

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	The RDG to Sarah T. Holewinski at 10:04:57.00. Subject: Re: mardi gras pictures. (1 page)	03/27/2000	Personal Misfile

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[03/06/2000 - 04/22/2000]

2015-0017-F

ab1572

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: Anna Richter (CN=Anna Richter/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-MAR-2000 12:33:02.00

SUBJECT: Advocate Interview

TO: Devorah R. Adler (CN=Devorah R. Adler/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Do you and Chris need to be involved in this?

----- Forwarded by Anna Richter/OPD/EOP on 03/06/2000

12:32 PM -----

Elizabeth J. Potter

03/06/2000 11:51:06 AM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc: Carolyn T. Wu/WHO/EOP@EOP, Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP,

Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP, Jenni R. Engebretsen/WHO/EOP@EOP

Subject: Advocate Interview

The President is doing an Interview with the Advocate tomorrow. Please provide draft guidance for the following questions by 3:00 pm today.

THANKS

NSC/WH Counsel

3. What are some of the things our readers may not know about the way the "don't ask, don't tell" debate played out among our political and military leaders?

DPC/WH Counsel

8. Do you think that Americans would ever come to a point where they would find same-sex marriage acceptable? Or is it more likely that they will be willing to recognize gay relationships primarily through domestic partnership agreements?

AIDS Policy Office

7. Because of the advances in AIDS treatments and the decline in death rates, is it possible to maintain a sense of urgency in dealing politically with AIDS issues?

Message Sent

To:

Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP@EOP

Mary L. Smith/OPD/EOP@EOP

Ann O'Leary/OPD/EOP@EOP

Eric P. Liu/OPD/EOP@EOP

Anna Richter/OPD/EOP@EOP

David B. Peterman/NSC/EOP@EOP

Johannes A. Binnendijk/NSC/EOP@EOP

Sandra Thurman/OPD/EOP@EOP

Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP@EOP

Sean P. Maloney/WHO/EOP@EOP

Daniel C. Montoya/OPD/EOP@EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-MAR-2000 15:20:42.00

SUBJECT: Advocate Interview

TO: Matthew Murguia (CN=Matthew Murguia/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Any progress?

dcm

----- Forwarded by Daniel C. Montoya/OPD/EOP on
03/06/2000 03:17 PM -----

Elizabeth J. Potter

03/06/2000 03:10:41 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP@EOP, David B. Peterman/NSC/EOP@EOP,
Sandra Thurman/OPD/EOP@EOP, Daniel C. Montoya/OPD/EOP@EOP

cc:

Subject: Advocate Interview

----- Forwarded by Elizabeth J. Potter/WHO/EOP on
03/06/2000 03:10 PM -----

Elizabeth J. Potter

03/06/2000 11:51:06 AM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc: Carolyn T. Wu/WHO/EOP@EOP, Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP,
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP, Jenni R. Engebretsen/WHO/EOP@EOP

Subject: Advocate Interview

The President is doing an Interview with the Advocate tomorrow. Please
provide draft guidance for the following questions by 3:00 pm today.

THANKS

NSC/WH Counsel

3. What are some of the things our readers may not know about the way the

"don't ask, don't tell" debate played out among our political and military leaders?

DPC/WH Counsel

8. Do you think that Americans would ever come to a point where they would find same-sex marriage acceptable? Or is it more likely that they will be willing to recognize gay relationships primarily through domestic partnership agreements?

AIDS Policy Office

7. Because of the advances in AIDS treatments and the decline in death rates, is it possible to maintain a sense of urgency in dealing politically with AIDS issues?

Message Sent

To:

Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mary L. Smith/OPD/EOP@EOP
Ann O'Leary/OPD/EOP@EOP
Eric P. Liu/OPD/EOP@EOP
Anna Richter/OPD/EOP@EOP
David B. Peterman/NSC/EOP@EOP
Johannes A. Binnendijk/NSC/EOP@EOP
Sandra Thurman/OPD/EOP@EOP
Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. Maloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Daniel C. Montoya/OPD/EOP@EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Elizabeth J. Potter (CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-MAR-2000 11:51:13.00

SUBJECT: Advocate Interview

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sandra Thurman (CN=Sandra Thurman/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David B. Peterman (CN=David B. Peterman/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eric P. Liu (CN=Eric P. Liu/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen Tramontano (CN=Karen Tramontano/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Johannes A. Binnendijk (CN=Johannes A. Binnendijk/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anna Richter (CN=Anna Richter/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ann O'Leary (CN=Ann O'Leary/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Edward W. Correia (CN=Edward W. Correia/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Jenni R. Engebretsen (CN=Jenni R. Engebretsen/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Victoria L. Valentine (CN=Victoria L. Valentine/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Carolyn T. Wu (CN=Carolyn T. Wu/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

The President is doing an Interview with the Advocate tomorrow. Please provide draft guidance for the following questions by 3:00 pm today.

THANKS

NSC/WH Counsel

3. What are some of the things our readers may not know about the way the "don't ask, don't tell" debate played out among our political and military leaders?

DPC/WH Counsel

8. Do you think that Americans would ever come to a point where they would find same-sex marriage acceptable? Or is it more likely that they will be willing to recognize gay relationships primarily through domestic partnership agreements?

AIDS Policy Office

7. Because of the advances in AIDS treatments and the decline in death rates, is it possible to maintain a sense of urgency in dealing politically with AIDS issues?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-MAR-2000 14:36:03.00

SUBJECT: URGENT: Advocate Interview

TO: Matthew Murguia (CN=Matthew Murguia/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Please check with Sandy about this and please advise me anyway.

dcm

----- Forwarded by Daniel C. Montoya/OPD/EOP on
03/06/2000 02:35 PM -----

Elizabeth J. Potter
03/06/2000 11:51:06 AM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc: Carolyn T. Wu/WHO/EOP@EOP, Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP,
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP, Jenni R. Engebretsen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Subject: Advocate Interview

The President is doing an Interview with the Advocate tomorrow. Please
provide draft guidance for the following questions by 3:00 pm today.
THANKS

NSC/WH Counsel

3. What are some of the things our readers may not know about the way the
"don't ask, don't tell" debate played out among our political and military
leaders?

DPC/WH Counsel

8. Do you think that Americans would ever come to a point where they would
find same-sex marriage acceptable? Or is it more likely that they will be
willing to recognize gay relationships primarily through domestic
partnership agreements?

AIDS Policy Office

7. Because of the advances in AIDS treatments and the decline in death
rates, is it possible to maintain a sense of urgency in dealing
politically with AIDS issues?

Message Sent

To:

Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP@EOP

Mary L. Smith/OPD/EOP@EOP

Ann O'Leary/OPD/EOP@EOP

Eric P. Liu/OPD/EOP@EOP

Anna Richter/OPD/EOP@EOP

David B. Peterman/NSC/EOP@EOP

Johannes A. Binnendijk/NSC/EOP@EOP

Sandra Thurman/OPD/EOP@EOP

Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP@EOP

Sean P. Maloney/WHO/EOP@EOP

Daniel C. Montoya/OPD/EOP@EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Anna Richter (CN=Anna Richter/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-MAR-2000 12:33:57.00

SUBJECT: Advocate Interview

TO: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

any more information about this?

----- Forwarded by Anna Richter/OPD/EOP on 03/06/2000
12:33 PM -----

Elizabeth J. Potter

03/06/2000 11:51:06 AM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc: Carolyn T. Wu/WHO/EOP@EOP, Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP,

Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP, Jenni R. Engebretsen/WHO/EOP@EOP

Subject: Advocate Interview

The President is doing an Interview with the Advocate tomorrow. Please
provide draft guidance for the following questions by 3:00 pm today.

THANKS

NSC/WH Counsel

3. What are some of the things our readers may not know about the way the
"don't ask, don't tell" debate played out among our political and military
leaders?

DPC/WH Counsel

8. Do you think that Americans would ever come to a point where they would
find same-sex marriage acceptable? Or is it more likely that they will be
willing to recognize gay relationships primarily through domestic
partnership agreements?

AIDS Policy Office

7. Because of the advances in AIDS treatments and the decline in death
rates, is it possible to maintain a sense of urgency in dealing
politically with AIDS issues?

Message Sent

To:

Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP@EOP

Mary L. Smith/OPD/EOP@EOP

Ann O'Leary/OPD/EOP@EOP

Eric P. Liu/OPD/EOP@EOP

Anna Richter/OPD/EOP@EOP

David B. Peterman/NSC/EOP@EOP

Johannes A. Binnendijk/NSC/EOP@EOP

Sandra Thurman/OPD/EOP@EOP

Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP@EOP

Sean P. Maloney/WHO/EOP@EOP

Daniel C. Montoya/OPD/EOP@EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Ann O'Leary (CN=Ann O'Leary/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-MAR-2000 14:51:04.00

SUBJECT: Re: Advocate Interview

TO: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: edward w. correia (CN=edward w. correia/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: elizabeth j. potter (CN=elizabeth j. potter/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Looks good to me, too.

Mary L. Smith

03/06/2000 12:35:08 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Elizabeth J. Potter/WHO/EOP@EOP

cc: Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP@EOP, Ann O'Leary/OPD/EOP@EOP

bcc:

Subject: Re: Advocate Interview

What do you think of the following?

Advocate Interview

Q&A

March 6, 2000

8. Do you think that Americans would ever come to a point where they would find same-sex marriage acceptable? Or is it more likely that they will be willing to recognize gay relationships primarily through domestic partnership agreements?

A: It's hard to predict what Americans will think in the future. But, I think we should focus our efforts on what we can accomplish. I support more equal treatment for domestic partners, and I am hopeful that we will see more equal treatment for domestic partners in the future. I also think it is important now to focus our efforts on the fight against

discrimination. That's why I urge Congress to pass the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, which extends workplace protections to gays and lesbians. And that's why I urge Congress to pass hate crimes legislation that would punish hate crimes based on sexual orientation.

Elizabeth J. Potter
03/06/2000 11:51:06 AM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc: Carolyn T. Wu/WHO/EOP@EOP, Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP,
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP, Jenni R. Engebretsen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Subject: Advocate Interview

The President is doing an Interview with the Advocate tomorrow. Please provide draft guidance for the following questions by 3:00 pm today.
THANKS

NSC/WH Counsel

3. What are some of the things our readers may not know about the way the "don't ask, don't tell" debate played out among our political and military leaders?

DPC/WH Counsel

8. Do you think that Americans would ever come to a point where they would find same-sex marriage acceptable? Or is it more likely that they will be willing to recognize gay relationships primarily through domestic partnership agreements?

AIDS Policy Office

7. Because of the advances in AIDS treatments and the decline in death rates, is it possible to maintain a sense of urgency in dealing politically with AIDS issues?

Message Sent

To: _____
Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mary L. Smith/OPD/EOP@EOP
Ann O'Leary/OPD/EOP@EOP
Eric P. Liu/OPD/EOP@EOP
Anna Richter/OPD/EOP@EOP
David B. Peterman/NSC/EOP@EOP
Johannes A. Binnendijk/NSC/EOP@EOP
Sandra Thurman/OPD/EOP@EOP

Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. Maloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Daniel C. Montoya/OPD/EOP@EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "LEXIS ("LEXIS /NEXIS Print Delivery" <lexis-nexis@prod.lexis-nexis.com> (R) (R) [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-MAR-2000 11:33:30.00

SUBJECT: civil rights

TO: Irene Bueno (CN=Irene Bueno/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

LEXIS-NEXIS Universe Update Report: March 07, 2000 at 11:22

Results from this Update: 23

Next Update: March 07, 2000 at 12:00

Access your results at:

http://web.lexis-nexis.com/in.universe/pnews/emailAlert?_pnewsAlert=0x000101a9-0x00004b26%2f0x000101a9%2f20000307%2f11%3a22%3a05

1 of 23 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Globe Newspaper Company

The Boston Globe

March 7, 2000, Tuesday ,THIRD EDITION

SECTION: OP-ED; Pg. A13

LENGTH: 778 words

HEADLINE: STEVE SANDERS Steve Sanders teaches and writes about gay and lesbian

politics at Indiana University.;

2000 ELECTION IS CRITICAL FOR GAYS AND LESBIANS

BYLINE: BY STEVE SANDERS

BODY:

The year 2000 has emerged as the most critical period in the history of the gay rights movement. During the next eight months, state legislators, the US

Supreme Court, and voters will determine in important ways how gay and lesbian relationships are recognized, how effectively civil rights laws can be used to promote homosexual equality, and which side is ascendant in the culture war over America's most controversial minority.

