to be viewed by a large portion of the world as the pariah, and I'm afraid that other nations are going to say because the United States has done this, we feel that we can disregard the sanctions. And if that happens, Saddam has won.

MITCHELL: Saddam could become even more of a hero elsewhere in the region, to young Palestinians, like those demonstrating against the US today in the West Bank, and to terrorist organizations like Hamas. And even more of a menace to his enemies.

Mr. PAUL WOLFOWITZ (Former Undersecretary of Defense): Every time he survives something, he sends the message to his enemies, I outlast my enemies, and if you are on the wrong list when I'm still around, you'll be in trouble.' It's like a mafia don. I mean, it's a power game.

MITCHELL: Least likely of all, scenario number three: the US targets Saddam and kills him. But is that really the best outcome?

General SCHWARZKOPF: Even if we got him, his heir apparent, his son, is considered to be much worse than he is and much more brutal.

MITCHELL: And without Saddam, experts believe Iraq could dissolve into civil war, like Lebanon or Bosnia--three warring ethnic groups; Kurds in the North, Sunni Muslims in central Iraq, Shiites in the South.

Mr. EDWARD DJEREJIAN (Former Ambassador to Israel and Syria): This disintegration will threaten Iraq's neighbors--all of its neighbors in the Gulf--Turkey, Syria, Iran--and could lead to consequences that we simply cannot see very clearly.

MITCHELL: Worst of all, even some administration supporters warn the US won't get a second chance to attack Iraq if the first air strikes don't get Saddam or his weapons. So military and diplomatic experts say the US must hit Saddam very hard or not at all. Andrea Mitchell, NBC News, Washington.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Brad L. Austin to Trey Graham at 13:49:29.00. Subject: RE: This Friday. (1 page)	03/24/1998	Personal Misfile

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
OPD ([Don't Ask, Don't Tell])
OA/Box Number: 250000

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/28/1998 - 06/25/1998]

2015-0017-F
ab1568

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]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Peter A. Weissman (CN=Peter A. Weissman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-APR-1998 10:21:13.00

SUBJECT: April 8 NSC News Summary

TO: Melissa G. Green (CN=Melissa G. Green/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Peter A. Weissman/OPD/EOP on 04/08/98
10:21 AM -----

RUBIN_E @ A1

04/08/98 08:45:00 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Gene B. Sperling, swanjohnsonfamily @ ibm.net@INET@LNGTWY

cc:

Subject: April 8 NSC News Summary

NATIONAL SECURITY NEWS SUMMARY

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 8, 1998

EUROPE/NIS/CANADA

N. IRELAND: Blair flies to Belfast to join peace talks as fatal deadlock threatens process. Masked gunmen kill man identified as a loyalist paramilitary member. Mitchell is the "man to trust" for all sides at talks. (NYT1,3;WP17,24;LAT3;USA1,10;WT11)

FRANCE: Chirac's conservative coalition splits over control of Paris city government. (WP18)

RUSSIA: Yeltsin pushes for Duma approval of Kiriyeenko as prime minister. (WP19, NYT3, LAT2, USA11)

GERMANY: Tale of one of Germany's secret spymasters is subject of a new documentary. Kohl faces uphill battle for re-election. Construction reveals bunkers of Goebbels, others under Berlin. (WP20, NYT6, WT11)

GREECE: Critical comments by Amb. Burns set off debate in Greek parliament. (NYT8, USA11, WT11)

NATO: Polls show U.S. public is "acutely uninterested" in outcome of enlargement ratification vote. (LAT2)

CZECH REP.: Ancient beer-maker goes head-to-head with Anheuser-Busch over Budweiser name. (LAT1)

FRY: Kosovo insurgents are buying weapons in Albania's lawless highlands, seek "blood revenge." Kosovar leaders reject Belgrade offer of talks. (WT1,18)

E.U.: Led by Blair, European socialist parties agree on strategy to reach out to Third World, other nations. (WT11)

ASIA/PACIFIC

INDONESIA: IMF, Jakarta agree on new bailout package allowing resumption of loans. (NYT1,WP18,USA/B1,WSJ19)

CHINA: Chinese and Hong Kong governments are exempted from privacy and anti-discrimination laws. Beijing deports Chinese-American scholar and human rights activist. As prosperity increases, Chinese tourists are now a common sight in other Asian countries. (WP18;NYT1,7;WT12)

BURMA: SLORC bars visit by Richardson, retaliating for U.S. ban on officials' visits. (NYT8,WT12)

JAPAN: Probe of central bank corruption uncovers improprieties. New U.S. Ambassador Foley wins plaudits in Tokyo. Merrill Lynch sets its sights on dominating Japan's securities market. Citicorp is thriving as haven for jittery Japanese. Japanese fret that they are being left behind as market changes. (WP18;NYT10;WSJ1,17,18)

PHILIPPINES: Manila wants U.S. to return bells seized in 1901; Ramos visit is possible venue. Four-page ad supplement in Washington Times. (WP21;WT1,suppl.)

MIDDLE EAST/SOUTH ASIA

IRAN: Uproar over jailing of Tehran mayor reveals splits within ruling regime. Iran releases 5600 Iraqi POWs. (NYT6,USA11,WT11)

MEPP: Israel on alert after soldiers kill Palestinian driver who allegedly ran a roadblock. Ross will travel to Mideast after Passover; Netanyahu sending envoy here. (WP18,NYT7,USA11,WT12)

SAUDI ARABIA: Muslims complete final rites of hajj in Mecca. (WP18,LAT2)

EGYPT: Cairo denies persecuting Coptic Christians, opposes Wolf-Specter bill. (WT12)

SOUTH ASIA: India blames China for selling Pakistan long-range missiles, says it has them too. (WP18,WT12)

LATIN AMERICA/CARIBBEAN

TRADE: Sen. McCain praises Clinton for working toward hemispheric free trade, laments failure of fast-track legislation. (WT4)

BRAZIL: Slash and burn agriculture threatens Amazon and the livelihood of its inhabitants. (WP1)

PARAGUAY: Alleging lack of consular notification, Asuncion seeks to block Virginia execution. (WP18)

CUBA: Twelve former political prisoners arrive in Canada; some may go on to Miami. State, Treasury dispute claim by trade show organizer that it has permission to organize a show in Cuba. (WP18,USA11)

PANAMA: El Nino is hurting the canal: low water levels and drought bring restrictions on passage. (WP20)

EL SALVADOR: Relatives of U.S. nuns slain in 1980 are outraged to learn that officers linked to killing received U.S. residence. (USA10)

MEXICO: Government is nursing its ailing banking system. (WSJ19)

AFRICA

NIGERIA: Protests by poor tribal communities rise against oil development on coast. (WP17)

RWANDA: Memorial to Tutsi victims of 1994 genocide is dedicated in Kigali. (WP18)

GLOBAL/DEFENSE/ECON

TWA 800: NTSB urges rewiring of 747 fuel sensors to prevent another explosion. (NYT1,WP2,LAT1,USA1)

DEFENSE: Secretary Cohen issues revisions to "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy on homosexuality. Project on Government Oversight says U.S. military is overloaded with flag-rank officers. Cohen strongly backs Navy's decision to discharge a gay sailor. (LAT1,USA11,WT1)

ENVIRONMENT: One-eight of all plant species are threatened with extinction. (WP1)

U.N./CONGRESS: Rep. Solomon apologizes for saying SecGen Annan should be horsewhipped. (WP5,USA11)

CTBT: Administration urges Senate to ratify treaty. (NYT7)

INTEL: Ex-wife of CIA spy suspect says the FBI ignored her warnings that

he
needed help. (LAT1)

IMMIGRATION: 55,000 applications selected at random for immigration visa lottery. (USA11)

ADMINISTRATION

KAMEN: Nick Burns is assailed by Greek parliament speaker for acting like a Roman governor; foreign minister defends his comments. Anne Luzzatto is off to the private sector at the end of the month. Adm. Pease is retiring to work for General Dynamics. Ginny Terzano has also gone private. (WP21)

OPINION

WP: Editorial says the U.S. should put up with U.N. human rights inspections and criticism of our own performance because it gives us a useful mechanism for addressing abuses by other countries. Editorial urges new legislation to correct problems with asylum procedure reforms in the 1996 immigration law. (22)

NYT: Editorial expresses concern that "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy has led to a 67 percent increase in the number of service members forced out for homosexuality. Editorial says the U.S. needs to encourage Saudi Arabia to modernize and become more democratic as King Fahd fades from the scene. Buerghenthal op-ed urges the U.S. to come clean about what it knows about Central America's "dirty wars" of the 1980s. Jessica Stern urges that we act now to prepare for bioterrorism incidents. (24-25)

LAT: Mann questions how important the Clinton-Yeltsin relationship is when events are rapidly moving beyond them. Herschensohn says that the ABM treaty (totally omitting minor considerations like technical feasibility)

,
is the only stumbling block to fulfillment of Reagan's vision of an anti-missile defense. Toffler and Toffler review the implications of a selective immigration policy that discourages unskilled laborers from entering the U.S. (5, 11)

WSJ: Editorial calls on Hashimoto to deliver supply-side tax reform, not tax-cut tokenism. (22)

USA: Editorial says the Administration was wrong to politicize the base closure process through its privatization efforts in California and Texas, but that should not be an excuse for Congress to maintain a larger than necessary defense infrastructure. Weldon's Opposing View calls on the President to reverse the privatization attempt, then somehow links the whole issue to too many deployments and a lack of allied burden-sharing. Shapiro column says INS urgently needs reform but only new leadership can make it happen. (11,14)

WT: Editorial supports Cohen's call for additional base closures, while

slamming the President for making the hard sell to Congress even tougher. Bartlett supports Arney's opposition to further IMF funding, but recognizes it will pass and encourages Treasury to increase IMF oversight. Hackett calls for passage of full theater missile defense to counteract Iranian efforts to obtain Russian missile technology. (14-17)

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Mark A. Kitchens (CN=Mark A. Kitchens/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-APR-1998 11:28:30.00

SUBJECT: NPR All Things Considered, April 7, 1998

TO: Dag Vega (CN=Dag Vega/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: June Shih (CN=June Shih/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Terri J. Tingen (CN=Terri J. Tingen/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alison Muscatine (CN=Alison Muscatine/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel J. Gunia (CN=Daniel J. Gunia/OU=OA/O=EOP @ EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven J. Naplan (CN=Steven J. Naplan/OU=NSC/O=EOP @ EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven A. Cohen (CN=Steven A. Cohen/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason S. Goldberg (CN=Jason S. Goldberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura D. Schwartz (CN=Laura D. Schwartz/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul K. Engskov (CN=Paul K. Engskov/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gene B. Sperling (CN=Gene B. Sperling/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards (CN=Anne M. Edwards/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua Silverman (CN=Joshua Silverman/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lori L. Anderson (CN=Lori L. Anderson/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan E. Smith (CN=Jonathan E. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sara M. Latham (CN=Sara M. Latham/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eli G. Attie (CN=Eli G. Attie/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter A. Weissman (CN=Peter A. Weissman/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David S. Beaubaire (CN=David S. Beaubaire/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nanda Chitre (CN=Nanda Chitre/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David K. Chai (CN=David K. Chai/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eleanor S. Parker (CN=Eleanor S. Parker/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer Ferguson (CN=Jennifer Ferguson/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kara Gerhardt (CN=Kara Gerhardt/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan Orszag (CN=Jonathan Orszag/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Estela Mendoza (CN=Estela Mendoza/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey M. Smith (CN=Jeffrey M. Smith/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julia M. Payne (CN=Julia M. Payne/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian D. Smith (CN=Brian D. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jordan Tamagni (CN=Jordan Tamagni/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph P. Lockhart (CN=Joseph P. Lockhart/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Megan C. Moloney (CN=Megan C. Moloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brenda M. Anders (CN=Brenda M. Anders/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey A. Shesol (CN=Jeffrey A. Shesol/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason H. Schechter (CN=Jason H. Schechter/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gordon Li (CN=Gordon Li/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen E. Finney (CN=Karen E. Finney/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jill M. Blickstein (CN=Jill M. Blickstein/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Russell W. Horwitz (CN=Russell W. Horwitz/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie E. Mason (CN=Julie E. Mason/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kevin S. Moran (CN=Kevin S. Moran/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Virginia M. Terzano (CN=Virginia M. Terzano/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rahm I. Emanuel (CN=Rahm I. Emanuel/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Waldman (CN=Michael Waldman/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barry J. Toiv (CN=Barry J. Toiv/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Darby E. Stott (CN=Darby E. Stott/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Miriam H. Vogel (CN=Miriam H. Vogel/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa M. Murray (CN=Melissa M. Murray/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patricia M. Ewing (CN=Patricia M. Ewing/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William A. Halter (CN=William A. Halter/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa J. Levin (CN=Lisa J. Levin/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Amy W. Tobe (CN=Amy W. Tobe/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ruby Shamir (CN=Ruby Shamir/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Matthew I. Fraidin (CN=Matthew I. Fraidin/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark D. Neschis (CN=Mark D. Neschis/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elisabeth Steele (CN=Elisabeth Steele/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr (CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan A. Kaplan (CN=Jonathan A. Kaplan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lowell A. Weiss (CN=Lowell A. Weiss/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julianne B. Corbett (CN=Julianne B. Corbett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman (CN=Elizabeth R. Newman/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Beverly J. Barnes (CN=Beverly J. Barnes/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jake Siewert (CN=Jake Siewert/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan Murchinson (CN=Jonathan Murchinson/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gamble-bennett (gamble-bennett @ dol.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michelle Crisci (CN=Michelle Crisci/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
NPR ALL THINGS CONSIDERED
Aired on APRIL 7, 1998, TUESDAY 8:00 pm ET

Clinton Opens National Dialogue on Social Security

Reported by John Ydstie, Kansas City; Robert Siegel, Washington DC

NPR's John Ydstie reports President Clinton travelled to Kansa City today

to
open a "national dialogue" on the future of Social Security. The event was sponsored by the Concord Coalition and the American Association of Retired People and featured speakers from both political parties and people with a variety of positions on reforming the nation's main retirement program.