These battles loom as gays are enjoying steady gains in public acceptance and political influence. A new review of public opinion by political scientists Kenneth Sherrill and Alan Yang shows that while 56 percent of Americans believe that homosexual behavior is "morally wrong," larger majorities support equal job opportunities and laws against hate crimes.

However, deep divisions over homosexuality remain, nowhere more starkly than in California, where voters in the nation's largest state decide today whether to approve a law saying "only a marriage between a man and a woman shall be valid or recognized."

The issue is moot: No state gives marriage licenses to same-sex couples. But the multimillion-dollar media war over the so-called "Knight initiative" (named for its sponsor, Republican state Senator William "Pete" Knight) has come to symbolize emotional, political, and religious differences over how society should treat its gay citizens. As if to underscore the issue's ability to polarize, Knight's son David revealed last fall that he is gay and estranged from his father.

While gay marriage remains theoretical, the Vermont Supreme Court ruled in December that limiting the benefits of marriage to opposite-sex couples violated the "common benefits clause" of the Vermont Constitution - an unprecedented victory in the quixotic campaign to legally recognize gay relationships.

Declaring gay couples' quest for protection and security nothing less than "a recognition of our common humanity," the court tossed a political hot potato to the state Legislature, which must decide this spring whether to grant marriage licenses to gay couples or erect an elaborate system of "domestic partnership."

Domestic partnership would provide gay couples the same state-conferred privileges - such as the ability to make medical decisions for partners or inherit property in the absence of a will - that married people get while withholding the "m" word and the social recognition it implies.

Legislative leaders have signaled that they intend to focus on domestic partnership rather than on expanding marriage. Unlike marriage, however, domestic partnership would not be recognized across state lines. Gays say it might represent a return to the "separate but equal" status the nation's legal system long ago rejected for blacks and other minorities.

While Vermont deliberates, the Supreme Court will hear arguments on another flash-point issue: whether a New Jersey civil rights law can be used to prohibit Boy Scout groups from enforcing policies that exclude gays.

The Scouts expelled James Dale as an assistant scoutmaster after learning he was involved with a gay student group at Rutgers University. In August, New Jersey's highest court ruled that the Boy Scouts were covered by a state law prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. The Scouts have argued that they have a special right to discriminate because they are a private membership organization.

Only 11 states have laws that protect gays from various forms of discrimination. That could change in November. Democratic leaders have pledged to pass a federal law barring antigay employment discrimination if they regain control of Congress. The Democrats have stepped up overt appeals to gays and lesbians, who make up an estimated 5 percent of the electorate - as much as 9 percent in large cities.

In the presidential primaries, Democrats Al Gore and Bill Bradley have vied for invitations to gay community centers, fund-raisers, even online chats, and have denounced the military's policy on homosexuals.

The Republican race between George Bush and John McCain, by contrast, seems like a contest to demonstrate who would take a harder line on issues such as "Don't ask, don't tell," marriage, and adoption.

Bush has waffled on whether he would appoint open gays to his administration, and he criticized the New Jersey Boy Scouts decision. Although McCain has had a cordial meeting with a gay Republican group and denounced figures such as televangelist Pat Robertson as being outside the mainstream, he has endorsed California's Knight initiative and said of homosexuality, "It's a lifestyle I don't approve of."

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 7, 2000

2 of 23 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 The Detroit News, Inc.

The Detroit News

March 7, 2000, Tuesday

SECTION: Editorial Page; Pg. 8

LENGTH: 1169 words

HEADLINE: Letters
Hemlock backs Humphry book, but not video

BODY:

I wish to make a correction. In The News' Feb. 24 article "Dying patients explore choices beyond Kevorkian," I am quoted as saying that Hemlock of Michigan tells callers considering aid-in-dying that the Derek Humphry video, recently released, is the next best alternative to calling Kevorkian. What I said was that Humphry's book, Final Exit, is all we can recommend, not the video.

I have not even seen the video, and I went on to say that from what I have heard about it, I have serious reservations. I fear that it might lead to impulsive actions, not careful decisions. Our main goal remains to have laws changed so as to permit physician-aid-in-dying under state supervision.

Shaw Livermore, Jr.

President

Hemlock of Michigan

Ann Arbor

Protect seniors

The Feb. 8 article "Safety rails on beds may not be safe" is just the tip of the iceberg. Our senior citizens are placed in nursing homes that are very loosely regulated. Penalties for misconduct or neglect are an insult to human dignity.

I wish every individual would take the time to walk through a "typical nursing home" to see how our elderly citizens are treated and cared for. It begs the question, "What is the quality of life?"

Peter J. Acho

Farmington Hills

Gun collection

It's good to hear about a potential tragedy being avoided, especially when someone has made overt threats to the intended victims ("Compuware threats spur raid," Feb. 20). However, I am concerned about the use of the term "arsenal" in regards to Kevin Olender's two rifles and one handgun.

The Detroit News now portrays anyone who has a similar quantity of guns as being a potential danger to neighbors and co-workers.

Gary Gurski

Orion

Fear and loathing of gays

The Detroit News gives Auburn Hills Mayor Tom McMillan too much credit for his role in defeating Ferndale's Human Rights Ordinance ("Neighboring mayor fights gay rights law," Feb. 24). The apathy of mainstream citizens in Ferndale who don't believe human rights have anything to do with them, coupled with the ignorance and fear of a small but vocal group of religious extremists who

use
the Bible as a shield for hatred and intolerance of gay people, are the
reasons
that the ordinance failed.

The misinformation being disseminated by Oakland County Citizens For
Equal
Rights Not Special Rights should raise questions in the minds of all
thoughtful
citizens of Royal Oak about the motives of the Auburn Hills mayor.

Karla Handley

Royal Oak

Revamped court works

The recent News article outlining the impact that our next president
will
have on the U.S. Supreme Court caused me to reflect on the historical
changes
brought about by the appointments made by Gov. John Engler to our Michigan
Supreme Court ("Next president likely to reshape court," Jan. 19). We
would all
be well served by an examination of the Court and a recognition of the
strides
it has taken in establishing equity in the criminal arena.

Having spent the past 25 years as a prosecuting attorney, I am
encouraged
that our current Supreme Court has repeatedly demonstrated that trial
courts are
best situated to determine the truth.

The court has implicitly recognized that citizen juries are best suited
to
evaluate the credibility of witnesses and the sufficiency of evidence and
that
trial judges are best able to ensure the fairness of proceedings conducted
before them. The decisions of the new majority re-establish that
appellate court
judges and justices, who are confined to reviewing a cold transcript far
removed
from the time and place of the crime, should not quickly substitute their
judgment for that of trial judges and juries.

As a result, in a sharp departure from the past, victims and their
families
are much less likely to be tortured with the prospect of a new trial and
the
resulting uncertainty of whether or not the defendant will be released
from
custody.

At the same time, we can also look to a court that recognizes that it is the role of the Legislature, not the courts, to make law and decide policy. In five recent decisions, our Supreme Court has chosen to strictly interpret the Constitution and Michigan law and to reinstate the convictions of drunk drivers.

As a result, many families traveling Michigan roads will be spared the trauma of an automobile collision at the hands of drunken repeat offenders.

gan to cut through the rhetoric of special interests and examine the decisions of our Supreme Court.

William A. Forsyth

Kent County Prosecuting Attorney

Grand Rapids

What about free speech?

Kudos to The Detroit News for having the courage to print the reasons for the refusal of the Free Press publishing company and the University of Michigan student newspaper to accept an ad because of the title of the book, Hating Whitey and Other Progressive Causes by David Horowitz, president of the Los Angeles-based Center for the Study of Popular Culture ("Why did U-M student paper refuse to print book ad?," Feb. 5).

What happened to free speech? Why don't they give the ad and the book a fair chance?

Milton and Zelda Rose

Farmington Hills

Prevent water loss

I read with interest The News Feb. 4 article, "Further lake drop forecast."

However, I am not convinced that the explanation offered by National Weather

Service on the issue of declining lake levels provides all the answers.

According to it, the lake levels have been dropping because of warmer, drier

winter weather that keeps ice from forming over the Great Lakes, thus increasing the rate of evaporation of water from lake surfaces.

I suspect the lake levels are also declining because we are drawing more water from the lakes than what we are putting into them. The water used in bathrooms and kitchens goes back to the lakes through sewer systems via the wastewater treatment plants, but the water used for watering lawns seeps into the ground or evaporated. Either way this water is lost from the circulation and unless it finds its way into the lakes through an unreliable circuitous route via ground water, we lose this water permanently.

The Great Lakes may be abundant, but they only have a finite amount of water.

If we keep drawing more water from them than the water that goes into them, we will have lake levels dropping all the time.

I suggest promoting the concept of fake lawns, such as AstroTurf, so we save the water that is used for watering lawns.

Pradeep Srivastava

Detroit

Mental sensitivity

I was saddened to see Tom Toles cartoon on the editorial page of Feb. 26. As a member of the Alliance for the Mentally Ill of Michigan, I find it offensive to ridicule those who need medications to become stable in order to function.

The cartoon references to Ritalin and Prozac are as inappropriate to a person coping with symptoms of mental illness as a comic reference of procordia or nitrobid are to a heart patient.

Please understand how sensitive we are to the perpetuating stigma of such thoughtless cartoons and its effects on our loved ones.

Dolores Howell

Royal Oak

LOAD-DATE: March 7, 2000

3 of 23 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Times Mirror Company

Los Angeles Times

March 7, 2000, Tuesday, Home Edition

SECTION: Part A; Page 5; National Desk

LENGTH: 1396 words

HEADLINE: NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE;

POLITICS;

JEB BUSH'S ANTI-AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLAN IGNITES FIRESTORM PROTESTERS TAKE
ISSUE

WITH HIS ONE FLORIDA INITIATIVE. CRITICS SAY THAT 'IT'S ALL ABOUT THE
LETTER

W'--GEORGE W. AND WARD CONNERLY OF CALIFORNIA.

BYLINE: MIKE CLARY, TIMES STAFF WRITER

DATELINE: TALLAHASSEE, Fla.

BODY:

For Gov. Jeb Bush, the honeymoon ended to the strains of "We Shall
Overcome."

His list of first-year triumphs--school vouchers, \$ 1 billion in tax cuts
and a
tough crime bill--were all but forgotten when two black lawmakers staged
an
executive office sit-in and hundreds of angry protesters rallied outside
the
state Capitol.

The furor was ignited by an executive order that banned the use of race
in
state university admissions--and turned Florida into a national
battleground
over affirmative action.

In protests reminiscent of the 1960s civil rights struggle, African
Americans, women and students have been lashing out at Bush's initiative
with
heartfelt fury.

"Governor, you have hurt women and minorities in the state of
Florida--hurt
us bad," state Sen. Daryl L. Jones told Bush before some of the 4,000

people who gathered in Miami last month to air their grievances. "And I am not sure you understand how it happened."

Bush's "One Florida" plan has two parts: The one dealing with university admissions, another governing minority-owned firms seeking state contracts.

The plan guarantees that students who graduate in the top 20% of their high school class will be admitted to one of the 10 state universities. Last month, the Board of Regents and the Cabinet approved that aspect of the plan. Similar changes came to California, Texas and Washington, spurred in part by divisive ballot initiatives and, in California's case, by the UC Board of Regents.

The Florida branch of the National Assn. for the Advancement of Colored People has filed suit to block the governor's plan, and thousands of demonstrators opposed to ending affirmative action are expected here today when the Legislature reconvenes. Among those expected to join in the protests are the Rev. Jesse Jackson, Martin Luther King III, NAACP President and Chief Executive Kweisi Mfume, National Organization for Women President Patricia Ireland and various labor and church leaders.