NOAH ADAMS, HOST: This is ALL THINGS CONSIDERED. I'm Noah Adams.

ROBERT SIEGEL, HOST: And I'm Robert Siegel.

In Kansas City today, President Clinton kicked off a national dialogue on Social Security. It's the first of several public events that will address the long-term problems faced by the nation's retirement system.

In little more than a decade, Social Security will pay out more than it takes in. And if trends continue, in the year 2029, the system would only be able to pay about 75 percent of promised benefits.

NPR's John Ydstie reports.

JOHN YDSTIE, NPR REPORTER: President Clinton took the stage at Penn Valley Community College in Kansas City today, and told the audience assembled that Americans must fix the roof while the sun is shining. "While the economy is strong and the budget is headed for surplus," he said, "Social Security must be reformed."

WILLIAM J. CLINTON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: If we act now, we can assure strong retirement benefits for the baby-boom generation without placing an undue burden on children and grandchildren. And we can do it, if we act now, with changes that will be far simpler easier than if we wait until the problem is closer at hand.

YDSTIE: The president came equipped with charts and graphs, depicting the demographic problems faced by the system as the huge baby boom generation begins to retire. One chart showed that in 1960, there were five workers supporting every retiree, but in three decades that will change dramatically, said the president.

CLINTON: If present birth rates and immigration rates and retirement rates continue, there will be only two people working for every person drawing Social Security.

YDSTIE: President Clinton pushed Social Security reform to the top of the political agenda during his State of the Union speech, with the call to use projected budget surpluses to save Social Security first.

But the president has offered no specifics on how to solve the problem.

Today,
he offered five general principles he will use to judge any proposal put forward. First, the president said, the basic

program must not be abandoned. Second, the reform program should be universal
and fair.

CLINTON: Third, Social Security must provide a benefit that people can count on.

Regardless of the ups and downs of the economy or the financial markets, we have
to provide a solid and dependable foundation of retirement security.

YDSTIE: Fourth, said Mr. Clinton, the program must continue to provide financial
security for disabled and low-income beneficiaries. And fifth, any fix for Social Security must not bust the budget.

But so far, the president hasn't showed much enthusiasm for an idea that many
Republicans, and even some Democrats want to pursue: diverting some of the Social Security payroll tax into private accounts, controlled by individuals
that could be invested in the stock market.

Republican Senator Rick Santorum pushed that idea at today's forum.

U.S. SENATOR RICH SANTORUM (R-PA); Everyone in American should get an account
that's their money, that can never be taken away from them, that they can invest, that they can see the growth in their future, and if they were to die
prematurely, something they can leave to the next generation, to help them in
their future...

APPLAUSE

YDSTIE: The day-long, forum broadcast nationwide by C-SPAN, came complete with
highly produced videos, panel discussions, and questions from the audience. And
the risks and rewards surrounding the idea of private accounts dominated the
discussion.

Fred Goldberg (ph) who managed an entitlement reform commission for Congress

argued the risks are worth taking.

FRED GOLDBERG, PAST MANAGER OF REFORM COMMISSION ADDRESSING FUTURE OF SOCIAL

SECURITY: Yes, private accounts have risks. They are not the silver bullet.

They are not the panacea. At the end of the day, people may conclude they don't

work. But if we don't try real hard to make them succeed, we're taking a pass

on an opportunity of a generation.

YDSTIE: But Gary Burtless (ph), an economist at the Brookings Institution, cautioned that many Americans might not do a good job of managing their own retirement funds.

GARY BURTLESS, ECONOMIST, BROOKINGS INSTITUTION: I would say whatever reform we

undertake, we want to avoid setting up a system that is going to rely too much

on the investment skills and the self-discipline of Uncle Milt and cousin Flo.

YDSTIE: Joining in during the closing panel discussion, President Clinton said

that he does not rule out the idea of supplemental private accounts. And the

president defended his decision not to put forward a plan right now.

CLINTON: What I'm attempting to do here is to avoid announcing a plan, while we

go through this period first, of educating the whole electorate on -- all of our

citizens -- on what the facts are, and then eliciting ideas from people to get

the broadest range of ideas, because if I come out and say well here's exactly

what I think ought to be done, then that forecloses debate when I'm trying to

broaden debate.

YDSTIE: And the debate will continue at least through this year, with three more

regional forums and a White House conference in December. The president says

next January, he will convene congressional leaders to draft a solution.

NPR ALL THINGS CONSIDERED

Aired on APRIL 7, 1998, Tuesday, 8:00 pm ET

Gay Military Discharges Increase

Reported by Martha Raddatz, Washington, DC; Robert Siegel, Washington

A Defense Department report says more homosexuals are being discharged from

the military today than when the Clinton administration first adopted its "don't ask, don't tell" policy. Defense Secretary William Cohen says the increase might be due to an increasing number of voluntary statements to commanders by gays who want to leave the military. Gay rights advocates see those figures as evidence that homosexuals are being outed and ousted in increasing numbers. NPR's Martha Raddatz reports.

ROBERT SIEGEL, HOST: A new Pentagon report says the number of people discharged from the military because of homosexuality is up significantly in the past year. But Defense Secretary William Cohen says the large majority of gays and lesbians who are leaving do so voluntarily.

The report is the first review of the "don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue policy" which went into effect in early 1994. The report concludes that the overall policy is working. Critics contend that the Pentagon still has a long way to go.

NPR's Martha Raddatz reports.

MARTHA RADDATZ, NPR REPORTER: The Pentagon policy towards gays in the military is supposed to work as its name implies: don't tell us you're gay and we won't ask or try to hunt you down.

Yet since the policy was implemented four years ago, an increasing number of gay service members have left the military. Why? According to the report, very few commanders are asking; very few are pursuing. But a growing number of gays and lesbians, in their first year of military service, are telling.

Defense Secretary William Cohen said on NPR today, it's a trend that caught his eye.

WILLIAM COHEN, SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE: Most of them I would say, that occurred during 1997, about 80 to 82 percent of those were from statements that they were in fact homosexual, and most of that 82 percent was a purely voluntary

statement. So, more and more appear to be declaring their homosexuality, and for that reason are being given administrative discharges.

RADDATZ: These are referred to as "statements cases" where a person basically says "I'm gay." Acts cases, where a person is found to have engaged in homosexual acts, have declined in the military. So, what's behind the increasing statements cases? Why would a person join the military and then make a statement to end his or her career?

The report doesn't address that, according to Pentagon spokesman Ken Bacon.

KEN BACON, SPOKESMAN, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE: We don't know that because when a person comes forward and makes a statement, the commander does not then whip out a form and say, fill out this form, and explain exactly why you're saying this. Are you saying it because you're coming out and you feel this is the right thing to do? Or, are you saying it because you have some fear that somebody else may be about to make a statement about you?

We don't investigate the statement itself, or the circumstances behind the statement.

RADDATZ: Which is as big mistake, according to Michelle Beneke (ph), co-director of the Service Members Legal Defense Network, a gay- rights group.

If the Pentagon would look behind the statistics, said Beneke, these statements cases would reveal a larger problem. Beneke says her group has represented 258 military members and none voluntarily left the service.

She pointed to the case of Marine Lance Corporal Kevin Smith, who she said revealed his homosexuality only under pressure, after a physical assault.

MICHELLE BENEKE, CO-DIRECTOR, SERVICE MEMBERS LEGAL DEFENSE NETWORK: He was gay-bashed. He was afraid to tell his military command for fear they would use that report to start an investigation against him. He was afraid even to report it to civilian police. Somehow, his command learned of the attack and as he feared, their response was to interrogate him about his sexual orientation. They showed no concern to catch the perpetrators.

Kevin Smith is counted as a statements case.

RADDATZ: The Pentagon has no plans to look further into the reasons behind the various statements cases cited. But Secretary Cohen is making a number of changes in implementing the policy. Among them: commanders will now be told to check with higher legal authorities before launching an investigation into a person's sexual orientation; and the Pentagon will have tighter rules on plea bargaining, where the accused offers to reveal the name of gay service members.

There will also be more training given to investigators who review cases to make sure there are no witch hunts.

Pentagon spokesman Ken Bacon was asked why the department is making changes if the policy is working as well as he says. To that, Bacon said, "there are very few policies in the U.S. government that can't be improved."

Martha Raddatz, NPR News, Washington.

NPR ALL THINGS CONSIDERED
Aired on APRIL 7, 1998, TUESDAY 8:00 pm ET
McCaffrey in Mexico

Reported by Phillip Davis, Mexico City; Robert Siegel, Washington DC

NPR's Phillip Davis reports from Mexico City on high-level talks between U.S. and Mexican authorities to combat drug smuggling. U.S. representatives at the talks have proposed new measures for tracking the success or failure of anti-drug efforts.

ROBERT SIEGEL, HOST: This is ALL THINGS CONSIDERED. I'm Robert Siegel.

NOAH ADAMS, HOST: And I'm Noah Adams.

Today in Mexico, U.S. drug policy chief Barry McCaffrey praised that country's efforts to fight drug trafficking. McCaffrey said a new plan for the U.S. and Mexico to cooperate on fighting drugs could provide more evidence of progress.

From Mexico City, NPR's Phillip Davis has the story.

PHILLIP DAVIS, NPR REPORTER: In general, McCaffrey gave a glowing review of Mexico's efforts to eradicate drug smuggling in that country. But that view is not universally shared by the U.S. Congress. It's passed a law requiring

that
the White House investigate Mexico each year, before certifying whether or
not
that country is cooperating fully on the war on drugs.

It's a process Mexico deeply resents. McCaffrey says he has a new plan,
developed over the past year in the United States, that when implemented
will
provide ongoing progress reports to both countries on efforts to stop drug
smuggling, as well as money laundering and arms trafficking.

BARRY MCCAFFREY, U.S. DRUG POLICY CHIEF: We do believe, many of us, that
that
evidence -- the reality of genuine progress over time will make irrelevant
the
U.S. process of certification.

DAVIS: McCaffrey and Mexican officials say their goal is ambitious: to cut
drug
use in half in both countries over the next 10 years.

Phillip Davis, NPR News, Mexico City.

NPR ALL THINGS CONSIDERED
Aired on APRIL 7, 1998, Tuesday, 8:00 pm ET

Yeltsin Meets with Kremlin
Reported by Andy Bowers, Moscow; Robert Siegel, Washington DC; Noa

NPR's Andy Bowers reports on today's round-table meeting at th Kremlin
between
Russian President Boris Yeltsin and parliamentary opponents. Some deputies
signaled their willingness to endorse Mr. Yeltsin's choice for Prime
Minister,
Sergei Kiriyenko. However, the leader of the Communist Party, the dominant
party in the lower house, is determined to vote down the Kiriyenko
nomination
when it comes up for a vote on Friday.

ROBERT SIEGEL, HOST: In Russia, today, President Boris Yeltsin appealed to
lawmakers to confirm his controversial choice of a new prime minister.
Yeltsin
and his political opponents gathered at a Kremlin roundtable meeting to
share
views on the nomination of 35- year-old Sergei Kiriyenko.

As NPR's Andy Bowers reports, the meeting does not seem to have changed
many
minds.

ANDY BOWERS, NPR REPORTER: Yeltsin looked healthy and relaxed today as he

welcomed some of his most bitter rivals to the Kremlin. The guest list included the man Yeltsin defeated in the last presidential race, communist leader Gennady Zyuganov, as well as the heads of all the other major parties.

They came to tell the president who they'd like to see in a new cabinet, and to judge the political neophyte Yeltsin has tapped to fill the number two job in Russia. Yeltsin didn't have to hold such a meeting. He agreed last week, as a goodwill gesture in what's becoming a difficult confirmation battle.

And today, he offered another small olive branch. He told the gathering that 1998 should be a non-confrontational year. "I don't veto; you don't reject," he said with a grin. "Let's give it a try."

But the communists seem bent on confrontation. They're demanding to be part of a coalition government -- an idea Yeltsin rejected today.

BORIS YELTSIN, PRESIDENT, RUSSIAN FEDERATION (VIA TRANSLATOR): No, no -- I will agree to a government of business-like people offered by any Duma faction, but never say that I agreed to a coalition government.

BOWERS: When he unexpectedly fired his old prime minister and cabinet two weeks ago, Yeltsin angered many Duma members by acting, they said, like a tsar -- demanding his nominee be approved and threatening lawmakers.

Today, he sounded much softer, saying the whole country will lose out if it continues to operate without a cabinet much longer. And although he didn't raise the issue, Yeltsin watchers also point out that without a prime minister, it isn't clear who would take over the presidency if Yeltsin were to die in the next few weeks.

After the roundtable, some lawmakers said they will now support Kiriyenko on the first vote this Friday. But communist leader Zyuganov seemed unmoved by Yeltsin's appeal.

GENNADY ZYUGANOV, COMMUNIST PARTY LEADER (VIA TRANSLATOR): Government policy should be formed by an experienced, educated person who has practical management skills. As far as Kiriyenko is concerned, he'd be a good deputy prime minister.

We are going to vote against.

BOWERS: But many parties, and even some communists, are refusing to shut the door on Kiriyeenko altogether, suggesting there could be a fair amount of backroom dealing before Friday's vote.

Andy Bowers, NPR News, Moscow.

NPR MORNING EDITION

Aired on APRIL 7, 1998, TUESDAY 10:00 am ET

Russian Politics

Reported by Andy Bowers, Moscow; Bob Edwards, Washington, DC

Host Bob Edwards talks with NPR's Andy Bowers about Russia President Boris Yeltsin's efforts to form a new cabinet. Yeltsin sacked Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin's government on March 23 and nominated Sergei Kiriyeenko to replace him.

BOB EDWARDS, HOST: Russia's President Boris Yeltsin today continues his efforts to win parliamentary approval of his choice for prime minister. He's meeting with his political opponents to discuss the selection of Sergei Kiriyeenko to assume the post.

Yeltsin fired former premier Viktor Chernomyrdin two weeks ago, and has threatened to dismiss parliament and call new elections if Kiriyeenko is not confirmed. A vote is set for Friday.

NPR's Andy Bowers is in Moscow. Andy, who's involved in these discussions and what's the significance of the talks?

ANDY BOWERS, NPR REPORTER: Well, it's the heads of all the major parties in the Duma, the lower house of parliament, plus leaders from the upper house, the Federation Council, some union officials and Kremlin officials.

Basically, Yeltsin has agreed just to hear their views about his choice for prime minister and about the makeup of the rest of the cabinet. Yeltsin is under no legal obligation to act on what he hears today.

The Duma can only vote up or down on the choice for prime minister and they have no vote at all on the other members of the cabinet. But, Yeltsin had been just barrelling ahead with this nomination, showing no signs that he really

cared
what lawmakers thought until last week, their outcry just became too loud.

And Yeltsin finally agreed to postpone the vote on Kiriyenko by a week,
and to
hold today's round table. Whether that's going to be enough to win over
the
lawmakers is a very big question.

EDWARDS: So, this meeting is largely a face-saving gesture?

BOWERS: That's right, it is. The Duma leaders were very angry at being
told
that they had to approve this relatively unknown junior minister, who's
been in
government for less than a year, or else Yeltsin would dissolve
parliament.

The leaders of a party such as the communists say Kiriyenko is just too
inexperienced, he's unknown, and they want at least a little more time to
get to
know him.

Yeltsin apparently decided that his threats weren't achieving what he
wanted, so
he gave in a little bit and agreed to this meeting. But neither side has
really
changed its position, at least publicly.

The communists say they will continue to oppose Kiriyenko until the end,
even if
Yeltsin does dissolve parliament and Yeltsin says he's going to push ahead
and
that he won't even accept a coalition government -- coalition cabinet with
the
communists.

EDWARDS: Yeltsin going to get his way?

BOWERS: It's very hard to guess right now. It's clear that neither
Yeltsin nor
the Duma leaders really want to hold new elections at the moment.

So, that would suggest that there will be a compromise before it goes that
far.
In the past, Yeltsin has usually come out on top of standoffs like this
and many
analysts believe that in the end, he will again.

But members of the Duma from all parties, not just the communists, but even
parties that generally support Yeltsin, seem ready to drag this out at
least for
awhile. They probably want to get as many concessions as they can from
Yeltsin,

and those concessions might be in the form of appointments to a new cabinet.

EDWARDS: Now, there was a court ruling yesterday that blocks Yeltsin from returning to Germany priceless artwork seized by the Red Army during World War

II. What do you know about that?

BOWERS: This is a very interesting decision, Bob. This is about works of art, and also archives and things like that, Soviet troops took from Germany and other Nazi-occupied countries after the war.

For decades, the Soviets even denied that they had this trophy art. But much of it has now come to light, and some of it's even hanging in museums here in Russia.

Yeltsin wants to give the art back because he wants good relations with Germany and with other European countries. But parliament, the Duma, has passed a bill saying that Russia will keep it, basically nationalize all of it.

Yeltsin vetoed the bill and Parliament the overrode his veto, then Yeltsin appealed to the constitutional court which yesterday said that he has to sign the bill.

So, this is as much about democracy in Russia as it as about the art itself.

EDWARDS: NPR's Andy Bowers in Moscow.

NPR ALL THINGS CONSIDERED
Aired on APRIL 7, 1998, TUESDAY 8:00 pm ET

Cuba Threat Assessment Overdue

Reported by Tom Gjelten, Washington, DC; Robert Siegel, Washington DC

HIGHLIGHT:

NPR's Tom Gjelten reports that the Pentagon has delayed release of an assessment of the military threat Cuba presents to the United States. According to those who have seen it, the report concludes that Cuba's conventional military forces no longer seriously threaten U.S. security. Military officials say they are more concerned about the possibility of civil unrest in Cuba, a situation which could lead to an outflow of refugees and even require a U.S. military

intervention.

The Pentagon's somewhat dove-ish tone has angered Cuban-American members of Congress, and administration officials are considering possible revisions to the report.

NOAH ADAMS, HOST: The Pentagon is a week overdue in releasing an assessment of the military threat Cuba presents to the U.S. Officials familiar with the report say it downplays the strength of the Cuban military and concludes that Cuba no longer represents a serious threat to U.S. security.

The report is mandated by Congress. It was supposed to be delivered last Tuesday. Leaders of the Cuban-American community objected to the report in advance, and Defense Secretary William Cohen said last week he wants to review the document before releasing it. Administration officials now say the Pentagon report may be revised before it is sent to Congress.

We have more from NPR's Tom Gjelten.

TOM GJELTEN, NPR REPORTER: The Pentagon's conclusions are classified, but the senior U.S. military officers who prepared the report have already made clear their view that Cuba no longer represents a serious threat to U.S. security.

That's also the assessment of retired Marine General John Sheehan (ph), who until last year headed the U.S.-Atlantic Command. Sheehan, whose area of responsibility included Cuba, says the Cuban armed forces were downsized after a cutoff of military aid from the Soviet Union.

GENERAL JOHN SHEEHAN (RET.), U.S. MARINE CORPS, FORMER HEAD, U.S.-ATLANTIC COMMAND: When that aid stopped in '89-90, what you saw happening is Cuba being forced to deal in the international market in hard currency, which meant there was less money for the military. So you could just see the Cuban military starting to shrink, adjust how it saw the world. And went from, what I would call kind of an internationalist policy, where the use of force was part of their foreign policy, to a policy now of home defense, internal concerns only.

GJELTEN: Sheehan argues that the United States has a stake in seeing that Cuba has a peaceful political transition once the communist regime there is finished. From the U.S. military's point of view, Sheehan says, one danger in Cuba is that a political crisis in the communist regime there could provoke civil unrest

which would then result in widespread repression. Under that scenario, Sheehan says, Cuba could suddenly become a problem for the U.S. military.

SHEEHAN: My chief concern is that an event may occur -- an event that, from an international news perspective and from a Miami perspective, would kind of reinforce all the negative images. And there would be a great hue and cry for U.S. intervention. That is the worst-case scenario that I can think of.

GJELTEN: Senior U.S. military officers on active duty will not comment on the Pentagon report until it's released. But Republican Congresswoman Iliana Ros-Lehtinen of Florida, who has met with the authors of the Pentagon report, says it mirrors Sheehan's analysis that Cuba is no longer a threat to the United States -- at least in conventional terms. She and other Cuban-American members of Congress have already rejected the report.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE ILIANA ROS-LEHTINEN (R-FL): We see this more as a political move, rather than a military assessment. We see this as a step in the direction that the Clinton administration has wanted to undertake for some time, which is to normalize relations. And they're willing to even bend -- bend the facts to get to that -- what they would think is the most beneficial strategy.

GJELTEN: Ros-Lehtinen, and other members of Congress who are criticizing the Pentagon report, say they want it to address the unconventional security threats in Cuba, such as the possibility of a biological warfare capability, espionage activity, or ties to international drug trafficking.

The negative reaction to the Pentagon report on Cuba from the Cuban-American community and their supporters in Congress has been so strong, in fact, that Defense Secretary William Cohen is holding up the report. Its somewhat dove-ish conclusions don't entirely fit the prevailing analysis of Cuba in the U.S. government.

One senior administration official said the Pentagon report could be revised in order to make sure the administration "speaks with one voice." That is always a challenge, he said, and especially in the case of Cuba, which is, he said

"a
sensitive and politically controversial issue."

General Sheehan, who has spoken out often on the need to move toward more
normal
relations with Cuba, has meanwhile found himself targeted for criticism by
the
Cuban-American community.

SHEEHAN: From their perspective, you know, I'm probably a threat to their
ideology. Within the U.S. military, those that look at Cuba on a rational
basis, I think, come to the same conclusion that Cuba is not a military
threat
to the United States, and we need to figure out we get on with the next
phase of
our relationship as a nation.

GJELTEN: Sources at the Pentagon and on Capitol Hill now say the report on
Cuba's threat to the United States is unlikely to be delivered until
Congress
returns from its Easter recess.

Tom Gjelten, NPR News, Washington.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Todd A. Summers (CN=Todd A. Summers/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-APR-1998 10:25:57.00

SUBJECT: Re: Sullivan Op-Ed on Gays in the Military report by pentagon

TO: Virginia Apuzzo (CN=Virginia Apuzzo/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

The needle article was good - cuts the legs off of one of McAffrey's principal arguments. FYI, confidentially, the COS is now on a call with Dr. Hitt.

Todd

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Todd A. Summers (CN=Todd A. Summers/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-APR-1998 08:55:13.00

SUBJECT: Sullivan Op-Ed on Gays in the Military report by pentagon

TO: Daniel W. Burkhardt (CN=Daniel W. Burkhardt/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel C. Montoya (CN=Daniel C. Montoya/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Philip G Dufour (CN=Philip G Dufour/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen Tramontano (CN=Karen Tramontano/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven W. Adamske (CN=Steven W. Adamske/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Miguel M. Bustos (CN=Miguel M. Bustos/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth J. Potter (CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sean P. Maloney (CN=Sean P. Maloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Virginia Apuzzo (CN=Virginia Apuzzo/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Relates to the discussion we had in our senior glbt appointees meeting.
Not very flattering.

April 9, 1998

Undone by 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell'

By ANDREW SULLIVAN

WASHINGTON -- "I think it's working," said Defense Secretary William Cohen, referring to the Pentagon's "don't ask, don't tell" policy for gay members of the armed services. He said this while announcing that discharges of homosexuals have increased by 67 percent since 1994. When you factor in the military's downsizing, the real figure is closer to 80 percent. If this is Mr. Cohen's definition of success, one wonders what failure would look like.

The real picture is actually grimmer. Although "don't ask, don't tell" forbids military commanders from pursuing investigations of suspected homosexual conduct without compelling evidence, violations of the policy not to ask, pursue or harass homosexuals have soared, according to the

Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, the only watchdog group tracking discharge cases under this policy.