Some observers predict that the fallout could roil the waters for the governor's brother, Texas Gov. George W. Bush, who is considered the front-runner in the state's Republican presidential primary set for March 14. However, the latest polls show him with a comfortable lead over rival Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.).

The mixing of national and state politics--and Bush-family ambitions--is nothing new in Florida. A scheduled speech by former President Bush to a special joint session of the state Legislature this month was canceled after objections from both Democrats and Republicans--including state Comptroller Robert F. Milligan, who heads the Florida presidential campaign for McCain.

The Democratic presidential contenders, Vice President Al Gore and former Sen. Bill Bradley of New Jersey, also have made campaign stops in Florida--attacking Jeb Bush's One Florida plan and, by implication, the Texas blueprint on which it is modeled.

For his part, the governor has seemed stunned by the furor unleashed by

his
Nov. 9 executive order replacing affirmative action with the One Florida
plan.

"This has been a difficult time for me," Bush confessed in Miami last
month,
as many in the audience jeered and booed. "The last two weeks, I have
carried a
heavy heart around."

Ironically, Bush's plan to do away with race and gender in deciding
university admissions and in handing out state contracts was designed in
part to
head off more drastic measures being promoted by Ward Connerly, a
conservative
California businessman and member of the UC Board of Regents. Connerly,
one of
the leaders of the California effort, wants to kill affirmative action in
Florida in the same way it has been scrapped in his home state and in
Washington
state.

Connerly's group asked the Florida Supreme Court on Monday to approve
ballot
language on the measure. The seven-member court could take months to make
a
decision.

Connerly, who was in Florida last month to rally support for his cause,
has
labeled Bush's initiative a timid proposal, designed only to thwart
stronger
efforts while protecting his brother's presidential bid.

Opposition to One Florida also has generated criticism from many who see
Bush's style of governing as imperious and autocratic.

"The governor did not get 100% of the vote in the state of Florida,"
said
Democratic state Sen. Kendrick Meek, who along with Democratic state Rep.
Anthony Hill staged the 25-hour sit-in in January. "But he shuts out
people. And
that's how you get turmoil started."

During his first 13 months in office, Bush enjoyed steady popular and
legislative support. In his 1998 race, Bush campaigned hard in minority
neighborhoods, winning 61% of the Latino vote and 14% of the black vote in
handily beating his Democrat rival. His approval ratings remain high.

At 47, Bush is known for his attention to detail, long days in the
office and
frequent late nights at the governor's mansion, e-mailing responses to
constituents' queries.

But in this Old South city 450 miles from Miami, where Bush grew rich during the 1980s as a real estate developer, the governor has offended even those in his own party with flashes of what Scher calls "arrogance, petulance and an impatience, which I don't think we've seen before."

"He came in playing hardball," said GOP state Sen. James E. King Jr. of Jacksonville. "He was saying, 'Legislature, step aside. There's a new force in town.'"

King, a 14-year veteran of the Legislature, said he often has urged Bush to slow down. "You can't not like Jeb Bush," King said. "But we had toe-to-toes. He is youthful, exuberant, and his style reflects the dot-com mentality of today's businesspeople. But his fault is that in his zeal he's convinced he's righter than he thinks he is. And that's why he finds himself in the maelstrom he's in."

King pointed out that many of Bush's legislative successes, such as tort reform, school vouchers and a streamlined death penalty appeal process, are tied up in the courts.

Bush admits to impatience. But he remains firm in his convictions that One Florida is the best way to eliminate race as a factor in university admissions and to end employment set-asides that many Floridians see as discriminatory. Although he agreed to hold three public hearings on his anti-affirmative action plan as a way of ending the sit-in, Bush has made only slight modifications, including excluding 10 state agencies from the ban on hiring set-asides.

He also has named a commission to monitor One Florida's effects on minority college admissions.

Democratic state Rep. Debbie Wasserman Schultz of Weston called One Florida a threat to minorities and women that owes more to politics than to a push for equality. "I believe it's all about the letter W--as in George W. and Ward," she said.

Even many Republicans say the governor's proposals will get a hard look

during the next legislative session, especially from those still
bristling over
Bush's veto of \$ 313 million worth of pet projects during 1999. "I don't
expect
the Senate to be a rubber stamp," said Tampa area Republican state Sen.
Tom Lee.

Until the affirmative action flap, Bush's missteps seemed minor. He
violated
the state's open-meeting law on his first day in office, for example.
And, in a
personal embarrassment, the governor's wife, Columba, last summer was
nabbed at
Hartsfield Atlanta International Airport returning from Paris with \$
19,000
worth of undeclared jewelry and clothes. She paid a civil fine of \$
4,100, three
times the duty she owed.

Even some of those who find fault with One Florida say Bush's
intentions are
good. "He's not a racist," said Miami-Dade County Commissioner Barbara
Carey-Shuler. "But I want to say to him, just as his father said, 'Read my
lips.' This plan is no good for us."

With relations with the Legislature's black caucus at low ebb, and even
some
Republicans feeling estranged, Bush could face problems passing his
proposed
budget: a \$ 49.8-billion package that includes major expenditures for
roads,
Everglades restoration and education.

"He is getting a dose of harsh political reality," Scher said. "But I
think
it's a stylistic problem rather than a substance problem. Mr. Bush is a
very
impatient man. He wants it done yesterday. If he can learn to adjust,
he'll be
all right."

Times researcher Anna M. Virtue contributed to this story.

GRAPHIC: PHOTO: Students in Tallahassee last month protest Gov. Jeb Bush's
"One
Florida" plan, which bans some affirmative action efforts. PHOTOGRAPHER:
Associated Press

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: March 7, 2000

THE ORLANDO SENTINEL

March 7, 2000 Tuesday, METRO

SECTION: A SECTION; Pg. A4

LENGTH: 526 words

HEADLINE: MARCHERS UNITE MANY BACKGROUNDS;
VETERAN ACTIVISTS AND PEOPLE WHO HAVE NEVER SPOKEN OUT BEFORE HAVE BEEN
GALVANIZED BY THE ONE FLORIDA PLAN.;

BYLINE: By Jeff Kunerth of The Sentinel Staff

BODY:

Gerald Jones has never marched or protested or demonstrated for anything in his life.

"I'm in Generation X that doesn't get involved," said Jones, 24, who works in the student affairs office at the University of Central Florida.

David Rucker has been marching and protesting and demonstrating since he was 16 years old and trying to integrate the lunch counters and movie theaters of Griffin, Ga.

"I was greatly influenced by Martin Luther King. That's where it all started," said Rucker, 53, an Orange County Public Schools employee.

Both will be on the buses leaving Orlando today for the "Coalition of Conscience" march in Tallahassee to protest Gov. Jeb Bush's One Florida plan, which bans race, ethnic, and gender preferences in state contracting and college admissions and in some state hiring.

"I think history is going to be made for this state," Jones said. "I'm marching for my nieces and nephews coming behind me."

The march, set to coincide with Bush's opening-day address to the Florida Legislature, is expected to draw as many as 10,000 demonstrators from all over the state.

More than a dozen busloads of people from Orlando-area civil-rights organizations, labor unions, women's groups, churches and UCF are

participating
in the protest.

"We have businessmen, we have community activists, we have professionals. We have people of all walks of life," said Reginald McGill, 44, an Orlando law-firm employee.

Scott Prange is a white, 22-year-old graduate of UCF going on his first protest march. He's getting involved, Prange said, because indifference toward minorities is what led to the Holocaust in Europe.

"A democracy that doesn't make provisions for minorities will fall," Prange said.

Kelvin Bodley, an Orange County code-enforcement employee, is exchanging a vacation day for a long bus ride and a day of speeches by the Rev. Jesse Jackson, NAACP President Kweisi Mfume, National Organization for Women President Patricia Ireland and AFL-CIO chief John Sweeney.

"We're not asking for handouts. We're asking for equal rights," said Bodley, 38.

"One Florida should have been one Florida from the beginning and included everyone."

Bodley said he has benefited throughout his life from affirmative-action programs that provide him with grants for school and equal opportunity to jobs.

Si Henderson, a 33-year-old carpenter for the city of Orlando, said he owes his job to a program that recruited minority candidates to learn the carpentry trade.

"The reason I'm doing this is to make a statement that we want a level playing field in regards to college admissions and hiring," Henderson said.

Henderson's brother, John, heads an organization for underprivileged children. It's their future that is at stake with the One Florida program, John Henderson said: "My concern is how this impacts our youth and young adults."

From neophytes to veterans, the Coalition of Conscience marchers will

converge on Tallahassee today from different directions and many perspectives.

"We have whites, we have blacks, we have Hispanics. We have people in their 80s," McGill said.

"This march is reflective of our state."

GRAPHIC: BOX: CENTRAL FLORIDA GROUPS IN THE MARCH; National Association for the

Advancement of Colored People; Central Florida AFL-CIO; Florida National Organization for Women; Florida Council of Churches; Hotel Employees Restaurant

Employees; Bakery Confectionary workers; Communication Workers of America; United Farm Workers; United Food and Commercial Workers; Service Employees International; UCF African American Student Union; United For Dignity; Floridians Representing Equity and Equality; Rainbow/PUSH Coalition;

Source:

Sentinel research

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

COLUMN: Fight over affirmative action

LOAD-DATE: March 7, 2000

5 of 23 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Sentinel Communications Co.

THE ORLANDO SENTINEL

March 7, 2000 Tuesday, METRO

SECTION: A SECTION; Pg. A3

LENGTH: 250 words

HEADLINE: TODAY IN HISTORY

BODY:

ON THIS DATE in 1850, in a three-hour speech to the U.S. Senate, Daniel Webster endorsed the Compromise of 1850, a bill that would have permitted slavery in some territories but not in others, as a means of preserving the Union.

In 1876, Alexander Graham Bell received a patent for his telephone.

In 1911, the United States sent 20,000 troops to the Mexican border as a

precaution in the wake of the Mexican Revolution. ... In 1936, Adolf Hitler ordered his troops to march into the Rhineland, thereby breaking the Treaty of Versailles and the Locarno Pact.

In 1945, during World War II, U.S. forces crossed the Rhine River at Remagen, Germany, using the damaged but still usable Ludendorff Bridge.

In 1965, a march by civil-rights demonstrators was broken up in Selma, Ala., by state troopers and a sheriff's posse.

In 1975, the Senate revised its filibuster rule, allowing 60 senators to limit debate in most cases, instead of the previously required two-thirds of senators present.

In 1990, Health and Human Services Secretary Louis Sullivan announced that the government would propose a more informative food-labeling system that would require the disclosure of the fat, fiber and cholesterol content of nearly all packaged foods.

In 1994, the Supreme Court ruled that parodies that poke fun at an original work can be considered "fair use" that doesn't require permission from the copyright holder.

In 1995, New York Gov. George Pataki signed a death-penalty bill into law.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

COLUMN: Briefing
Nation & world
TODAY IN HISTORY

LOAD-DATE: March 7, 2000

6 of 23 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Sun-Sentinel Company

Sun-Sentinel (Fort Lauderdale, FL)

March 7, 2000, Tuesday, Broward Metro EDITION

SECTION: LOCAL, Pg. 1B

LENGTH: 968 words

HEADLINE: BOY'S DEATH SPURS CALL FOR INQUIRY;
STATE TREATMENT OF MENTALLY ILL CHILDREN AT ISSUE

BYLINE: SALLY KESTIN ; Staff Writer

BODY:

A national mental health advocacy group has asked Attorney General Janet Reno to investigate Florida's treatment of children with serious mental illnesses.

The request comes after the death last month of a 12-year-old boy at a camp for juvenile offenders in Central Florida.

Michael Wiltsie, who weighed 65 pounds, died Feb. 5 after being restrained by a 320-pound counselor at Camp E-Kel-Etu near Ocala.

The death is "part of a pattern of inadequate treatment and gross violations of the civil rights of children and adolescents with mental illnesses under the care of the state," Laurie Flynn, executive director of the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill, wrote in a letter sent last week to Reno.