The organization has documented 563 violations by military authorities of "don't ask, don't tell" in 1997, a jump from 443 violations in 1996.

Reported cases of physical and verbal harassment of gay service members rose 38 percent from 1996 to 1997; cases in which military authorities illegally "asked" troops if they were gay increased 39 percent.

Until August of last year, the military was still even using enlistment forms that directly asked about a person's sexual orientation. In its report, the Pentagon said the original form was preserved for four years "as a cost savings measure."

Witch hunts have continued. In 1996, an airman convicted of forcible sodomy at Hickam Air Force Base had a life sentence reduced to 20 months in return for outing 17 other allegedly gay servicemen. All the accused air force men were discharged; the rapist served less than a year.

Secretary Cohen's improbable defense is that the vast majority of discharges were voluntary. The proof? None in the Pentagon report, except for this: "The Services believe that most of the [cases involving a disclosure of homosexuality] -- although not all of them -- involve service members who voluntarily elected to disclose their sexual orientation to their peers, supervisors or commanders."

That's what it comes down to: "the Services believe . . ." The report later concedes that "because extensive inquiries or investigations are not conducted in most of these cases, the reasons for [the increase in numbers] are not known and would be difficult to ascertain." Compare this with the documentation of the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network.

The Pentagon further claimed that 80 percent of discharges were "statement" cases, implying that individuals were discharged after spontaneously declaring their orientation to their superiors. But that is misleading at best. All that a "statement" case means is that the grounds for discharge arose from what a service member allegedly said, and not what he or she did.

Such "statements" can include private confessions to therapists, friends, peers or family members that were subsequently reported to military authorities.

I asked Michelle Benecke, co-director of the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, how many of the 1,300 people her group has helped in the last four years have truly voluntarily disclosed their orientation. "None that I've come across," she said.

To its credit, the Pentagon does admit in its report that it has a problem. While insisting that the policy is "generally being implemented properly," the military concedes that it has not been vigilant enough in policing anti-gay harassment. As it now stands, someone attacked for being gay cannot report the abuse without risking discharge as a result.

The report also acknowledges that some women have been intimidated into not reporting sexual harassment, because they are sometimes accused of being lesbians if they reject male advances. More needs to be done to inform commanders of the regulations, the report adds.

These admissions would be more encouraging if the record was not so damning. Last year, despite the 563 reported violations of "don't ask, don't tell," not a single military commander was disciplined for misconduct.

It's now clear that the policy has not simply failed. It is far worse than what went on before. Gay service members are now allowed into the

military, only to face a series of tripwires intended to flush them out. They have become, in effect, the unintended bait of rogue military commanders. Other, more decent officers (and there are many) simply do not know the rules, since the Pentagon has done a poor job of telling them. What to do about this? The Pentagon has embraced a mix of spin, denial and confession. The President has other options. Last year, he denounced employment discrimination against homosexuals. But as Commander in Chief, Bill Clinton has now fired more homosexuals than any other employer in America. Is it too much to ask that this President finally live up to his own words? Or with this President, is that now utterly beside the point? Andrew Sullivan, a senior editor at The New Republic, is the author of the forthcoming ``Love Undetectable."

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Virginia Apuzzo (CN=Virginia Apuzzo/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-APR-1998 09:12:00.00

SUBJECT: Re: Sullivan Op-Ed on Gays in the Military report by pentagon

TO: Todd A. Summers (CN=Todd A. Summers/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

saw it, had the same thought, thanks--needle exchange below it wasn't
bad...

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Daniel C. Montoya (CN=Daniel C. Montoya/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-APR-1998 08:57:02.00

SUBJECT: fwd: DoD Report Update

TO: paul_yandura (paul_yandura @ hud.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeff.Trandahl (Jeff.Trandahl @ clerk.house.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: msmolinski (msmolinski @ osophs.dhhs.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: palmerl (palmerl @ us.ibm.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: HMolina451 (HMolina451 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MARTINB (MARTINB @ dmbb.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: clord (clord @ aidsaction.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marklacy (Marklacy @ flash.net @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: kelly_wilson_kent (kelly_wilson_kent @ HUD.GOV @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: kkavanaugh (kkavanaugh @ nccbuscc.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dc (dc @ nrharural.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: zguerra (zguerra @ admissions.caltech.edu @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: agarner72 (agarner72 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rdupaix (rdupaix @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bcrow (Bcrow @ worldbank.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ktuerff (Ktuerff @ 4env.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rsorian (rsorian @ osaspe.dhhs.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: texjmp (texjmp @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: joneill (joneill @ hrsa.dhhs.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mmartin (mmartin @ os.dhhs.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: markeyop (markeyop @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey_Levi (Jeffrey_Levi @ compuserve.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dkinch (dkinch @ hotmail.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: pkawata (pkawata @ nmac.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gjonesl (gjonesl @ os.dhhs.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dharvey (dharvey @ aidspolicycenter.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: sean.m.grimes (sean.m.grimes @ bankamerica.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dan.eckhardt (dan.eckhardt @ mci.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: pddfcaa (pddfcaa @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gonzaloa (Gonzaloa @ poz.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
fyi -

dcm

----- Forwarded by Daniel C. Montoya/OPD/EOP on 04/10/98
08:56 AM -----

LAGomez @ efaches.navfac.navy.mil

04/09/98 05:43:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Daniel C. Montoya

cc:

Subject: fwd: DoD Report Update

FYI

Original Text

From: "SLDNI" <SLDNI@aol.com>, on 4/9/98 4:40 PM:

To:

April 9, 1998

Greetings. Thank you if you have already responded to our last action alert by contacting the Secretary of Defense, Vice President and President. If you have not had the opportunity to do so, please weigh in now. Its important. Message points and contact info are below. Now, here's the latest on the Pentagon review.

The Pentagon has officially released its review of Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue. If we were grading the report, we would give the recommendations a "B." They address many, though not all, of our concerns. In particular, the Pentagon will instruct commanders that anti-gay harassment will not be tolerated and they will reissue the Dorn memo we obtained last year telling commanders to investigate reported harassment, not those who are victimized by it. Commanders will be instructed to seek guidance from higher headquarters before beginning investigations and they will be evaluated during their yearly command climate assessments on whether they are training their units on da,dt,dp. These are good first steps.

However, we would give the Pentagon an "F" for the false and misleading rhetoric they have employed in the press, where they have asserted with no basis whatsoever that the significant increase in gay discharges last year

--

up to 997 from 850 the year before -- is due to people who come out in order to avoid their service obligation. This is not contained in the report, probably because it is simply not true. The report itself actually admits that the Pentagon has no way to ascertain the facts of these cases. We do, and we have proven that commanders are asking, pursuing and harassing servicemembers out of the closet.

The increase in gay discharges to 997 represents a 67% increase in discharges under da,dt,dp; the percentage rises to 80% when the downsizing of the

force
is taken into account. This is the highest number of discharges since 1989
and the highest percentage since 1986.

Today's op-ed in the New York Times by Andrew Sullivan takes apart the
review
and the Pentagon's misleading and untruthful assertions. Its worth a look.
It can be found at <http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/oped/09sull.html>.

Your help is needed. Please contact Secretary of Defense Cohen, Vice-
President Gore, and President Clinton.

? Let them know that you are outraged by the offensive misinformation
leaked

to the press by the Pentagon.

? Tell Secretary of Defense Cohen that he should stick to the facts and fix
the problem rather than launch a smear campaign against gay people.

? Tell them the Pentagon should instead be focusing on the real problems of
anti-gay violence, harassment, witch hunts, and "asking" by commanders.

Those individuals serving our country should be praised instead of
slandered.

Secretary of Defense William Cohen, comment via DoD web page:
<http://www.defenselink.mil/faq/comment.html>; voice: (703) 697-5737; fax:
(703) 695-1219; snail: 1000 Defense Pentagon, Washington, D.C.
20301-1000

Vice-President Albert Gore, vicepresident@whitehouse.gov, voice: (202)
456-1111, White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20500

President William J. Clinton, email: president@whitehouse.gov; voice:
(202)
456-1111; snail: White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC
20500

M. Benecke

Michelle M. Benecke
Co-Executive Director

Servicemembers Legal Defense Network
PO Box 65301 ~ Washington DC 20035-5301
202.328.3244 ~ 202.797.1635 fax
sldn@sldn.org ~ www.sldn.org

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #22921)
id <01IVO9X3BSTC005T4U@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for montoya_dc@al.eop.gov; Thu,
9 Apr 1998 17:45:47 EDT

Received: from Storm.EOP.GOV by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #22921)
with ESMTP id <01IVO9WW3MI8005QE3@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for montoya_dc@al.eop.gov;
Thu, 09 Apr 1998 17:45:37 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from ches02.efaches.navfac.navy.mil ([138.145.175.3])
by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-10 #22921)
with SMTP id <01IVO9WLCFYE000IHA@STORM.EOP.GOV> for montoya_dc@al.eop.gov;
Thu, 09 Apr 1998 17:45:19 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by ches02.efaches.navfac.navy.mil with VINES-ISMTP; Thu,
09 Apr 1998 17:43:58 -0400 (EDT)

X-Incognito-SN: 410

From: LAGomez@efaches.navfac.navy.mil, "Letitia A Gomez"@STORM.EOP.GOV

Errors-to: LAGomez@efaches.navfac.navy.mil

X-Incognito-Version: 4.11.23

X-Priority: 3 (Normal)

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Daniel C. Montoya (CN=Daniel C. Montoya/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-APR-1998 08:58:02.00

SUBJECT: fwd: DoD Report Update

TO: nadg (nadg @ erols.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: lynnemc (lynnemc @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mra1019 (mra1019 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SteveLew2 (SteveLew2 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ctroupe (ctroupe @ services.state.mo.us @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: kinseyvi (kinseyvi @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: debaids (debaids @ isdn.net @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: navdocsf (navdocsf @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: helenmm (helenmm @ itsa.ucsf.edu @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: RAPANUIJER (RAPANUIJER @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: scotthitt (scotthitt @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BHattoy (BHattoy @ ios.doi.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: fatema (fatema @ womens-health.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bigbob411 (bigbob411 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: nbollman (nbollman @ irvine.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: terje (terje @ worldnet.att.net @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mmdorian (mmdorian @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rws82552 (Rws82552 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jedelheit (jedelheit @ templeisrael.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bgw2 (bgw2 @ nipl.em.cdc.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: shenovice (shenovice @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mojo1025 (mojo1025 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: harndc (harndc @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rev_alta (rev_alta @ junos.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: hornor (hornor @ hsc.usc.edu @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Isbell (Isbell @ hugheshubbard.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: thenders (thenders @ glo.state.tx.us @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: NSG999 (NSG999 @ msn.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: katgerus (katgerus @ sprynet.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jerryc (jerryc @ wizard.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: raragon (raragon @ sfaf.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: snabel (snabel @ mem.po.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
fyi -

dcm

----- Forwarded by Daniel C. Montoya/OPD/EOP on 04/10/98
08:57 AM -----

LAGomez @ efaches.navfac.navy.mil

04/09/98 05:43:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Daniel C. Montoya

cc:

Subject: fwd: DoD Report Update

FYI

Original Text

From: "SLDNI" <SLDNI@aol.com>, on 4/9/98 4:40 PM:

To:

April 9, 1998

Greetings. Thank you if you have already responded to our last action alert

by contacting the Secretary of Defense, Vice President and President. If you

have not had the opportunity to do so, please weigh in now. Its important.

Message points and contact info are below. Now, here's the latest on the Pentagon review.

The Pentagon has officially released its review of Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue. If we were grading the report, we would give the recommendations a "B." They address many, though not all, of our concerns. In particular, the Pentagon will instruct commanders that anti-gay harassment

will not be tolerated and they will reissue the Dorn memo we obtained last year telling commanders to investigate reported harassment, not those who are

victimized by it. Commanders will be instructed to seek guidance from higher

headquarters before beginning investigations and they will be evaluated during

their yearly command climate assessments on whether they are training their units on da,dt,dp. These are good first steps.

However, we would give the Pentagon an "F" for the false and misleading rhetoric they have employed in the press, where they have asserted with no basis whatsoever that the significant increase in gay discharges last year

--

up to 997 from 850 the year before -- is due to people who come out in order

to avoid their service obligation. This is not contained in the report, probably because it is simply not true. The report itself actually admits that the Pentagon has no way to ascertain the facts of these cases. We do,

and we have proven that commanders are asking, pursuing and harassing servicemembers out of the closet.

The increase in gay discharges to 997 represents a 67% increase in discharges under da,dt,dp; the percentage rises to 80% when the downsizing of the force is taken into account. This is the highest number of discharges since 1989 and the highest percentage since 1986.

Today's op-ed in the New York Times by Andrew Sullivan takes apart the review and the Pentagon's misleading and untruthful assertions. Its worth a look. It can be found at <http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/oped/09sull.html>.

Your help is needed. Please contact Secretary of Defense Cohen, Vice-President Gore, and President Clinton.

? Let them know that you are outraged by the offensive misinformation leaked to the press by the Pentagon.

? Tell Secretary of Defense Cohen that he should stick to the facts and fix the problem rather than launch a smear campaign against gay people.

? Tell them the Pentagon should instead be focusing on the real problems of anti-gay violence, harassment, witch hunts, and "asking" by commanders.

Those individuals serving our country should be praised instead of slandered.

Secretary of Defense William Cohen, comment via DoD web page:
<http://www.defenselink.mil/faq/comment.html>; voice: (703) 697-5737; fax: (703) 695-1219; snail: 1000 Defense Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20301-1000

Vice-President Albert Gore, vicepresident@whitehouse.gov, voice: (202) 456-1111, White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20500

President William J. Clinton, email: president@whitehouse.gov; voice: (202) 456-1111; snail: White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20500

M. Benecke

Michelle M. Benecke
Co-Executive Director
Servicemembers Legal Defense Network
PO Box 65301 ~ Washington DC 20035-5301
202.328.3244 ~ 202.797.1635 fax
sldn@sldn.org ~ www.sldn.org

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDf V5.1-9 #22921)

id <011VO9X3BSTC005T4U@PMDf.EOP.GOV> for montoya_dc@al.eop.gov; Thu,

9 Apr 1998 17:45:47 EDT

Received: from Storm.EOP.GOV by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDf V5.1-9 #22921)

with ESMTP id <011VO9WW3MI8005QE3@PMDf.EOP.GOV> for montoya_dc@al.eop.gov;

Thu, 09 Apr 1998 17:45:37 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from ches02.efaches.navfac.navy.mil ([138.145.175.3])

by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDf V5.1-10 #22921)

with SMTP id <011VO9WLCFYE000IHA@STORM.EOP.GOV> for montoya_dc@al.eop.gov;

Thu, 09 Apr 1998 17:45:19 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by ches02.efaches.navfac.navy.mil with VINES-ISMTP; Thu,

09 Apr 1998 17:43:58 -0400 (EDT)

X-Incognito-SN: 410

From: LAGomez@efaches.navfac.navy.mil, "Letitia A Gomez"@STORM.EOP.GOV

Errors-to: LAGomez@efaches.navfac.navy.mil

X-Incognito-Version: 4.11.23

X-Priority: 3 (Normal)

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Daniel C. Montoya (CN=Daniel C. Montoya/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-APR-1998 08:57:42.00

SUBJECT: gays in the military

TO: nadg (nadg @ erols.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: lynnemc (lynnemc @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mra1019 (mra1019 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SteveLew2 (SteveLew2 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ctroupe (ctroupe @ services.state.mo.us @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: kinseyvi (kinseyvi @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: debaids (debaids @ isdn.net @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: navdocsf (navdocsf @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: helenmm (helenmm @ itsa.ucsf.edu @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: RAPANUIJER (RAPANUIJER @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: scotthitt (scotthitt @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BHattoy (BHattoy @ ios.doi.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: fatema (fatema @ womens-health.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bigbob411 (bigbob411 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: nbollman (nbollman @ irvine.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: terje (terje @ worldnet.att.net @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mmdorian (mmdorian @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rws82552 (Rws82552 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jedelheit (jedelheit @ templeisrael.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bgw2 (bgw2 @ nip1.em.cdc.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: shenovice (shenovice @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mojo1025 (mojo1025 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: harndc (harndc @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rev_alta (rev_alta @ junos.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: hornor (hornor @ hsc.usc.edu @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Isbell (Isbell @ hugheshubbard.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: thenders (thenders @ glo.state.tx.us @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: NSG999 (NSG999 @ msn.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: katgerus (katgerus @ sprynet.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jerryc (jerryc @ wizard.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: raragon (raragon @ sfaf.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: snabel (snabel @ mem.po.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
April 9, 1998
Undone by 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell'

By ANDREW SULLIVAN

WASHINGTON -- "I think it's working," said Defense Secretary William Cohen, referring to the Pentagon's "don't ask, don't tell" policy for gay members of the armed services. He said this while announcing that discharges of homosexuals have increased by 67 percent since 1994. When you factor in the military's downsizing, the real figure is closer to 80 percent. If this is Mr. Cohen's definition of success, one wonders what failure would look like.

The real picture is actually grimmer. Although "don't ask, don't tell" forbids military commanders from pursuing investigations of suspected homosexual conduct without compelling evidence, violations of the policy not to ask, pursue or harass homosexuals have soared, according to the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, the only watchdog group tracking discharge cases under this policy.

The organization has documented 563 violations by military authorities of "don't ask, don't tell" in 1997, a jump from 443 violations in 1996.

Reported cases of physical and verbal harassment of gay service members rose 38 percent from 1996 to 1997; cases in which military authorities illegally "asked" troops if they were gay increased 39 percent.

Until August of last year, the military was still even using enlistment forms that directly asked about a person's sexual orientation. In its report, the Pentagon said the original form was preserved for four years "as a cost savings measure."

Witch hunts have continued. In 1996, an airman convicted of forcible sodomy at Hickam Air Force Base had a life sentence reduced to 20 months in return for outing 17 other allegedly gay servicemen. All the accused air force men were discharged; the rapist served less than a year.

Secretary Cohen's improbable defense is that the vast majority of discharges were voluntary. The proof? None in the Pentagon report, except for this: "The Services believe that most of the [cases involving a disclosure of homosexuality] -- although not all of them -- involve service members who voluntarily elected to disclose their sexual orientation to their peers, supervisors or commanders."

That's what it comes down to: "the Services believe . . ." The report later concedes that "because extensive inquiries or investigations are not conducted in most of these cases, the reasons for [the increase in numbers] are not known and would be difficult to ascertain." Compare this with the documentation of the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network.

The Pentagon further claimed that 80 percent of discharges were "statement" cases, implying that individuals were discharged after spontaneously declaring their orientation to their superiors. But that is misleading at best. All that a "statement" case means is that the grounds for discharge arose from what a service member allegedly said, and not what he or she did.

Such "statements" can include private confessions to therapists, friends, peers or family members that were subsequently reported to military authorities.

I asked Michelle Benecke, co-director of the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, how many of the 1,300 people her group has helped in the last four years have truly voluntarily disclosed their orientation. "None that I've come across," she said.

To its credit, the Pentagon does admit in its report that it has a problem. While insisting that the policy is "generally being implemented properly," the military concedes that it has not been vigilant enough in

policing anti-gay harassment. As it now stands, someone attacked for being gay cannot report the abuse without risking discharge as a result.

The report also acknowledges that some women have been intimidated into not reporting sexual harassment, because they are sometimes accused of being lesbians if they reject male advances. More needs to be done to inform commanders of the regulations, the report adds.

These admissions would be more encouraging if the record was not so damning. Last year, despite the 563 reported violations of "don't ask, don't tell," not a single military commander was disciplined for misconduct.

It's now clear that the policy has not simply failed. It is far worse than what went on before. Gay service members are now allowed into the military, only to face a series of tripwires intended to flush them out.

They have become, in effect, the unintended bait of rogue military commanders. Other, more decent officers (and there are many) simply do not know the rules, since the Pentagon has done a poor job of telling them.

What to do about this? The Pentagon has embraced a mix of spin, denial and confession. The President has other options. Last year, he denounced employment discrimination against homosexuals. But as Commander in Chief, Bill Clinton has now fired more homosexuals than any other employer in America. Is it too much to ask that this President finally live up to his own words? Or with this President, is that now utterly beside the point?

Andrew Sullivan, a senior editor at The New Republic, is the author of the forthcoming "Love Undetectable."

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Daniel C. Montoya (CN=Daniel C. Montoya/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-APR-1998 08:56:52.00

SUBJECT: fwd: PENTAGON LEAKS MISINFORMATION

TO: paul_yandura (paul_yandura @ hud.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeff.Trandahl (Jeff.Trandahl @ clerk.house.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: msmolinski (msmolinski @ osophs.dhhs.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: palmer1 (palmer1 @ us.ibm.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: HMolina451 (HMolina451 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MARTINB (MARTINB @ dmbb.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: clord (clord @ aidsaction.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marklacy (Marklacy @ flash.net @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: kelly_wilson_kent (kelly_wilson_kent @ HUD.GOV @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: kkavanaugh (kkavanaugh @ nccbuscc.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dc (dc @ nrharural.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: zguerra (zguerra @ admissions.caltech.edu @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: agarner72 (agarner72 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rdupaix (rdupaix @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bcrow (Bcrow @ worldbank.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ktuerff (Ktuerff @ 4env.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rsorian (rsorian @ osaspe.dhhs.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: texjmp (texjmp @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: joneill (joneill @ hrsa.dhhs.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mmartin (mmartin @ os.dhhs.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: markeyop (markeyop @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey_Levi (Jeffrey_Levi @ compuserve.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dkinch (dkinch @ hotmail.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: pkawata (pkawata @ nmac.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gjones1 (gjones1 @ os.dhhs.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dharvey (dharvey @ aidspolicycenter.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: sean.m.grimes (sean.m.grimes @ bankamerica.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dan.eckhardt (dan.eckhardt @ mci.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: pddfcaa (pddfcaa @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gonzaloe (Gonzaloe @ poz.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
fyi

dcm

----- Forwarded by Daniel C. Montoya/OPD/EOP on 04/10/98
08:56 AM -----

LAGomez @ efaches.navfac.navy.mil

04/07/98 04:42:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Daniel C. Montoya

cc:

Subject: fwd: PENTAGON LEAKS MISINFORMATION

FYI

Original Text

From: "SLDN1" <SLDN1@aol.com>, on 4/7/98 1:56 PM:

To:

April 7, 1998

ACTION ALERT:

PENTAGON LEAKS MISINFORMATION

On Friday, unnamed Pentagon Officials leaked offensive and untrue statements about gay servicemembers under the guise of explaining why gay discharges have risen 67% since the implementation of the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue" policy. The number of discharges this year was 997, the highest number since 1989. These officials implied that gay servicemembers are using the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue" policy in order to escape their military obligations and that gay people simply cannot "hack it" in the military.

This spin is contrary to the report itself. In the report, the Department of Defense acknowledges that implementation of the policy has indeed been problematic. It recognizes that DoD does not know what is causing the rise in discharges. SLDN knows that the problem is continuing anti-gay harassment, witch-hunts, and improper investigations and asking. Recommendations contained in the report include reissuing guidance concerning anti-gay threats and violence and ensuring that those implementing the policy receive proper training. These recommendations are good first steps, however their existence has been lost in the offensive leaks to the press.

Your help is needed. Please contact Secretary of Defense Cohen, Vice-President Gore, and President Clinton.

? Let them know that you are outraged by the offensive misinformation leaked to the press by the Pentagon.

? Tell Secretary of Defense Cohen that he should stick to the facts and fix the problem rather than launch a smear campaign against gay people.
? Tell them the Pentagon should instead be focusing on the real problems of anti-gay violence, harassment, witch hunts, and "asking" by commanders.

Those individuals serving our country should be praised instead of slandered.