Flynn cited a Sun-Sentinel series published in November, called "Throwaway Kids," that found the state is sending hundreds of children to privately run mental health treatment centers that operate with little oversight or regulation.

Once confined, some children spend years in the centers largely under the care of poorly educated and trained staff. At least 55 children were abused or neglected in the past three years, the investigation found.

"What we know about Florida, in part through 'Throwaway Kids,' is there really is not a treatment system in place," said Bob Carolla, spokesman for NAMI, which has 210,000 members nationwide. "They're denying appropriate treatment."

Officials at the U.S. Justice Department are reviewing NAMI's request and have not decided whether to investigate, said spokeswoman Kara Peterman.

NAMI has lobbied Congress in recent months to limit the use of restraints in psychiatric facilities for children and adults. Each year in the United States, 50 to 150 patients die from improper restraints, the group has reported.

Advocates found Michael's death particularly troubling.

Michael had a long history of emotional and behavioral problems. One of three children, he grew up in a small, rural town near Ocala, said the family's lawyer, Ellis Rubin of Miami.

"They're very, very poor," Rubin said. "I was in their one-room house."

Michael's mother first sought help for him when he was 5 years old. Teachers at his daycare center said he was aggressive with other children, according to a report issued last month by a Marion County grand jury.

Michael was diagnosed with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder and opposition defiance disorder.

He was first arrested in 1996 at age 8. During the next three years, he was arrested nine more times on charges including burglary, battery and criminal mischief, the grand jury said.

In three separate evaluations, mental health workers recommended Michael receive intensive psychiatric treatment. But he received none, the grand jury report said.

After Michael threatened to shoot students at his school last November, the Department of Juvenile Justice placed him at Camp E-Kel-Etu, one of five in Florida operated by the non-profit Eckerd Youth Alternatives.

At the camps, youths live in tents in isolated wooded settings with no television, radio or electricity, said Andy Anderson, an Eckerd vice president.

Eckerd receives \$ 110 a day per child from the state. That includes \$ 35 a day for mental health services for disturbed children.

But just how much treatment Michael received is in dispute. Michael had been prescribed Ritalin. But Eckerd discontinued the drug because the camp does not accept children on such medications, the grand jury report said.

Michael received therapy at the camp, including two one-on-one sessions just before he died, said Catherine Arnold, spokeswoman for the juvenile justice agency.

On the day of the fatal restraint, Michael became agitated.

When another youth approached him, Michael clenched his fist and threatened him, the grand jury report said.

Counselor Joe Cooley, who was nearly five times Michael's weight, decided to restrain him as he had done one other time when Michael threw soap on other youths, the report said.

Eckerd allows employees to restrain children to prevent them from injuring themselves or others.

Cooley placed Michael face down on the ground and held his arm over the boy's torso. Michael complained he couldn't breathe. He pinched and kicked Cooley, who then straddled the boy, the grand jury report said.

Cooley took his weight off the boy when the youth promised to behave but again straddled him when the child resumed kicking. Michael became still, and Cooley accused him of "playing possum," the report said.

A short time later, Cooley turned Michael over and found he wasn't breathing. Michael died several hours later at a hospital.

A medical examiner concluded Michael died of compressional asphyxiation and said Cooley's weight, given the boy's size, led to his death, the report said.

The grand jury, although critical of the state's failure to get Michael appropriate treatment, declined to indict Cooley.

"He followed the procedure which he had been taught," jurors wrote. "No one who witnessed the restraint saw it as more forceful or longer in length than other restraints."

Cooley is on paid leave, pending the results of investigations by state juvenile justice and child welfare officials, Eckerd's Anderson said.

Rubin, the family's lawyer, has asked Gov. Jeb Bush to appoint a special prosecutor and reopen the investigation. The family plans to file a wrongful death lawsuit against Eckerd, Rubin said.

NAMI executives hope Michael's death will force reforms in Florida.

"This goes to a system that is not just flawed, it doesn't exist, and people aren't getting the treatment that they need," Carolla said. "This case is so bad (we decided) if we do not cry bloody murder and try to get some change in Florida, then when will we?"

LOAD-DATE: March 7, 2000

7 of 23 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Toronto Star Newspapers, Ltd.

The Toronto Star

March 7, 2000, Tuesday, Edition 1

SECTION: SPORTS

LENGTH: 365 words

HEADLINE: CASEY MARTIN GETS GREEN FLAG

BODY:

allows disabled

golfer to use a cart SAN FRANCISCO (Reuters) - A U.S. federal appeals court ruled yesterday that disabled golfer Casey Martin be allowed to use a golf cart during PGA Tour competitions, saying federal anti-discrimination laws overruled match regulations requiring competitors to walk from hole to hole.

In a verdict civil rights advocates said marked an important new victory for the disabled, the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals said Martin's use of a cart to move around the golf course simply put him on par with able-bodied competitors.

"We conclude that the Americans With Disabilities Act applies to PGA

competitions and that allowing Martin to use a cart is a reasonable accommodation that does not fundamentally alter the nature of those events,"

Justice William Canby said in the 3-0 decision upholding a lower court verdict.

Martin, 27, suffers from a circulatory disorder that has atrophied his lower right leg, which causes him severe pain if he stands or walks on it for any length of time.

A former Stanford University golfer, Martin sued PGA Tour Inc. in 1997 after being denied the right to use a cart in a final qualifying round for PGA tour events. The association allowed players to use carts for the first two rounds, but required them to walk the third round and the two tours.

Martin won a preliminary injunction in 1998, which has allowed him to participate pending a final legal decision. That year he earned a spot on the Nike Tour, the second level PGA national championship now known as the Buy. com Tour, and last year he advanced to win his own PGA Tour card.

PGA Tour officials said they had not yet decided whether to submit the decision on appeal to a full panel of 9th Circuit judges or even to the U.S. Supreme Court.

PGA Tour spokesperson Bob Combs said it was possible the organization would have further comment after the issue is discussed by the tour policy board on March 15.

Sid Wolinsky, litigation director for the Oakland, Calif.-based Disability Rights Advocates, said the Martin decision marked an important step forward for disabled athletes, both professional and amateur.

GRAPHIC: CASEY MARTIN

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: March 7, 2000

March 07, 2000, Tuesday, Final Edition

SECTION: PART A; COMMENTARY; Pg. A13

LENGTH: 907 words

HEADLINE: Genesis of voting

BYLINE: Balint Vazsonyi

BODY:

On a day known as Super Tuesday, it seems entirely appropriate to address the topic of voting. The ability to cast a ballot is now as basic an American right as those to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

That was not always the case.

When the Constitution was agreed upon and ratified, all sorts of people did not vote. This shocking state of affairs is punctuating the academic round tables and town meetings - we call them "We The People" forums - as the "Re-elect America" national bus tour winds its way across the southern flank of this great continent.

This is the way it happens. We begin each event with an enumeration of America's founding principles - the rule of law, individual rights, security of property and our common American identity - which we present as the "Four Points of America's Compass." Then we invite members of the panel to comment. Panels are carefully constituted to include a majority of those who are presumed to have reservations about the founders and the founding of America.

Still, everyone's first utterance is an affirmation of the person's approval of our founding documents, although it is often pointed out straightaway that "the Constitution was a compromise and very much in need of updating." Nonetheless, gradually, as each principle is explored, the genius of the framers emerges in ever more glorious dimensions.

That is when what we have come to call "the laundry list" is trotted out.

The list begins with the "three-fifths" clause of Article I, and goes on to women not having the vote until 1920. (In case of extreme need, the internment during World War II of families of Japanese origin is thrown in.)

I apologize for sounding frivolous. These, of course, are all serious matters. But it is remarkable how the exact same grievances are recited from the southern tip of Florida to the northwestern corner of Washington state every time the Constitution is discussed. It is remarkable because all these matters lie in the distant past. It is remarkable because the sole purpose appears to be to rebuke, castigate, indeed disapprove of America's founders. And, more often than not, the poison arrows hit their target: Those who identify with America's founders bow their heads in shame.

We are in the year 2000. How about calling it a day?

The concept of a universal right to vote did not grow on trees. Nor does the Constitution provide for any such thing. It therefore cannot be a weakness of the Constitution that women did not vote because the Constitution does not speak to the matter one way or the other. Nor does the Constitution define people of African origin as three-fifths of a human being. Rather, in its original - now defunct - wording, it prescribes that ratio in the apportionment of representatives and taxes, referring to "the whole number of free persons . . . and three-fifths of all other persons."

The purpose, as is well-known, was to avoid undue influence by the slave-holding states. But we should look beyond the standard explanation.

The clear implication of slaves notwithstanding, it is remarkable that the framers stopped short of any reference to origin, race or skin color. By attaching the injurious fraction to a state of being that could always change, as opposed to race or color which is permanent, they left the door wide open. And let us remember, when the time arrived for the liberated slaves to exercise

their franchise, they became beneficiaries of a political structure established by Americans - and no one else.

Although I understand that women voted in New Jersey as early as the time of the founding, Wyoming led the way by enacting such a law in 1889, and at least three different explanations exist in learned books as to how that came about. Our team can hardly wait to arrive in Wyoming and ask everyone we encounter.

With some difficulty, I can sympathize with women who get exercised in the year 2000 about other women who could not vote in the year 1919, although it has yet to be demonstrated that such a condition was a source of unhappiness for a majority.

It is more puzzling to experience men, especially of the white variety, brandishing about this piece of history as once the blood-stained sword was carried around to demonstrate guilt. A broader context is revealed when the (white male) mayor of a state capital, in extolling the merit of America's founders, utters the words: "Of course, they were not perfect. They were white males. And they were landowners."

Lest the reader takes the mayor's words for a tongue-in-cheek remark, let me assure everyone that the sentences were delivered in utter earnestness.

How did we get here?

How did we succumb to an unseen hand implanting stereotyped sin lists and clearly nonsensical attitudes into American brains, once the favorite place of residence for common sense?

All of us, over 18 and not convicted of a felony, can vote now. We are free to do so every couple of years, but the one this time around is promising to have far-reaching consequences. Let us take a moment to contemplate to whom we owe the privilege, and let those who appointed themselves to avenge past injuries - real or perceived - go on to a more productive and fulfilling existence.

Balint Vazsonyi, author of "America's 30 Years War: Who Is Winning?", is

director of the Center for the American Founding and its "Re-elect America" bus tour.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 7, 2000

9 of 23 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Cox News Service

Cox News Service

March 6, 2000

SECTION: Domestic, non-Washington, general news item

LENGTH: 682 words

HEADLINE: Anti-affirmative action proposal goes to court

BYLINE: S.V. Date

DATELINE: TALLAHASSEE, Fla.

BODY:

The man behind Florida's recent tumult in race relations had his day in court Monday, with his lawyers explaining to seven judges why the question of whether to end affirmative action should be permitted to go to the voters.

Even as protesters arrived in Tallahassee for today's march on the Capitol against Gov. Jeb Bush's response to California activist Ward Connerly, Florida Supreme Court justices picked at the wording of the ballot question, and wondered whether voters could reasonably be expected to know that while the proposals appear to ban discrimination, they would actually ban preferences.

"Is this a wolf dressed up in sheep's clothing?" asked Justice Harry Lee Anstead.

Tom Ervin, lawyer for the Florida Civil Rights Initiative, told the court that reverse discrimination was indeed a form of discrimination, and that voters would know exactly what the ballot questions are about. "I don't think they're misled for a minute," Ervin said.

With an audience that included black U.S. Reps. Alcee Hastings

(D-Miramar)

and Corrine Brown (D-Jacksonville), as well as Rhea Chiles, widow of former Gov.

Lawton Chiles, Attorney General Bob Butterworth made his first personal appearance before the high court in his 13 years in office.

'A GREAT EMBARRASSMENT'

"If it is put on the ballot, it would be a disaster, a great embarrassment to the state," Butterworth said.