Secretary of Defense William Cohen, comment via DoD web page:
<http://www.defenselink.mil/faq/comment.html>; voice: (703) 697-5737; fax: (703) 695-1219; snail: 1000 Defense Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20301-1000

Vice-President Albert Gore, vicepresident@whitehouse.gov, voice: (202) 456-1111, White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20500

President William J. Clinton, email: president@whitehouse.gov; voice: (202) 456-1111; snail: White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20500

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #22921)
id <011VLFBXJLDC0059RZ@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for montoya_dc@a1.eop.gov; Tue,
7 Apr 1998 16:48:05 EDT

Received: from Storm.EOP.GOV by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #22921)
with ESMTP id <011VLFBUF34004X4U@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for montoya_dc@a1.eop.gov;
Tue, 07 Apr 1998 16:48:01 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from ches02.efaches.navfac.navy.mil ([138.145.175.3])
by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-10 #22921)
with SMTP id <011VLFBMDG3I000EUZ@STORM.EOP.GOV> for montoya_dc@a1.eop.gov;
Tue, 07 Apr 1998 16:47:50 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by ches02.efaches.navfac.navy.mil with VINES-ISMTP; Tue,
07 Apr 1998 16:43:30 -0400 (EDT)

X-Incognito-SN: 410

From: LAGomez@efaches.navfac.navy.mil, "Letitia A Gomez"@STORM.EOP.GOV

Errors-to: LAGomez@efaches.navfac.navy.mil

X-Incognito-Version: 4.11.23

X-Priority: 3 (Normal)

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Daniel C. Montoya (CN=Daniel C. Montoya/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-APR-1998 08:55:59.00

SUBJECT: gays in the military

TO: paul_yandura (paul_yandura @ hud.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeff.Trandahl (Jeff.Trandahl @ clerk.house.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: msmolinski (msmolinski @ osophs.dhhs.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: palmer1 (palmer1 @ us.ibm.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: HMolina451 (HMolina451 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MARTINB (MARTINB @ dmbb.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: clord (clord @ aidsaction.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marklacy (Marklacy @ flash.net @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: kelly_wilson_kent (kelly_wilson_kent @ HUD.GOV @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: kkavanaugh (kkavanaugh @ nccbuscc.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dc (dc @ nrharural.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: zguerra (zguerra @ admissions.caltech.edu @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: agarner72 (agarner72 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rdupaix (rdupaix @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bcrow (Bcrow @ worldbank.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ktuerff (Ktuerff @ 4env.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rsorian (rsorian @ osaspe.dhhs.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: texjmp (texjmp @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: joneill (joneill @ hrsa.dhhs.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mmartin (mmartin @ os.dhhs.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: markeyop (markeyop @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey_Levi (Jeffrey_Levi @ compuserve.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dkinch (dkinch @ hotmail.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: pkawata (pkawata @ nmac.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gjones1 (gjones1 @ os.dhhs.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dharvey (dharvey @ aidspolicycenter.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: sean.m.grimes (sean.m.grimes @ bankamerica.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dan.eckhardt (dan.eckhardt @ mci.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: pddfcaa (pddfcaa @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gonzaloe (Gonzaloe @ poz.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

April 9, 1998

Undone by 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell'

By ANDREW SULLIVAN

WASHINGTON -- "I think it's working," said Defense Secretary William Cohen, referring to the Pentagon's "don't ask, don't tell" policy for gay members of the armed services. He said this while announcing that discharges of homosexuals have increased by 67 percent since 1994. When you factor in the military's downsizing, the real figure is closer to 80

percent. If this is Mr. Cohen's definition of success, one wonders what failure would look like.

The real picture is actually grimmer. Although "don't ask, don't tell" forbids military commanders from pursuing investigations of suspected homosexual conduct without compelling evidence, violations of the policy not to ask, pursue or harass homosexuals have soared, according to the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, the only watchdog group tracking discharge cases under this policy.

The organization has documented 563 violations by military authorities of "don't ask, don't tell" in 1997, a jump from 443 violations in 1996.

Reported cases of physical and verbal harassment of gay service members rose 38 percent from 1996 to 1997; cases in which military authorities illegally "asked" troops if they were gay increased 39 percent.

Until August of last year, the military was still even using enlistment forms that directly asked about a person's sexual orientation. In its report, the Pentagon said the original form was preserved for four years "as a cost savings measure."

Witch hunts have continued. In 1996, an airman convicted of forcible sodomy at Hickam Air Force Base had a life sentence reduced to 20 months in return for outing 17 other allegedly gay servicemen. All the accused air force men were discharged; the rapist served less than a year.

Secretary Cohen's improbable defense is that the vast majority of discharges were voluntary. The proof? None in the Pentagon report, except for this: "The Services believe that most of the [cases involving a disclosure of homosexuality] -- although not all of them -- involve service members who voluntarily elected to disclose their sexual orientation to their peers, supervisors or commanders."

That's what it comes down to: "the Services believe . . . " The report later concedes that "because extensive inquiries or investigations are not conducted in most of these cases, the reasons for [the increase in numbers] are not known and would be difficult to ascertain." Compare this with the documentation of the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network.

The Pentagon further claimed that 80 percent of discharges were "statement" cases, implying that individuals were discharged after spontaneously declaring their orientation to their superiors. But that is misleading at best. All that a "statement" case means is that the grounds for discharge arose from what a service member allegedly said, and not what he or she did.

Such "statements" can include private confessions to therapists, friends, peers or family members that were subsequently reported to military authorities.

I asked Michelle Benecke, co-director of the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, how many of the 1,300 people her group has helped in the last four years have truly voluntarily disclosed their orientation. "None that I've come across," she said.

To its credit, the Pentagon does admit in its report that it has a problem. While insisting that the policy is "generally being implemented properly," the military concedes that it has not been vigilant enough in policing anti-gay harassment. As it now stands, someone attacked for being gay cannot report the abuse without risking discharge as a result.

The report also acknowledges that some women have been intimidated into not reporting sexual harassment, because they are sometimes accused of being lesbians if they reject male advances. More needs to be done to inform commanders of the regulations, the report adds.

These admissions would be more encouraging if the record was not so damning. Last year, despite the 563 reported violations of "don't ask, don't tell," not a single military commander was disciplined for misconduct.

It's now clear that the policy has not simply failed. It is far worse than what went on before. Gay service members are now allowed into the military, only to face a series of tripwires intended to flush them out. They have become, in effect, the unintended bait of rogue military commanders. Other, more decent officers (and there are many) simply do not know the rules, since the Pentagon has done a poor job of telling them. What to do about this? The Pentagon has embraced a mix of spin, denial and confession. The President has other options. Last year, he denounced employment discrimination against homosexuals. But as Commander in Chief, Bill Clinton has now fired more homosexuals than any other employer in America. Is it too much to ask that this President finally live up to his own words? Or with this President, is that now utterly beside the point? Andrew Sullivan, a senior editor at The New Republic, is the author of the forthcoming ``Love Undetectable."

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. email	Daniel C. Montoya to Jeff Trandahl at 09:50:10.00. Subject: RE: gays in the military. (1 page)	04/10/1998	b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
OPD ([Don't Ask, Don't Tell])
OA/Box Number: 250000

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/28/1998 - 06/25/1998]

2015-0017-F
ab1568

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]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Daniel C. Montoya (CN=Daniel C. Montoya/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-APR-1998 11:38:44.00

SUBJECT: re: gays in the military

TO: Todd A. Summers (CN=Todd A. Summers/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Sarah T. Holewinski (CN=Sarah T. Holewinski/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

greg jones is a good guy. he is leg affairs and will be long term (career). i see him all the time in my neighborhood.

aside from the meet and greet with you and sandy (she could do a drop-in and leave, if you want), he wants to establish the important leg issues for onap so he can keep them on his radar screen. he was in the meeting with the council, sandy and the secretary back in september and i know he's been in other meetings with her.

sarah - i just spoke to todd and he said a meeting is okay. can you set it up for this week?

let todd and sandy know as well as myself so i can see him afterwards.

thanks,

dcm

----- Forwarded by Daniel C. Montoya/OPD/EOP on 04/13/98
11:19 AM -----

gjones1 @ os.dhhs.gov

04/13/98 10:11:12 AM

Please respond to gjones1@os.dhhs.gov

Record Type: Record

To: Daniel C. Montoya/OPD/EOP

cc:

Subject: re: gays in the military

Daniel -

Since Sean Donohue has moved to the HHS Executive Secretariat, I have been informed that I will be covering HIV/AIDS legislative issues for our office. I will fill in as necessary until a replacement is found for the issues I currently am assigned, but anticipate the permanent change within

4-6 weeks.

Please continue to forward info to me. I'd also welcome the opportunity to meet with you (and folks from Sandy Thurman's office) over at OEOB sometime in the near future to get input on the status of legislation and what issues you all see as heating up before close of Congress later this fall.

Let me know if such a meeting would be useful (from your perspective) and if so, when it might be scheduled.

Thanks. I'm looking forward to working you and the others.

Greg Jones <gjones1@os.dhhs.gov>

(202) 690-6047 / fax: (202) 690-8425

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Legislation

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Original Text

From: <Daniel_C._Montoya@opd.eop.gov>, on 4/10/98 8:55 AM:

April 9, 1998

Undone by 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell'

By ANDREW SULLIVAN

WASHINGTON -- "I think it's working," said Defense Secretary William Cohen, referring to the Pentagon's "don't ask, don't tell" policy for gay members of the armed services. He said this while announcing that discharges of homosexuals have increased by 67 percent since 1994. When you factor in the military's downsizing, the real figure is closer to 80 percent. If this is Mr. Cohen's definition of success, one wonders what failure would look like.

The real picture is actually grimmer. Although "don't ask, don't tell" forbids military commanders from pursuing investigations of suspected homosexual conduct without compelling evidence, violations of the policy not to ask, pursue or harass homosexuals have soared, according to the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, the only watchdog group tracking discharge cases under this policy.

The organization has documented 563 violations by military authorities of "don't ask, don't tell" in 1997, a jump from 443 violations in 1996. Reported cases of physical and verbal harassment of gay service members rose 38 percent from 1996 to 1997; cases in which military authorities illegally "asked" troops if they were gay increased 39 percent.

Until August of last year, the military was still even using enlistment forms that directly asked about a person's sexual orientation. In its report, the Pentagon said the original form was preserved for four years "as a cost savings measure."

Witch hunts have continued. In 1996, an airman convicted of forcible sodomy at Hickam Air Force Base had a life sentence reduced to 20 months in return for outing 17 other allegedly gay servicemen. All the accused air force men were discharged; the rapist served less than a year.

Secretary Cohen's improbable defense is that the vast majority of discharges were voluntary. The proof? None in the Pentagon report, except for this: "The Services believe that most of the [cases involving a disclosure of homosexuality] -- although not all of them -- involve service members who voluntarily elected to disclose their sexual orientation to their peers, supervisors or commanders."

That's what it comes down to: "the Services believe . . ." The report later concedes that "because extensive inquiries or investigations are not conducted in most of these cases, the reasons for [the increase in numbers] are not known and would be difficult to ascertain." Compare this with the documentation of the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network.

The Pentagon further claimed that 80 percent of discharges were "statement" cases, implying that individuals were discharged after spontaneously declaring their orientation to their superiors. But that is misleading at best. All that a "statement" case means is that the grounds for discharge arose from what a service member allegedly said, and not what he or she did.

Such "statements" can include private confessions to therapists, friends, peers or family members that were subsequently reported to military authorities.

I asked Michelle Benecke, co-director of the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, how many of the 1,300 people her group has helped in the last four years have truly voluntarily disclosed their orientation. "None that I've come across," she said.

To its credit, the Pentagon does admit in its report that it has a problem. While insisting that the policy is "generally being implemented properly," the military concedes that it has not been vigilant enough in policing anti-gay harassment. As it now stands, someone attacked for being gay cannot report the abuse without risking discharge as a result.

The report also acknowledges that some women have been intimidated into not reporting sexual harassment, because they are sometimes accused of being lesbians if they reject male advances. More needs to be done to inform commanders of the regulations, the report adds.

These admissions would be more encouraging if the record was not so damning. Last year, despite the 563 reported violations of "don't ask, don't tell," not a single military commander was disciplined for misconduct.

It's now clear that the policy has not simply failed. It is far worse than what went on before. Gay service members are now allowed into the military, only to face a series of tripwires intended to flush them out. They have become, in effect, the unintended bait of rogue military commanders. Other, more decent officers (and there are many) simply do not know the rules, since the Pentagon has done a poor job of telling them.

What to do about this? The Pentagon has embraced a mix of spin, denial and confession. The President has other options. Last year, he denounced employment discrimination against homosexuals. But as Commander in Chief, Bill Clinton has now fired more homosexuals than any other employer in America. Is it too much to ask that this President finally live up to his own words? Or with this President, is that now utterly beside the point?

Andrew Sullivan, a senior editor at The New Republic, is the author of the forthcoming "Love Undetectable."