He and other opponents of the initiatives, modeled on those that have already passed in California and Washington, seemed to hang many of their legal arguments on the requirement that each ballot question must have a clear title and ballot summary to explain to voters exactly what each constitutional amendment would do.

And they argued that the proposals' titles _ each starting with: "Amendment to bar Government from Treating People Differently Based on Race" _ make them sound as though they end discrimination against blacks and other minorities, when in fact they would end the remedies created to make up for centuries of discrimination.

H.T. Smith, a lawyer who served on the recent Constitutional Revision Commission, said that upon reading those words, "I wanted to rush to the ballot box and be the first to vote against discrimination. ... That's how it's advertised. But it's false advertisement. This is a cruel hoax."

Connerly's ballot initiatives would end consideration of race, national origin, color, or ethnicity by all governments in Florida in the areas of employment, contracting and public education. One of the four initiatives under the court's consideration addresses all three areas. The other three each address one area, in the event justices conclude that wrapping up all three in one ballot question violates the constitutional "single-subject" restriction.

Herb Harmon, Connerly's Florida director, said he hopes the court rules in time for the group to continue gathering signatures in time to put the questions on the November ballot. BUSH HAD HOPED TO AVOID THIS

It was just that possibility of a controversial voter initiative on the same

ballot as his brother's bid for United States president that Bush had hoped to avoid when he announced his One Florida plan last autumn that eliminates by executive decree preferences in education, employment and contracting within the state agencies under his control.

Ironically, the political backlash to that plan now threatens to bring exactly that kind of energized black voter turnout come November, regardless of whether the Connerly initiatives make the ballot.

Harmon said that if the court issues its ruling on the ballot questions too late to realistically gather the remaining 450,000 petition signatures in time for this November, then organizers would aim for the November 2002 ballot.

Either way, he said contributors _ who thus far have been predominantly the owners of white contracting firms _ have already promised to kick in the necessary \$1 million or so to pay for the required signatures to be gathered.

"We have that in pledges," Harmon said.

Story Filed By Cox Newspapers

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 7, 2000

10 of 23 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 The Dallas Morning News

The Dallas Morning News

March 6, 2000, Sunday THIRD EDITION

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. 14A; LARRY POWELL

LENGTH: 849 words

HEADLINE: 1960 brought us sit-ins and Anna Maria Alberghetti

BYLINE: Larry Powell

BODY:

Good morning. Today we'll go back to a time of revolution and rock, i.e.,

Hudson and roll.

Here's what was in The Dallas Morning News of Sunday, March 6, 1960:

* FRONT PAGE NEWS - Cuban Premier Fidel Castro blamed "enemies of the revolution" for blowing up a munitions ship in Havana Harbor and killing about

100 dock workers and sailors. The U.S. State Department denied American involvement and said that the premier appeared to be under "emotional strain." .

. . NAACP executive secretary Roy Wilkins, at the organization's southwest regional conference in Dallas Memorial Auditorium, said he expected to see anti-segregation demonstrations in Dallas. He criticized "the spineless attitude

of some Negroes who are afraid to stand up and be counted on the side of freedom." He reminded the 1,600 people in the audience that "white people helped

organized the NAACP; white people are helping us every day - right here in Dallas." . . . Texas Sen. Lyndon Johnson was attempting to push a "moderate

voting rights bill" through the Senate. (Aside: A civil-rights bill, with 16

amendments, passed April 8.) . . . The Rev. Stuart McGregor futilely complained

to the Dallas vice squad that people at the Hotel Adolphus were breaking a law

against playing cards in public. Texas Regional Bridge Tournament organizer

Kenneth Stone said: "If the police should come down here now, they'd find 800

people playing at 200 tables. And that's a whale of a lot of people to run into jail."

* INSIDE NEWS - A winter storm killed more than 170 people in the South,

Midwest, Northeast and Ohio Valley. . . . President Dwight Eisenhower vacationed

in Puerto Rico after touring South America. . . . A Gallup Poll found that Republican Vice President Richard Nixon had a 55-45 percent lead over possible

Democratic presidential candidate Adlai Stevenson but was even with Massachusetts Sen. John Kennedy.

* COMMERCIAL BREAK - At Sanger's department stores, a set of four TV trays

cost \$ 9.88. . . . On the car lots: At Hine Pontiac, you could put \$ 399 down

and get both a 1960 Catalina and a 1960 Vauxhall for \$ 61.98 a month. If you

bought a Peugeot 403 from Sterling Motors for \$ 2,353, the dealership would

include free air fare to Europe. . . . Trans-Texas Airways urged Dallasites to "

fly TTA Super Starliners" to Hot Springs for the horse races at Oaklawn Park. .

. . A city of Dallas IBM key punch operator could make \$ 240 a month. If you were single and had a "good figure," you could make \$ 650 a month singing and

dancing as a Gaslite Girl at the Gaslite Club. . . . For sale near Webb Chapel

Road at Forest Lane: Fox & Jacobs Accent Homes with three bedrooms, two baths

and workshop for \$ 20,300. An "Executive Home" - a three-bedroom, two-bath home

with a den, air-conditioning and a built-in bar - in a "livable neighborhood"

was listed at \$ 32,500 under "Real Estate for Colored." Also for sale, an air-conditioned two-story, four-bedroom, three-bath home with a large porch,

guest house and landscaped grounds on Beverly Drive. That Highland Park price: \$

49,500.

* COUNTING - In 1950, Dallas needed 450 census-takers, but Census Bureau

officials declared that for 1960 the city would need nearly 1,000.

(Aside: In

1950, Dallas' population was 434,462. In 1960, it was 679,684. In 1998, the

city's population was just over 1 million.)

* PROTESTS AND PUNCHES - In Houston, Negro students held "orderly sit-down

protests" against white-only lunch counters. They were Texas' first "sit-ins."

On the parking lot of one store, a protester was stabbed by a white man.

The

white man, "dressed in cowboy boots and a Western hat, lost two teeth in the

tussle."

* THE DALLAS NAACP CONFERENCE - About ending school segregation, Mr. Wilkins

said, "The NAACP has wondered why a city like Dallas - progressive and usually

far ahead of the rest of the Southern atmosphere - has taken so long."

* THAT'S ENTERTAINMENT - In New York, Metropolitan Opera director Rudolph

Bing paid tribute on nationwide radio to baritone Leonard Warren, who died on

the stage of the opera house in New York on Friday night "after singing a taxing

aria ending with the words "oh joy, oh joy.'" . . . On TV: The Ed Sullivan Show

with guest star Anna Maria Alberghetti and The Rebel with Nick Adams as

Johnny

Yuma. . . . At the movies: Ben Hur, with 12 Oscar nominations, at the Tower; at the Village, Pillow Talk (five Oscar nominations) with Rock Hudson and Doris Day.

* GREAT ESCAPES - The Dalai Lama , 25-year-old "god-king of Tibet," announced from his mansion in Mussoorie, India, that he'd smuggled a "king's ransom of silver from red-ruled Tibet when he fled Chinese Communist persecution last March." . . . Elvis Presley became a civilian, picking up his final check of \$ 100.54 from the Army at Fort Dix, N.J. He left the fort in a chauffeur-driven limo - the god-king of rock 'n' roll.

Larry Powell's column appears Sundays, Mondays and Fridays. To contact him, call 214-977-8487; write to P.O. Box 655237, Dallas, TX 75265; send faxes to 214-977-8319; or e-mail lrpowell@dallasnews.com.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 7, 2000

11 of 23 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Sun-Sentinel Company

Sun-Sentinel (Fort Lauderdale, FL)

March 6, 2000, Monday, Broward Metro EDITION

SECTION: EDITORIAL, Pg. 23A

LENGTH: 503 words

HEADLINE: OPEN WINDOW OF OPPORTUNITY TO ALL

BYLINE: STRATTON POLLITZER

BODY:

I have followed with great interest and concern the growing debate on the future of affirmative action in Florida, and I am writing because I am the product of an affirmative action program.

I am a white male, born in the South, and I am the product of the most comprehensive system of preferences that exists in our nation. From the

day I
was born I have benefited from an omnipresent, institutionalized system
of white
privilege. Nearly every major hurdle in my life has been more manageable
because
I am white and a man.

Yes, affirmative action has provided a window of opportunity through
which I
have walked many times. It has influenced my standing with prospective
employers, schools, loan officers and friends. But I stand on the other
side of
that opportunity today, not as an underachiever who should not be here,
but as
an enriched person with increased tools and skills.

And so I say to my fellow white male Americans, you, too, have
benefited from
affirmative action and racial preferences. We white men get the benefit
of the
doubt. We probably look like the person who owns the company. The
admissions
officer probably has a nephew that you or I remind him of. No racial
profiling
for us, no concern that a man won't be tough enough for the job, no
suspicious
store clerks following us around just because we're white.

I am not suggesting that we have not overcome obstacles. We have. I am
only
pointing out that women and people of color often face additional,
manufactured
obstacles.

And this is a subtle but critical point, because job applications do not
measure the obstacles you must overcome to reach the interview. Imagine
that a
job interview sits at the top of a difficult-to-climb mountain and two
people
arrive for the interview at the same moment with identical
qualifications. The
only difference between the two is that one person has reached the
interview
carrying a heavy backpack and having climbed over difficult terrain,
while the
other has arrived by helicopter.

Affirmative action allows us to give value to the additional strength
required of the climber.

The problem is not that we white males have been given a chance, the
problem
is that others are often not given that same chance.

So I am a strong advocate for affirmative action in Florida. I believe we must strive to open these windows of opportunity for other Americans that we white men have always enjoyed.

Affirmative action is not about giving jobs and scholarships away to the less qualified. Affirmative action is about ensuring that in a nation with an institutionalized, automatic system of white, male privilege, we do not fail to provide equal opportunities for women and non-whites. We need not keep others down to hold ourselves up. Our state and our nation will always benefit when we provide qualified people with the opportunity to succeed.

The author is the assistant director of Equality Florida, 1222 S. Dale Mabry, Suite 652, Tampa FL 33629 on the Web at www.eqfl.org.

LOAD-DATE: March 7, 2000

12 of 23 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 The Atlanta Constitution

The Atlanta Journal and Constitution

March 5, 2000, Sunday, Home Edition,
Correction Appended

SECTION: News; Pg. 4A

LENGTH: 799 words

HEADLINE: Lewis to encounter president, not clubs;
Civil Rights pilgrimage: Clinton will help activists and supporters retrace steps taken on 'Bloody Sunday.'

BYLINE: Ismail Turay Jr., Cox Washington Bureau

SOURCE: AJC

DATELINE: Birmingham

BODY:

In 1965, a young black man named John Lewis was severely beaten by white state troopers who attacked more than 600 nonviolent civil rights marchers trying to cross Selma's Edmund Pettus Bridge on their way to the state capital.

Today, 35 years later, U.S. Rep. John Lewis will be joined by President Clinton, former U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young and a bipartisan group of 30 members of Congress and other luminaries who will cross the bridge again in the third annual Congressional Civil Rights Pilgrimage.

This time, however, Alabama state troopers will act as supportive escorts.

And a racially mixed crowd of onlookers is expected to cheer.

"To have the president of the United States and some of my colleagues from Congress walking across that bridge with me is the impossible dream, the unthinkable," Lewis said.

Lewis, a Georgia Democrat serving his seventh term in Congress, has often returned to commemorate the "Bloody Sunday" attack. The troopers used tear gas, bull whips and billy clubs on unarmed marchers who were protesting poll taxes, literacy tests and other tactics aimed at intimidating black voters.

The vicious beatings, shown on national television, appalled much of America and bolstered support for the civil rights movement. Within months, Congress had passed the 1965 Voting Rights Act outlawing the poll tax and requiring that Americans, regardless of race, be permitted to cast ballots freely.

In 1965, only 2 percent of voting-age blacks were registered to vote in Dallas County, where Selma is located. Today, nearly 60 percent are registered.

This year's re-enactment, with the worldwide media attention generated by Clinton's participation, is a special pilgrimage.

It started Friday evening with a tour of the Civil Rights Institute in Birmingham. Saturday's events began with a tour of the Kelly Ingram Park, which is dedicated to those who died in the civil rights movement.

The participants then visited Sixteenth Street Baptist Church, the city's first black church, where four girls were killed in 1963 when it was bombed by white segregationists.

The group also made a 90-minute trip to Montgomery and toured the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church, once headed by the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. His widow, Coretta Scott King, briefly reflected on the life of the slain civil rights

leader. Martin Luther King III was in the audience.

Several members of Congress found the experience moving.

"My presence here is to honor all those who we've heard of and those whose names I don't know," said Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee (D-Texas), an African-American. "Because of them I am educated, I am an elected official and I am a better person."

Lewis, 60, said the pilgrimage can educate and sensitize his colleagues to the problems of race and "just maybe all of us can go back to our districts, our own states and get people discussing race."

"It means a great deal to recognize those who made it possible, but it can't continue if we don't pass it on to the youth," agreed Rep. Tom Sawyer (D-Ohio).

Lewis remembers his "Bloody Sunday" march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge "like it was yesterday." There was a cool breeze blowing that Sunday afternoon, on March 7. Lewis wore a beige coat. In his backpack he carried two books, an apple, an orange and a toothbrush.

"I thought we were going to be arrested and be sent to jail," said Lewis, who already had been arrested 40 times while pushing for civil rights. "So I wanted to have something to eat, something to read. And since I was going to be in close quarters with my friends and neighbors and colleagues, I wanted to be able to brush my teeth."

The demonstrators first saw the sea of state troopers when the marchers got to the crest of the bridge. Although Lewis expected to be arrested, "something didn't seem right this time," he recalled.

But there was no turning back. After all, the civil rights activists had already trekked 54 miles from Montgomery.

The state troopers ordered them to disperse. But the marchers continued. The more than 100 armed troopers began to push the marchers, who resisted. The troopers reacted with force.

Lewis and others were sprayed with tear gas, trampled by police horses

and
beaten with clubs. Some ran. Others, including Lewis, were severely
injured. He
suffered a fractured skull. Lewis doesn't remember how he got to a
hospital, but
feels fortunate to be alive.

Despite the bloodshed and struggles of the civil rights movement, people
today don't exercise their voting rights, Lewis said.

"It makes me very sad; it troubles me a great deal when so many people
do not
understand the significance of what Selma was all about," he said. "It
makes me
sad when we don't go out and vote when people died for that right."

CORRECTION-DATE: March 7, 2000

CORRECTION:

Page A/2: Civil rights march: A news article Sunday about the anniversary
of the
1965 Selma, Ala., march mischaracterized the route in one reference.
Marchers
were going to Montgomery.

GRAPHIC: Photo

In remembrance, Coretta Scott King (left) gathers with other officials
outside
the Mount Zion AME Church in Montgomery on Saturday. They were taking
part in
activities leading to the 35th anniversary of the attack on protesters
marching
through Selma to the state capital. / KEVIN GLACKMEYER / Associated Press

LOAD-DATE: March 7, 2000

13 of 23 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Cox News Service

Cox News Service

March 5, 2000

SECTION: Domestic, non-Washington, general news item

LENGTH: 764 words

HEADLINE: CLINTON LEADS MARCHERS IN RE-ENACTMENT OF SELMA MARCH

BYLINE: ISMAIL TURAY Jr.

DATELINE: SELMA, Ala.

BODY:

President Clinton joined civil rights activists Sunday at the Edmund Pettus Bridge in marking the 35th anniversary of the attack on voting rights marchers that he said made it possible for white Southerners like him to reach the White House.

Clinton locked arms with Rep. John Lewis, D-Ga., and Coretta Scott King and led modern-day marchers to the crest of the bridge where they stopped and prayed before continuing across.

It was March 7, 1965, when Lewis, then a young black voting rights organizer, suffered a fractured skull and was left for dead after being beaten by Alabama state troopers intent on halting their march through Selma on to the state capital of Montgomery 54 miles away.

The "Bloody Sunday" beatings, televised on newscasts across America, galvanized the nation and pressured Congress that summer to pass the Voting Rights Act that guaranteed the right to vote regardless of race.

Mrs. King, the widow of slain civil rights leader Rev. Martin Luther King Jr., was also joined by a wheelchair-bound Hosea Williams, who wore denim overalls and red sneakers and clutched a metal cane. Like Lewis, Williams was an aide to King in the 1960s.

"As long as there is any inequality (or) prejudice against any Americans because of the color of their skin or sexual preference, we have a very long bridge to cross," Clinton told a peaceful gathering of about 7,000 before re-enacting the walk across the bridge.

"It has been said that the Voting Rights Act was signed in ink in Washington," the president said. "But it was first signed in blood in Selma."

Lewis, who marches every year to mark the anniversary, had invited Clinton. Speaking to the crowd, he recounted how the troopers had used tear gas, bull whips and clubs to attack the marchers, who were protesting poll taxes and other methods used to prevent blacks from voting.

"They turned our non-violent protest into blood," Lewis said. "Today, when we walk arm and arm across this bridge, no one will beat us. No one will taunt us and call us names. Today, no one will lose their life for the precious right to vote."

Several weeks after the 1965 attack, Martin Luther King Jr., _ under the protection of a federal court _ led hundreds of people in completing the long march to Montgomery. The march is widely seen as having launched the careers of black leaders like Lewis, now serving his 7th term in Congress. It also paved the way for a new type of white Southern politician who could campaign for civil rights and, in the process, benefit from the new-found freedom of blacks and other minorities to freely vote for them in elections.

Without the changes brought about by the Selma march in 1965, Clinton said, "Atlanta never would have had the Super Bowl or the Olympics, and Jimmy Carter and Bill Clinton would never have been elected president of the United States."

"I, too, am a son of the South, the old segregated South," Clinton said. "Those of you who marched 35 years ago set me free, too, on Bloody Sunday. Free to know you, to work with you, to love you. I thank you all for what you did here."

"I tell you, as long as Americans are willing to hold hands, we can walk with any wind, we can cross any bridge. Deep in my heart I do believe, we shall overcome."

Clinton urged those who benefitted from the Voting Rights Act to exercise the hard-fought right in this year's elections.

"On this day in 1965, the eyes of the nation were on Selma. So it is again today," Lewis said. "I ask you to turn your eyes homeward to the bridges we must cross in every hamlet. . . every town and every city. We are Selma. We have come a mighty long way. Let us summon the strength of those who have walked this bridge before us and move forward toward a new America."

During the original 1965 march, mobs of angry whites insulted Lewis and his fellow protestors. He was among 17 who were hospitalized. But on Sunday, the mostly black crowd of nearly 7,000 cheered proudly.

Nearby, Alabama state troopers _ white and black _ saluted the marchers and they sang "We Shall Overcome."

Some in the crowd held up signs reading: "Don't Dump On Our Civil Rights Trails" and "Human Rights At Home."

Other participants in Sunday's march were former United Nations Ambassador Andrew Young and the Rev. Jesse Jackson, both King aides. Ethel Kennedy, the widow of Bobby Kennedy, also attended, as did 30 members of Congress from both parties.

(The Associated Press contributed to this report).

Ismail Turay Jr. can be reached by e-mail at: ismailt(at)coxnews.com.

ENDIT

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 7, 2000

14 of 23 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 The Dallas Morning News

The Dallas Morning News

March 5, 2000, Sunday THIRD EDITION

SECTION: SUNDAY READER; Pg. 1J; MOVEMENTS

LENGTH: 2166 words

HEADLINE: Reform with a capital 'R';
Although candidates promise it, historians say that it's a misnomer except in the eras of truly sweeping change

SOURCE: Staff Writer of The Dallas Morning News

BYLINE: Ira J. Hadnot

BODY:

It took a revolution in the United States to establish a system of government and a set of ideals that embody change. It took a civil war to reunite a divided country around those ideals. And it took a civil rights movement to remind the nation that social and political change is part of its character.

The country has outgrown the need for violent upheaval. But does America still have the stomach for reform?

From Reconstruction to the "Great Society," history teaches that reform takes unpredictable turns. It is political, social or economic catharsis fed by public dissatisfaction. Reform routs the establishment or restores the status quo, depending upon popular will.

Although there has been a lot of "romanticizing" of the word lately, with Republican presidential candidates George W. Bush and John McCain fighting over the "reform" label, reformers, in the classical sense of the word, are in short supply.

"We haven't seen reform or reformers in a long time," says Dr. Jacqueline Moore, an assistant professor of history at Austin College. "I am no longer idealistic enough to believe the kind of reform that drives true systemic change is going to happen again in this country."

If you really want to rouse historians into a heated debate, pick any period since the 1800s and you are likely to see some academic sparring over the effectiveness of the reform. President Lyndon B. Johnson's Great Society programs have generally been considered by historians as the most recent reform movement in America. But even that period is now seen by some historians as the legislative aftermath to the Civil Rights Movement.

There is consensus that the last reform with a capital "R" was the social turmoil of the 1960s. Since then, there have been attempts at reform. But the American public, experts say, is treated to a lot of policy talk.

Educational reform, welfare reform, health-care reform, Social Security

reform, campaign-finance reform - they may carry the tag but in reality bear little resemblance to radical reform most Americans would recognize.

Dr. Moore and her colleagues say reform conjures up notions of "good guys" trying to right something that has gone wrong. To that extent, the public has romantic notions about reform.

But, these days, the reform practiced in America is very pragmatic and consensus-driven. It is change by policy and administrative initiatives. It's what some experts refer to as "low-risk" reform. And candidates have become very adept at talking about it.

Mr. Bush calls himself "the reformer with results." Mr. McCain calls himself the "real reformer." Democratic candidates Al Gore and Bill Bradley have spoken of reforming health care, campaign finance and Social Security without bickering so publicly about the reform label.

"The candidates seem to be playing to our romantic notions of reformers as good guys," says Dr. Moore. "It is a play for one to try to distinguish himself from the other - to be the good guy. But that is just doing the talk without having to walk the walk. It sounds good to say you are cleaning up something."

Without its more radical elements, can the public recognize reform?

The harder it is for the public to grasp an issue, the easier it is for the candidate to make general claims of reform, historians say.

"Who understands campaign-finance reform? Calling for something like that is safe. It is not going to divide the electorate," Dr. Moore says. "You are not going to risk your support because it's not something everyday people can get their arms around. You won't hear them talking about social reform [controversial issues such as abortion, affirmative action and public prayer.] That isn't something we can gain consensus on."

Paul Schumaker, chair of the political science department at the University of Kansas, says that reform has come to mean administratively solving any

type
of political, social or economic problem.

"We've moved away from that broader context of reform, meaning a chance to bring the system in line with progressive ideals like equal citizenship," he says. The problem, Dr. Schumaker adds, is candidates are calling themselves reformers without "providing a clear sense of what their ideals are or specific changes they are going to make. To say 'I'm going to clean up that mess in Washington' is not reform. That is rhetoric."

Reform is in the details. And so is the political danger.

"The narrower you draw an issue or solution, the more you risk alienating a segment of the public that disagrees with you. It is consensus that drives reform," Dr. Moore says.

Reform eras

Historians generally identify six periods of reform in American history: Reconstruction, Populism, Progressivism, the New Deal, Civil Rights and the Great Society. Reform movements are either driven by the government to address a problem - such as the New Deal - or they are grassroots, such as the Civil Rights Movement, and driven by people demanding change.

For a reform to take hold, Dr. Moore says, the majority of the people have to be for it. There has to be political compromise. Otherwise, no matter what the reform is, it will fail, she says.

"A reformer takes a stand, risking a split with his political party or conventional wisdom out of ideological or moral conviction," says Lori Cox Han, assistant professor of political science at Austin College. "And while this person may come from outside established circles, he will have to win the majority to his side; otherwise there will be no reform."

Not every public-officeholder has the ability to be a reformer, she says. "Without constitutional power, you cannot effect change. In our state, the governor is in a weakened position because that office lacks legislative power," says Dr. Han, who teaches a course on Texas politics. "The lieutenant governor has more power and influence over policy."