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: RUBIN_E@A1@CD@LNGTWY (RUBIN_E@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (NSC)

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-APR-1998 17:11:51.00

SUBJECT: April 8 NSC News Summary

TO: swanjohnsonfamily@ibm.net@INET@LNGTWY (swanjohnsonfamily@ibm.net@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gene B. Sperling@eop (Gene B. Sperling@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
NATIONAL SECURITY NEWS SUMMARY
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 8, 1998

EUROPE/NIS/CANADA

N. IRELAND: Blair flies to Belfast to join peace talks as fatal deadlock threatens process. Masked gunmen kill man identified as a loyalist paramilitary member. Mitchell is the "man to trust" for all sides at talks. (NYT1,3;WP17,24;LAT3;USA1,10;WT11)

FRANCE: Chirac's conservative coalition splits over control of Paris city government. (WP18)

RUSSIA: Yeltsin pushes for Duma approval of Kiriyenko as prime minister. (WP19, NYT3, LAT2, USA11)

GERMANY: Tale of one of Germany's secret spymasters is subject of a new documentary. Kohl faces uphill battle for re-election. Construction reveals bunkers of Goebbels, others under Berlin. (WP20, NYT6, WT11)

GREECE: Critical comments by Amb. Burns set off debate in Greek parliament. (NYT8, USA11, WT11)

NATO: Polls show U.S. public is "acutely uninterested" in outcome of enlargement ratification vote. (LAT2)

CZECH REP.: Ancient beer-maker goes head-to-head with Anheuser-Busch over Budweiser name. (LAT1)

FRY: Kosovo insurgents are buying weapons in Albania's lawless highlands, seek "blood revenge." Kosovar leaders reject Belgrade offer of talks. (WT1,18)

E.U.: Led by Blair, European socialist parties agree on strategy to reach out to Third World, other nations. (WT11)

ASIA/PACIFIC

INDONESIA: IMF, Jakarta agree on new bailout package allowing resumption of loans. (NYT1,WP18,USA/B1,WSJ19)

CHINA: Chinese and Hong Kong governments are exempted from privacy and anti-discrimination laws. Beijing deports Chinese-American scholar and human rights activist. As prosperity increases, Chinese tourists are now a common sight in other Asian countries. (WP18;NYT1,7;WT12)

BURMA: SLORC bars visit by Richardson, retaliating for U.S. ban on officials' visits. (NYT8,WT12)

JAPAN: Probe of central bank corruption uncovers improprieties. New U.S. Ambassador Foley wins plaudits in Tokyo. Merrill Lynch sets its sights on dominating Japan's securities market. Citicorp is thriving as haven for jittery Japanese. Japanese fret that they are being left behind as market changes. (WP18;NYT10;WSJ1,17,18)

PHILIPPINES: Manila wants U.S. to return bells seized in 1901; Ramos visit is possible venue. Four-page ad supplement in Washington Times. (WP21;WT1,suppl.)

MIDDLE EAST/SOUTH ASIA

IRAN: Uproar over jailing of Tehran mayor reveals splits within ruling regime. Iran releases 5600 Iraqi POWs. (NYT6,USA11,WT11)

MEPP: Israel on alert after soldiers kill Palestinian driver who allegedly ran a roadblock. Ross will travel to Mideast after Passover; Netanyahu sending envoy here. (WP18,NYT7,USA11,WT12)

SAUDI ARABIA: Muslims complete final rites of hajj in Mecca. (WP18,LAT2)

EGYPT: Cairo denies persecuting Coptic Christians, opposes Wolf-Specter bill. (WT12)

SOUTH ASIA: India blames China for selling Pakistan long-range missiles, says it has them too. (WP18,WT12)

LATIN AMERICA/CARIBBEAN

,

TRADE: Sen. McCain praises Clinton for working toward hemispheric free trade, laments failure of fast-track legislation. (WT4)

BRAZIL: Slash and burn agriculture threatens Amazon and the livelihood of its inhabitants. (WP1)

PARAGUAY: Alleging lack of consular notification, Asuncion seeks to block

Virginia execution. (WP18)

CUBA: Twelve former political prisoners arrive in Canada; some may go on to Miami. State, Treasury dispute claim by trade show organizer that it has permission to organize a show in Cuba. (WP18,USA11)

PANAMA: El Nino is hurting the canal: low water levels and drought bring restrictions on passage. (WP20)

EL SALVADOR: Relatives of U.S. nuns slain in 1980 are outraged to learn that officers linked to killing received U.S. residence. (USA10)

MEXICO: Government is nursing its ailing banking system. (WSJ19)

AFRICA

NIGERIA: Protests by poor tribal communities rise against oil development on coast. (WP17)

RWANDA: Memorial to Tutsi victims of 1994 genocide is dedicated in Kigali. (WP18)

GLOBAL/DEFENSE/ECON

TWA 800: NTSB urges rewiring of 747 fuel sensors to prevent another explosion. (NYT1,WP2,LAT1,USA1)

DEFENSE: Secretary Cohen issues revisions to "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy on homosexuality. Project on Government Oversight says U.S. military is overloaded with flag-rank officers. Cohen strongly backs Navy's decision to discharge a gay sailor. (LAT1,USA11,WT1)

ENVIRONMENT: One-eight of all plant species are threatened with extinction. (WP1)

U.N./CONGRESS: Rep. Solomon apologizes for saying SecGen Annan should be horsewhipped. (WP5,USA11)

CTBT: Administration urges Senate to ratify treaty. (NYT7)

INTEL: Ex-wife of CIA spy suspect says the FBI ignored her warnings that he needed help. (LAT1)

IMMIGRATION: 55,000 applications selected at random for immigration visa lottery. (USA11)

ADMINISTRATION

KAMEN: Nick Burns is assailed by Greek parliament speaker for acting like a

Roman governor; foreign minister defends his comments. Anne Luzzatto is off to the private sector at the end of the month. Adm. Pease is retiring to work for General Dynamics. Ginny Terzano has also gone private. (WP21)

OPINION

WP: Editorial says the U.S. should put up with U.N. human rights inspections and criticism of our own performance because it gives us a useful mechanism for addressing abuses by other countries. Editorial urges new legislation to correct problems with asylum procedure reforms in the 1996 immigration law. (22)

NYT: Editorial expresses concern that "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy has led to a 67 percent increase in the number of service members forced out for homosexuality. Editorial says the U.S. needs to encourage Saudi Arabia to modernize and become more democratic as King Fahd fades from the scene. Buerghenthal op-ed urges the U.S. to come clean about what it knows about Central America's "dirty wars" of the 1980s. Jessica Stern urges that we act now to prepare for bioterrorism incidents. (24-25)

LAT: Mann questions how important the Clinton-Yeltsin relationship is when events are rapidly moving beyond them. Herschensohn says that the ABM treaty (totally omitting minor considerations like technical feasibility)

is the only stumbling block to fulfillment of Reagan's vision of an anti-missile defense. Toffler and Toffler review the implications of a selective immigration policy that discourages unskilled laborers from entering the U.S. (5, 11)

WSJ: Editorial calls on Hashimoto to deliver supply-side tax reform, not tax-cut tokenism. (22)

USA: Editorial says the Administration was wrong to politicize the base closure process through its privatization efforts in California and Texas, but that should not be an excuse for Congress to maintain a larger than necessary defense infrastructure. Weldon's Opposing View calls on the President to reverse the privatization attempt, then somehow links the whole issue to too many deployments and a lack of allied burden-sharing. Shapiro column says INS urgently needs reform but only new leadership can make it happen. (11,14)

WT: Editorial supports Cohen's call for additional base closures, while slamming the President for making the hard sell to Congress even tougher. Bartlett supports Arme's opposition to further IMF funding, but recognizes it will pass and encourages Treasury to increase IMF oversight. Hackett calls for passage of full theater missile defense to counteract Iranian efforts to obtain Russian missile technology. (14-17)

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Todd A. Summers (CN=Todd A. Summers/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-APR-1998 20:15:28.00

SUBJECT: text for advocate piece

TO: Scotthitt (Scotthitt @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Last week, the President allowed bad politics to override good science in our battle against AIDS. While his Secretary of Health and Human Services declared, finally, that science had proven that needle exchange programs reduce HIV infections without encouraging drug use, the President said federal funds could not be used for them. It was the kind of

&split-the-baby & mentality that has haunted this Administration since its first days (remember &Don't Ask, Don't Tell &?).

One of the most difficult things to do in political life is to publicly challenge the decisions of political friends who stray into unacceptable territory. And make no mistake, this President has been our friend on AIDS. Funding levels for AIDS programs and research have increased dramatically, even when overall discretionary funding has remained stagnant. Drug approvals come faster, research is better coordinated, services are expanding. All of this deserves our praise.

Unfortunately, good is not good enough in the fight against AIDS. Until a cure and a vaccine are found, HIV must be treated as the health crisis that it is.

President Clinton articulated back in 1995 the goal of &[reducing] the number of new [HIV] infections each and every year until there are no new infections. & With as many as 20,000 new infections occurring in this country directly or indirectly from injection drug use, his decision to withhold federal funds for needle exchange will make it impossible to achieve his stated goal.

This is not the only time that the President has stumbled in this fight. Despite success in funding for research and treatment, the Clinton administration *like its predecessors *has failed to lay out a coherent, strategic HIV prevention plan of action. Funding for HIV prevention and drug treatment remain woefully inadequate, particularly when compared with the monumental toll in human lives, medical expenses, and lost productivity stemming from HIV and AIDS.

All of this when experts warn that an estimated 40,000 Americans will become infected with HIV this year alone *40% will be infected from a dirty needle and another 10-20% will be infected because they have had sex with an infected IV drug user. Without an honest, scientifically-based HIV prevention strategy that includes needle exchange and drug treatment programs, the President's promise rings hollow.

Last year, Congress debated whether to ban funding for needle exchange programs and decided to punt the political hot potato back to the Administration. They voted to allow local communities the option to use part of their prevention dollars for these programs if the Secretary of HHS declared that scientific studies showed that they decreased HIV transmissions without encouraging drug use.

Yes, this is a political hot potato. Yes, this issue requires political courage. But most importantly, it requires leadership to educate the American people about the science and the lives that will be saved. Fifteen years ago, we saw real courage from Dr. C. Everett Koop who refused to be politically intimidated and insisted that this nation follow the science. He educated millions and helped a frightened nation begin to come to terms with this disease.

Dr. Koop set the standard both for political courage and for following the science. The Administration should have done the same, allowing local communities the choice as to how best use their prevention dollars *including the exchange of clean needles to injection drug users.

But instead, the President stepped in and, ignoring the unanimous advice from AIDS czar Thurman, Secretary Shalala, National Institutes of Health Director Varmus and Surgeon General Satcher, said no federal dollars could be used by local communities to implement these life-saving programs.

And to whom did the President listen? Barry McCaffrey, the drug czar with no public health or medical experience. All McCaffrey could say was, &it sends the wrong message. 8 Hardly a rousing statement for ending this epidemic.

Granted the approval of any needle exchange policy would face an uphill battle in Congress, with Republicans eager to demagogue on the vital public health issue. But the chance of losing should not have deterred the Administration from following the science. That ,s leadership.

It is at exactly such moments that we need the President to rise above political rhetoric, follow the science, and communicate that science directly to the nation. Thus far, the President has failed this test. Sadly, the epidemic will rage on, fueled as much by political expedience as it is by HIV.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Daniel C. Montoya (CN=Daniel C. Montoya/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:18-MAY-1998 13:22:59.00

SUBJECT: fwd: SLDN's Response to DoD Review

TO: Judtaral (Judtaral @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: nadg (nadg @ erols.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: lynnemc (lynnemc @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mra1019 (mra1019 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SteveLew2 (SteveLew2 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ctroupe (ctroupe @ services.state.mo.us @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: kinseyvi (kinseyvi @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: debaids (debaids @ isdn.net @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: navdocsf (navdocsf @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: helenmm (helenmm @ itsa.ucsf.edu @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: RAPANUIJER (RAPANUIJER @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: scotthitt (scotthitt @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BHattoy (BHattoy @ ios.doi.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: fatema (fatema @ womens-health.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bigbob411 (bigbob411 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: nbollman (nbollman @ irvine.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: terje (terje @ worldnet.att.net @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dbone (dbone @ irvine.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mmdorian (mmdorian @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rwstaff (rwstaff @ uswest.net @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jedelheit (jedelheit @ templeisrael.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bgw2 (bgw2 @ nipl.em.cdc.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: shenovice (shenovice @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mojo1025 (mojo1025 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: harndc (harndc @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rev_alta (rev_alta @ junos.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: hornor (hornor @ hsc.usc.edu @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Isbell (Isbell @ hugheshubbard.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: thenders (thenders @ glo.state.tx.us @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: NSG999 (NSG999 @ msn.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: katgerus (katgerus @ sprynet.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jerryc (jerryc @ wizard.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: raragon (raragon @ sfaf.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: snabel (snabel @ mem.po.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

fyi -

dcm

----- Forwarded by Daniel C. Montoya/OPD/EOP on 05/18/98

01:22 PM -----

LAGomez @ efaches.navfac.navy.mil

05/15/98 05:13:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Daniel C. Montoya

cc:

Subject: fwd: SLDN's Response to DoD Review

fyi

Original Text

From: "SLDN1" <SLDN1@aol.com>, on 5/15/98 4:31 PM:

To:

May 15, 1998

ACTION ALERT.

Please write, call, fax, or e-mail Secretary Cohen, President

Clinton

and

Vice President Gore with the following critical message:

The DoD report on the implementation of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell,

Don't

Pursue"

is not and cannot be credible until DoD lets commanders know what the rules are. Reports show that many commanders do not know that the current policy contains limits on investigations and was intended to protect people's privacy. The result: gay discharges soared to 997 last year, their highest

level since 1988. DoD needs to act and to act now.