"Lately, we've had policy-oriented reform politicians. We have not had a structural reform that has taken over the political process."

There was talk of a "realigning" election in 1994 - the Republican Revolution - when the Republicans swept Congress.

Dr. Han says there would have been the chance for reform then if one political party had captured the White House, Congress and most of the state governments - something that has not happened since Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected in 1932.

"There is reform when you have a majority going with you. A divided government doesn't create reform," Dr. Han says. "Even FDR had problems getting his reform legislation through because a Republican Supreme Court didn't go along with the New Deal. He was later able to appoint justices who did not block his reforms."

Not even the Reform Party has been able to live up to its name. "Ross Perot deserves credit for putting it on the map. But the support the party received in 1992 was the American people saying they were tired of the two-party system and the way the president is elected," Dr. Han says.

"It was a warning to Democrats and Republicans. But it was not a rout of the two-party system.

" The Reform Party was not able to capture the White House and change the electoral process. Their candidate did not get one Electoral College vote. There was no systemic change. And today the party is in disarray."

Not a time for change

Several experts said that the country is in a conservative era and that the tenor of so-called reform discussions is not how to change government but how to decrease its size. They call the period not one of "revolution but devolution" - moving away from big government.

Dr. Moore says Republicans may claim reform if the party is finally successful in its ongoing attempts to dismantle the government created by the

New Deal. The Democrats, Dr. Han says, have identity issues that are distracting their candidates from reform: Are they going to be traditional liberals or Clinton centrists?

It has become the political nature of the country, Dr. Han says, to take a middle-of-the-road approach with reform. There is currently no desire to go too far in either direction. Reform, she says, is stalled by frustration, when the people get tired by the slow pace of change; by distraction, when another issue such as a war arises; and by fractionalization, internal splits created within political parties by reformers.

The country appears more comfortable with rhetoric than reform. "We're more a nation of conformists. Extremists may get media coverage. But our political system is incremental and change is slow. It doesn't allow massive reform," Dr. Han says. "Some people say that is good because massive change is destabilizing."

Every campaign season will just about guarantee some talk of reform, says Dr. Diana Owen, an assistant professor of government and communications at Georgetown University. "It is a historical condition. Candidates either talk about change or about reform. It has become predictable," Dr. Owen says. "We're in a society that deals with single issues. There are no unifying overall issues being discussed. If there are, there has been a failure to communicate."

Dr. Owen and Dr. Jack Dennis of the University of Wisconsin have looked at public satisfaction with government. What they found is puzzling: "On the issue of reform, we found no relationship between people's feelings about reform and the way government is performing," she says. "You'd expect people in favor of reform would be dissatisfied with government. But we did not find that in our research."

It is often hard to get an accurate view of what the public wants through opinion surveys, Dr. Owen explains. "Creating questions to deal with reform can be tricky. To ask people if they are for campaign finance reform is like

asking them if they are against crime. You get an automatic yes. But people begin equivocating when specifics are given."

Stumbling blocks

Several policy analysts recited polls that said the majority of the people are for educational reform, but if it means de-emphasizing "the 3 R's" or blurring the line between church and state, there is going to be a roadblock.

Health-care reform sounds good as a very general concept, but not at the cost of individual control over selecting health-care providers. Changing welfare eligibility requirements sounds great as long as taxpayers aren't asked to support the cost of training programs for people without marketable skills.

"People are for reform if it does not adversely affect them," Dr. Owen says.

"Change cannot always be win-win. Reform can create a backlash. I am afraid we're in an era where the politicians work both sides of the street with their rhetoric, promising everybody a positive outcome."

It is hard for complex issues to win public support without a charismatic figure as the reformer, says Charles Lewis, executive director of the Center for Public Integrity in Washington.

"The trouble with campaign finance reform," he says, "is it hasn't had any leadership to galvanize the people. The symbolic dimensions of why we need it have gotten lost in a lot of arcane details."

Mr. Lewis doesn't believe "the public ever gets too deep in the mechanics of reform itself." But some figures successfully combine charisma and strategy.

He cited the decision of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. to use nonviolence as a protest tactic during the civil rights era. Dr. King did not become mired in legislative details. He knew that "nonviolence would end up being a confrontational situation with authorities. Watching people, marching peacefully, being hosed down with water and bitten by dogs was a more powerful moral pull towards reform," Mr. Lewis says. Skillfully using the media to reach the nation and drawing young white liberals to the cause of fighting

injustice
was Dr. King's reform strategy.

Dr. King, Mr. Lewis observes, got the country morally ready for social reform. But reform relies on laws to institutionalize change. Every major reform movement has been followed by a series of laws and programs enacting the changes sought.

Passage of the various civil rights acts, after the assassinations of President John F. Kennedy and Dr. King, required a leader skilled in the art of political compromise, experts say. President Johnson formed alliances with old political enemies to get civil rights legislation enacted. The measures were the most sweeping reforms in civil rights laws since Reconstruction, when segregation laws and racial codes were dismantled to protect the rights of newly freed slaves. After President Abraham Lincoln's assassination, some of his Reconstruction agenda was diluted and Southern states, for a time, reverted to denying blacks rights.

Some historians assert that it took three reform movements - Reconstruction, Civil Rights and the Great Society - to ensure equality of opportunity for some Americans. That's another characteristic of reforms: They may also need reform.

GRAPHIC: CHART(S): (DMN) Talking Reform PHOTO(S): 1. Gov. George W. Bush.
2.

Sen. John McCain. (3. Archive Photos) POPULISM, 1890- 1904: Democrats in nominating William Jennings Bryan (left) for president in 1896. (4. The Dallas

Morning News) PROGRESSIVISM, 1893-1917: Muckrakers, such as Upton Sinclair in

The Jungle, exposed corruption during an era of monopolies, poor working conditions and city slums. (5. Associated Press) THE GREAT SOCIETY, 1965-1969:

The War on Poverty was the centerpiece of effort by President Lyndon Johnson

(above) to improve the quality of life for people in impoverished areas of the

United States. (6. UPI/Bettmann Newsphotos) CIVIL RIGHTS, 1954-1965: The fire

department in Birmingham, Ala., turns its hoses on demonstrators against segregation. (7. Knight-Ridder/Tribune photo) THE NEW DEAL, 1933-1940: This

program pulled the United States out of the Depression through the passage of

laws and creations of government agencies. (8. RECONSTRUCTION 1865-1877)

After

Abraham Lincoln's death, Andrew Johnson (right) inherited his dispute with Congress over the treatment of the South and was impeached.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 7, 2000

15 of 23 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Stuart News Company

The Stuart News/Port St. Lucie News (Stuart,FL)

March 5, 2000, Sunday

SECTION: TV Pastime; Pg. P2

LENGTH: 627 words

HEADLINE: 'DR. LAURA' UNDER THE GUN

BYLINE: Carol Ness San Francisco Examiner

BODY:

A gay rights foundation has launched a national campaign to get conservative talk-radio personality Laura Schlessinger to tone down her attacks on homosexuals and lesbians.

Advertisements published in several newspapers say Schlessinger's use of such words as "deviant" and "a biological error" is based on outdated, discredited theories and is doing "real harm, to real people."

A public letter also went out appealing to Schlessinger to follow the example set by the Rev. Jerry Falwell, the conservative Christian who renounced statements that might incite hatred of gays.

Acknowledging Schlessinger's right to express her views, the letter said, "We are simply saying this: Young people who are otherwise happy and healthy are being taught to hate themselves simply because they are gay."

The ads and letter, organized by the San Francisco-based Horizons Foundation, the nation's first gay and lesbian foundation, were signed by more than 180 child welfare organizations, health and medical associations, civil

rights and
civil liberties groups, rabbis and other religious leaders, as well as
advocates
for gay rights.

"Our concern is that Dr. Laura is reaching 20 million people a day, day
in,
day out, with the message that gays and lesbians are deviant, that we are
biological errors, that we can and should be cured," said Peter Teague,
the
executive director of Horizons. Schlessinger is known as "Dr. Laura"
among her
audience of 20 million although she does not have a medical degree.

Her radio show, broadcast from Premiere Radio Networks in Los Angeles,
airs
on 500 stations in the United States and Canada and attracts more
listeners than
conservative commentator Rush Limbaugh or shock jock Howard Stern. She
also is
the author of best-selling advice books and a syndicated newspaper
column. She
is scheduled to launch a daytime television talk show later this year.

(On the Treasure Coast, Schlessinger's radio show is heard on WPSL/1590
AM
from 11 a.m. to noon and 3 to 5 p.m. weekdays. In September, her new
one-hour TV
show will be carried at 11 a.m. weekdays by WPTV Channel 5.)

"She issues an invitation to think of gays and lesbians as inferior, as
less
than human. As an adult I can decline that invitation; kids can't,"
Teague said.
"Statistics speak for themselves about the impact those words have. It's
extraordinary."

Schlessinger, 53, alerted to the campaign by calls from reporters,
immediately went on the offensive.

"Unless I have hallucinated, I have never made an anti-gay commentary,"
she
said. "I have made anti-gay-activist-agenda commentaries."

Calling the campaign the "worst kind of intellectual dishonesty," she
said
the coalition was trying to "demonize me in an effort to help their
political
campaign against" the anti-gay-marriage initiative that is to appear on
California's March 7 ballot.

This month, she told the Advocate, a gay news magazine, that her message
about homosexuality had grown sterner since she went on the air in 1996
as a

result of her deepening Orthodox Jewish faith and the "rise of the radical gay and lesbian agenda."

Her warnings against gay parenting and gay marriage and her advocacy of efforts to "cure" gays fit into her sharp moral commentary on life. She rails against unmarried couples living together.

"We are concerned that your show, columns and television appearances are contributing to the fear and hatred of gay and lesbian people," said the public appeal made Thursday.

The letter refers to recent scientific data contradicting Schlessinger's claims that homosexuality is deviant.

The Horizons Foundation also points out that Schlessinger earned a doctorate in physiology, and that she is not a psychologist.

\$130:(B/W) Schlessinger

LOAD-DATE: March 7, 2000

16 of 23 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Stuart News Company

The Stuart News/Port St. Lucie News (Stuart,FL)

March 5, 2000, Sunday

SECTION: A Section; Pg. A21

LENGTH: 942 words

HEADLINE: LEWIS RETURNS TO SELMA TO REMEMBER, HONOR STRUGGLE

BYLINE: Rachel Smolkin Scripps Howard News Service

BODY:

John Lewis, now a Georgia congressman, co-led the "Bloody Sunday" march that spurred the passage of the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

"Some of my colleagues have said that when they go . . . it's like almost going to the holy land. This is where people suffered."

-John Lewis

WASHINGTON - John Lewis remembers the somber quiet of the marchers behind him as he led them to the top of Selma's Edmund Pettus Bridge and found a sea of Alabama state troopers waiting on the other side.

He remembers the sounds as the troopers rushed toward them - the heavy boots, the horses' hooves hitting asphalt, the rebel yells of white onlookers. He felt no pain, just the thud of the blow, as the first trooper swung his club against the left side of Lewis' head, fracturing his skull.

Thirty-five years later, President Clinton today will cross the same bridge, becoming the first sitting president to participate in the annual re-enactment of the "Bloody Sunday" voting rights march. The cracks of billy clubs and cries of marchers have been replaced by sounds of celebration in testament to progress in the civil-rights struggle.

The shocking images from Selma, captured on national television, spurred the passage of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, outlawing literacy tests, poll taxes and other forms of intimidation aimed at preventing blacks from registering to vote.

"Selma is one of those defining moments in American history - the battle of Selma, of Bloody Sunday," Lewis said in an interview. "People gave a little blood there for the right to vote."

A sharecropper's son born in rural Alabama, Lewis has served as Atlanta's Democratic congressman since 1987. At 60, he is short and sturdy with a deep voice and earnest manner. He sits at a round table in the middle of his congressional office, getting up every now and then to point out a face in the many photographs that surround him.

"It is hard for me to believe really, that 35 years later the president of the United States is coming to Selma," Lewis said. "It will be so meaningful. It will give people hope for the president of the United States to come there, to be there, to walk across that bridge."