Attached you will find SLDN's letter to Secretary Cohen regarding

DoD's

report on the implementation of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue."

Also,

attached is a one page list of talking points.

We are coordinating this action with the members of the Human

Rights

Campaign

and the National Lesbian & Gay Task Force. As always, thank you for your assistance.

Secretary of Defense William Cohen, comment via DoD web page:
<http://www.defenselink.mil/faq/comment.html>; voice: (703) 697-5737; fax: (703) 695-1219; snail: 1000 Defense Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20301-1000

President William J. Clinton, email: president@whitehouse.gov; voice: (202) 456-1111; snail: White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20500

Vice-President Albert Gore, vicepresident@whitehouse.gov, White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20500

TALKING POINTS DOD REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF "DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL, DON'T PURSUE"

+ Gay Discharges Are Up 67%. Discharges soared to 997 in 1997, a 67% increase under the policy, and the highest level of discharges since 1988.

+ DoD Misrepresents Report Findings. The DoD report admits that the reasons for increased discharges "are not known." Yet, officials publicly represented that increased discharges are due to gays "opting out" of the military. This unsupported and offensive generalization raises questions about DoD's credibility and commitment to fair enforcement of the policy.

+ Commands Continue To Ask, Pursue and Harass. SLDN documented 1379 instances in four years where commanders did not follow the rules under this policy. DoD's report is non-responsive to these documented command violations.

+ DoD Fails To Address Limits To Investigations and Intent of Policy To Protect People's Privacy. A major problem is that personnel do not know the rules. DoD cannot be deemed credible until it issues guidance on the limits to investigations and the intent of the policy.

+ DoD Ignores Coercive Tactics. The DoD report fails to respond to documented instances where commanders threatened service members with prison unless they confessed to being gay or accused others as gay, as occurred on the USS

Simon

Lake. The report also ignored the practice of seizing personal diaries to find out if someone is gay, as in the case of West Point Cadet Nicole

Galvan,

and the practice of questioning parents and siblings per Air Force instructions. Secretary Cohen should end these practices.

+ DoD Fails To Address Issues of Accountability and Recourse. The report omits the issues of accountability for command violations and recourse for personnel harmed by improper inquiries.

+ DoD Did Not Interview Service Members Affected by The Policy. The Department failed to contact one of the primary sources of information on this subject for its review.

+ DoD Agrees That Health Care Providers Are Not Required To Turn In Gay People. Providers should be informed of this important clarification, a step the DoD report fails to recommend. Secretary Cohen should further clarify that information confided in a health care provider should not be used for purposes of discharge.

+ Some Recommendations are Problematic. Recommendations concerning training evaluations, the use of lawyers to police command actions and service Secretary approval for some investigations raise many questions and contain loopholes that could do more harm than good.

+ DoD Should Implement its Good Recommendations Now. The Department should implement (1) guidance against anti-gay harassment, and (2) an end to pretrial agreements to solicit names of suspected gay service members, as recommended in the DoD report.

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D35]MAIL478975730.126 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

===== ATTACHMENT 2 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)

id <01IX2JDT9J5S006YG6@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for montoya_dc@al.eop.gov; Fri,

15 May 1998 17:16:09 EDT

Received: from Storm.EOP.GOV by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)

with ESMTP id <01IX2JDNMZHS006RN5@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for montoya_dc@al.eop.gov;

Fri, 15 May 1998 17:16:02 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from ches02.efaches.navfac.navy.mil ([138.145.175.3])

by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-10 #22921)

with SMTP id <01IX2JDA52NM001GKZ@STORM.EOP.GOV> for montoya_dc@al.eop.gov;

Fri, 15 May 1998 17:15:43 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by ches02.efaches.navfac.navy.mil with VINES-ISMTP; Fri,

15 May 1998 17:14:33 -0400 (EDT)

X-Incognito-SN: 410

From: LAGomez@efaches.navfac.navy.mil, "Letitia A Gomez"@STORM.EOP.GOV

Errors-to: LAGomez@efaches.navfac.navy.mil

X-Incognito-Version: 4.11.23

X-Priority: 3 (Normal)

===== END ATTACHMENT 2 =====

May 25, 1998

Dear Secretary Cohen:

The number of discharges under "Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue" climbed last year to its highest level since 1988. Most members of Congress, like us, believed that "Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue" would result in a decline in discharges, not an increase.

We are concerned by the report that the Department of Defense misrepresented to the public the findings of its year-long review of the policy. The public representation was that gay discharges are increasing because more gays are "coming out," though the report clearly states that the reasons for the increasing discharge numbers "are not known."

Reports the past four years have suggested that one of the reasons gay discharges have climbed is that military personnel are not following the rules and guidelines agreed to by Congress. We understand that Servicemembers Legal Defense Network has made a very reasonable suggestion to correct this problem. The recommendation is for the Department to issue guidance on the limits to gay investigations and the intent of the policy to respect people's privacy using exact quotes from the existing regulations. This is a sensible recommendation that deserves your fullest consideration.

Sincerely,

SENATE

Sen. Jeff Bingaman

Sen. Barbara Boxer

Sen. Ben Nighthorse Campbell

Sen. John Chafee

Sen. Max Cleland

Sen. Alfonse D'Amato

Sen. Christopher Dodd

Sen. Richard Durbin

Sen. Russell Feingold

Sen. Dianne Feinstein

Sen. Slade Gorton

Sen. Tom Harkin

Sen. Daniel Inouye

Sen. Ted Kennedy

Sen. Bob Kerrey

Sen. John Kerry

Sen. Herb Kohl

Sen. Mary Landrieu

Sen. Patrick Leahy

Sen. Carl Levin

Sen. Joseph Lieberman

Sen. McCain

Sen. Barbara Mikulski

Sen. Carol Moseley-Braun

Sen. Patty Murray

Sen. Jack Reed

Sen. Charles Robb

Sen. Paul Sarbanes

Sen. Olympia Snowe

Sen. Arlen Specter

Sen. Robert Toricelli

Sen. Paul Wellstone

Sen. Ron Wyden

HOUSE

Rep. Neil Abercrombie

Rep. Gary Ackerman

Rep. Bentsen

Rep. Howard Berman

Rep. George Brown

Rep. Sherrod Brown

Rep. Tom Campbell

Rep. John Conyers

Rep. Peter DeFazio

Rep. Diana DeGette

Rep. William Delahunt

Rep. Rosa DeLauro

Rep. Eliot Engel

Rep. Anna Eshoo

Rep. Lane Evans

Rep. Vic Fazio

Rep. Bob Filner

Rep. Thomas Foglietta

Rep. Mark Foley

Rep. Tillie Fowler

Rep. Barney Frank

Rep. Elizabeth Furse

Rep. Dick Gephardt

Rep. Jane Harman

Rep. Hinchey

Rep. Eleanor Holmes Norton

Rep. Joseph Kennedy

Rep. Patrick Kennedy

Rep. Jim Kolbe

Rep. Tom Lantos

Rep. John Lewis

Rep. Nita Lowey

Rep. Carolyn McCarthy

Rep. Jim McDermott

Rep. Cynthia McKinney

Rep. Marty Meehan

Rep. Carrie Meek

Rep. Patsy Mink

Rep. Constance Morella

Rep. Patrick Moynihan

Rep. Nadler

Rep. John Oliver

Rep. Nancy Pelosi

Rep. Charles Rangel

Rep. Jack Reed (Westpoint grad)

Rep. Lynn Rivers

Rep. Lucille Roybal - Allard

Rep. Bobby Rush

Rep. Loretta Sanchez

Rep. Martin Sabo

Rep. Jose Serano

Rep. Christopher Shays

Rep. David Skaggs

Rep. Louise Slaughter

Rep. Pete Stark

Rep. Ellen Tauscher

Rep. John Tierney

Rep. Edolphus Towns

Rep. Maxine Waters

Rep. Henry Waxman

Rep. Lynn Woolsey

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Daniel C. Montoya (CN=Daniel C. Montoya/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:25-JUN-1998 09:48:55.00

SUBJECT: new article

TO: Judtaral (Judtaral @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: nadg (nadg @ erols.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: lynnemc (lynnemc @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mra1019 (mra1019 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SteveLew2 (SteveLew2 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ctroupe (ctroupe @ services.state.mo.us @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: kinseyvi (kinseyvi @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: debaids (debaids @ isdn.net @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: navdocsf (navdocsf @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: helenmm (helenmm @ itsa.ucsf.edu @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: RAPANUIJER (RAPANUIJER @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: scotthitt (scotthitt @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BHattoy (BHattoy @ ios.doi.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: fatema (fatema @ womens-health.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bigbob411 (bigbob411 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: nbollman (nbollman @ irvine.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: terje (terje @ worldnet.att.net @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dbone (dbone @ irvine.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: miami2000 (miami2000 @ earthlink.net @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rwstaff (rwstaff @ uswest.net @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jedelheit (jedelheit @ templeisrael.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bgw2 (bgw2 @ nipl.em.cdc.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: shenovice (shenovice @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mojo1025 (mojo1025 @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: harndc (harndc @ aol.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rev_alta (rev_alta @ junos.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: hornor (hornor @ hsc.usc.edu @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Isbell (Isbell @ hugheshubbard.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: thenders (thenders @ glo.state.tx.us @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ngutierrez (ngutierrez @ hcfa.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: katgerus (katgerus @ sprynet.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jerryc (jerryc @ wizard.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: raragon (raragon @ sfaf.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: snabel (snabel @ mem.po.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

* Reprint rights for this copyrighted news article must be obtained *
* ---> by you <--- from the originating news organization. *

NY Daily News 6/24/98

You can e-mail the Daily News editors at voicers@edit.nydailynews.com.

Gay-Bashing Divides GOP and the Nation
By COKIE and STEVEN V. ROBERTS
Daily News Columnists

The strategy of some Republican leaders is now clear. They intend to make gay-bashing a central part of their election campaign this fall.

This might energize conservative Christians, a key element of the GOP base. But it has a destructive and divisive impact on our politics and should be disowned by honorable party members. Besides, the strategy could backfire, alienating mainstream voters who believe in fundamental fairness. And it should.

Republicans are facing off-year elections, when turnout is traditionally low. That puts a premium on firing up hard-core supporters, and the best way to get them excited is to exploit their fear and anger. But that's hard to do when a booming economy has most voters feeling secure and satisfied.

Moreover, the GOP's golden oldies don't work so well anymore. Attacking Democrats as wasteful spenders falls flat in the face of budget surpluses. The embers of anti-communism, always ripe for a good stirring, have grown cold.

That leaves the holy trinity of social issues dear to the religious right: assailing abortion, promoting prayer and harassing homosexuals.

Look what's happened recently. In the Senate, a small band of right-wingers is blocking the nomination of James Hormel as ambassador to Luxembourg. Because Hormel is openly gay and a supporter of gay causes, he's being trashed as an unfit representative of his country.

A few Republicans have been courageous enough to stand up to this hate-mongering. Sen. Alfonse D'Amato, who has a large gay constituency in New York, wrote, "I am embarrassed that our Republican Party, the party of Lincoln, is seen to be the force behind this injustice."

But Mississippi Sen. Trent Lott, the Republican leader, continues to pander to the right and block a vote on Hormel. That's not surprising, given the views on homosexuality Lott expressed on a TV talk show last week. Noting that his own father was an alcoholic, Lott compared being gay

to sexual addiction or kleptomania.

This was clearly not an isolated outburst. At the Texas GOP convention this month, the Log Cabin Republicans, a group of gay activists, were barred from having an exhibit booth. Robert Black, the state party spokesman, called them a "hate group" and compared them to the Ku Klux Klan.

The religious right is a legitimate force in Republican circles and deserves to be heard, but it threatens to stain the whole party with its brand of self-righteous intolerance. And that has important implications for the congressional elections this fall, and the presidential contest in 2000.

The right already has blackballed any potential national candidate * such as Gov. Pataki or New Jersey Gov. Christie Whitman * who supports abortion rights. Now they are trying to make gay-baiting a litmus test as well.

Gary Bauer, a leading voice on the religious right, is already questioning whether Gov. George W. Bush of Texas is "conservative enough" to qualify for the party's nomination. Bauer, who is toying with a candidacy of his own, says Bush is not yet "adamant enough against same-sex marriages and inclusion of homosexuals in the GOP."

The Democrats are not immune from the impulse to pander on gay issues. Bill Clinton got into trouble by pushing for gays in the military. Vice President Gore crassly courted homosexual support by praising the lesbian character in the TV sitcom "Ellen."

But what these Republicans are doing is much worse. Their cynical decision to demonize gays is meanspirited and un-American. They deserve to be repudiated.