Lewis' wall is a tribute to the civil-rights movement and to his own philosophy of inclusion. It is entirely covered with awards from segments of society that have struggled against discrimination, from the Georgia Women's Political Caucus to the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force.

Pointing to an arrest record from Nashville, Tenn., Lewis says he thinks he was charged with breach of peace that time but can't remember for sure - he was arrested 40 times trying to integrate the lunch counters and movie theaters of Nashville, working to secure voting rights for blacks in Mississippi and Alabama.

He expected to be arrested again that day in Selma. He wore a suit and tie, a light tan raincoat and dress shoes. He carried a toothbrush in his backpack in preparation for his time in jail. Instead of a jail cell, he faced the tear gas and clubs of troopers and sheriff's men, a confrontation he describes vividly in his memoir *Walking With the Wind*.

Lewis says the people of Selma have changed since the attack on March 7, 1965.

"I think the non-violent movement in the long run had a cleansing effect on the very psyche of black and white southerners," Lewis said. "So today I think we're different people, we're better people."

Selma's mayor, Joe Smitherman, is the same man who presided over the city then. In those days, he accused Lewis of being "a dangerous person, a troublemaker, an agitator."

Since then, Smitherman has told Lewis he was "on the wrong side," and Lewis says the two have become friends. Smitherman gave Lewis a key to the city and made him honorary mayor of Selma - "I don't know why anyone would want to be an honorary mayor of Selma," joked Lewis. But the certificate hangs on his office wall.

In 1965, only 2 percent of voting-age blacks were registered to vote. Today in Dallas County, where Selma sits, about 60 percent are registered. The city has a majority-black city council, a black chief of police and black fire

chief.

Lewis has returned to Selma for every anniversary of Bloody Sunday. As he has done for the past two years, he will bring a congressional delegation with him today.

"It's always very uplifting, very inspiring, really, to go back," he said.

"It's like being renewed. It's like going back almost to a holy place. ... Some of my colleagues have said that when they go and visit Selma, or Birmingham, or visit Montgomery, it's like almost going to the holy land. Because you know this was struggle. This is where people suffered, this is where people displayed a sense of faith and hope in the democratic process."

The mindset of the marchers has changed.

In 1965, the 600 marchers walked with almost military discipline as they set out on a route that was to take them to Montgomery, staying in line and walking by twos in silence. There was no singing, no talking until they reached the top of the bridge and saw the troopers.

That's when Hosea Williams, who was co-leading the march, turned to Lewis and asked whether he could swim.

Lewis says the march now has more of a festival attitude. But when marchers reach the point where they faced down the troopers, the mood shifts. People become serious, respectful, knowing something important took place on that bridge.

Today, President Clinton will experience that feeling with them.

"I really believe that when we get down on Sunday, 35 years later, there will be a great sense of joy," Lewis said.

\$130:(color) AP PHOTO

LOAD-DATE: March 7, 2000

THE SATURDAY OKLAHOMAN

March 04, 2000, Saturday CITY EDITION

SECTION: EDITORIAL; YOUR VIEWS

LENGTH: 1243 words

HEADLINE: Deming's remarks right on target

BODY:

TO THE EDITOR:

OU professor David Deming equated in a letter the similar propensity of having a firearm with a certain female anatomical part. In his letter he stated that simply having the item doesn't impart a criminal or vile intent upon the owner. This point was apparently overlooked by the owner of the aforementioned female anatomical part. Deming's point is not new. In a televised interview with a military base commander a while back, a female reporter showed concern that the base was going to take some Boy Scouts to the rifle range and do some shooting along with other related activities such as gun safety, etc. She insinuated that this activity would make the boys more likely to misuse firearms or use them for purposes not intended by the activity. The base commander essentially brought out the same argument that Deming mentioned, whereupon the interview came to an immediate conclusion. Deming's letter is perfectly legitimate and should be viewed in the context of the idea he was trying to put forth.

Robert Sims, Harrah

Good illustration

TO THE EDITOR:

My hat's off to professor Deming. Gun owners are tired of being blamed for the acts of criminals. Deming's comparison of a vagina to a handgun illustrates the frustration that so many law-abiding citizens feel in the wake of continued attacks on Second Amendment rights.

Kevin Shutt, Midwest City

Reputation tarnished

TO THE EDITOR:

The United Ministry Center and Advocates for Sexual Assault Awareness deserve the support of all students and OU alumni for their sexual harassment complaint against geology professor David Deming. OU should not have allowed the situation to escalate to a professor openly advocating women-hating, as Deming did in writing that Julie Ketter's "possession of an unregistered vagina also

equips her to work as a prostitute and spread venereal disease." It disparages a university's reputation to allow a professor to publicly harass women and attack grieving students.

Lucia Perri, Guthrie

Breath of fresh air
TO THE EDITOR:

David Deming is a breath of fresh air and please don't let the politically correct nonsense step on civil rights. We need your help back east and all you have to do is stand up for the Constitution.

Hank Klein, Baltimore, Md.

Guns protect people
TO THE EDITOR:

The OU professor stirred up a hornets' nest getting the attention of the gun prohibitionists when he pointed out that the use one makes of anything determines whether that thing is dangerous. Guns protect people from criminals and from the greatest criminal of all, a dictator. After one is disarmed, the dictator can take all of one's civil rights - invalidating the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Liquor prohibition brought us organized crime, and gun prohibitionists need to examine the unintended consequences of their political agenda.

Thelma Gahan, City

Not harassment
TO THE EDITOR:

I am in support of David Deming and the university on the matter of the sexual harassment charge levied against him. For years we on the pro-firearms side have had to put up with remarks about how our firearms assuage our inadequacies in our manhood. Now one guy makes one remark about one woman's anatomy and everyone is ready to go to federal court? How this can possibly qualify as harassment is beyond me. Harassment implies an ongoing and pervasive event. There would seem to be no evidence that Deming has expressed any sexual interest in this woman. There is no "hostile workplace" in evidence. This woman has chosen to use her sexuality against a man who deigned to bring up that she even had one and, at the same time as she wields same as a truncheon, proclaims her victimization. What a crock. We surely have gone mad.

Jim Peel, Attleboro, Mass.

Freedom has died
TO THE EDITOR:

I was not surprised to hear that University of Oklahoma

professor David Deming is the latest victim of politically correct speech and thought. We have truly entered the age of "1984" when those on one side of an issue are welcomed and encouraged to speak out and others are sued under such pretext as "sexual harassment." God help us all. Freedom finally has died in America.

John B. Hubbard, Bangor, Maine

She can't take it
TO THE EDITOR:

I can't believe that David Deming is being accused of sexual harassment just for his comments comparing a gun to a vagina! First of all, why is it OK for someone to attack the morality of gun owners in general as did Joni Kletter? Making broad statements condemning the morality of legitimate gun owners because of the actions of a few is like saying all women are prostitutes because you see one walking on the street at night. Kletter ignores FBI statistics showing that firearms (particularly handguns) save many more lives every year than they take. Maybe she ought to research how many women's lives are saved every year through the use of a firearm. This is not a case of sexual harassment! It's a case of a woman who, when confronted with a reasonable rebuttal, lashed out irrationally with a cheap attack instead of re-examining the issue. Like Deming, I resent her attacks on me and other law-abiding gun owners. He was exercising his freedom of speech just as Kletter was doing. In this case, Kletter couldn't take the truth!

Michael Sorgenfrei, Sugar Land, Texas

Low standards?
TO THE EDITOR:

Please tell us that no one in the administration at the University of Oklahoma is taking seriously the charge that David Deming's recent letter to the campus newspaper is a form of "sexual harassment." If there's anything to be learned from this embarrassing incident - in which a number of college students appear to have missed the point of a clear and obvious analogy (i.e., possessing an item doesn't mean that you'll make use of it) - it is that the university should perhaps consider implementing more rigorous standards for admission.

Ian Underwood, Rutledge, Pa.

Refusing victimhood
TO THE EDITOR:

So, professor Deming has made a political comparison between guns and vaginas. For years, I've heard ignorant fools compare my gun to a phallic symbol. I've been called a coward for wanting a gun (and me a combat vet. How many of my detractors have ever served, or is that beneath them?). Then, the same people who call me an irrational coward express a fear that I'll go on a shooting

spree. How paranoid is that? I've been told I make people ashamed to be an American because I refuse to be a victim and take my duty to protect myself and my family seriously. So now they wish to control speech. Comparing a gun to a penis is acceptable apparently. Comparing one to a vagina is degrading. Are only anti-self defense, anti-immigrant, anti-veteran, anti-male liberal bigots allowed free speech in this country?

Michael Z. Williamson, Indianapolis, Ind.

Letters to "Your Views" do not necessarily reflect the editorial policies or beliefs of The Oklahoman. Letters must carry the author's signature and address. All letters are subject to editing; every effort is made to preserve a letter's essential meaning. Send letters to "Your Views," The Oklahoman, P.O. Box 25125, Oklahoma City, OK 73125. Fax: (405) 475-3971. Or, e-mail: yourviews@oklahoman.com.

GRAPHIC: "I suppose a lot of people were offended, but I was offended to begin with." - David Deming, University of Oklahoma

LOAD-DATE: March 7, 2000

18 of 23 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 LRP Publications

AIDS Policy and Law

March 3, 2000

SECTION: Vol. 15, No. 4

LENGTH: 84 words

HEADLINE: Other bills before Congress Exclude immigrants

BODY:

H.R. 3170 would amend several civil rights statutes, including the Americans with Disabilities Act, to exclude from coverage individuals who are employed, but unlawfully present, in the United States.

"These are illegal immigrants," said the sponsor, Rep. Mark Foley, R-Fla.,

"Illegal immigrants take jobs away from American workers, hurt the U.S. work force and damage the national economy."

Foley's bill, which has three co-sponsors, is now before the House Education

and Workforce Committee.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 7, 2000

19 of 23 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 LRP Publications

Federal Human Resources Week

March 1, 2000

SECTION: Vol. 6, No. 42

LENGTH: 231 words

HEADLINE: SHRM's argument

BODY:

In a brief that supports the company's position, SHRM urges the high court to drop its "pretext" rule altogether and allow judges instead to look at the case as a whole to determine whether it merits a trial.

"Just because an employee has drawn into question an employer's motives is no reason to send the case in front of a jury," said Petesh, who prepared SHRM's brief.

The HR organization argues that judges should review a case in its entirety and determine if there is "significantly probative evidence" of discriminatory intent. Claims that offer "mere speculation or conjecture" should be thrown out, says SHRM, which represents more than 130,000 HR professionals in the United States and abroad.

Several civil rights groups, including the NAACP, the American Civil Liberties Union and the National Partnership for Women & Families, filed a joint brief to back the Reeves position.

They urge "that the evidentiary bar be set no higher than ordinary victims can reasonably be expected to reach."

In addition, they argue that a jury finding has greater weight than

that of a
judge, and it should be overturned only in "rare cases, for compelling
reasons
not involving re-weighing of evidence or a presumption as to the
credibility of
any witness."

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the U.S. government
have also
filed a brief in support of Reeves.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 7, 2000

20 of 23 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 LRP Publications

Federal Human Resources Week

March 1, 2000

SECTION: Vol. 6, No. 42

LENGTH: 223 words

HEADLINE: Employee reinstated through grievance was not similarly situated

BODY:

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission affirmed the agency's final
decision after finding that an employee reinstated pursuant to the
settlement of
a grievance was not similarly situated to the complainant, even though
they were
both terminated after engaging in similar misconduct. Sunshine M. Nelson
v.
Henderson, Postmaster General, U.S. Postal Service, 100 FEOR 3130 (EEOC
02/03/00).

Sunshine M. Nelson, a casual employee with the U.S. Postal Service,
claimed
she was subjected to a sex-based hostile work environment and then
terminated in
retaliation for her complaint.

An EEOC administrative judge determined that the agency's failure to
reinstate Nelson was discriminatory in light of the fact that another
employee
who was terminated after engaging in sexual and inappropriate behavior
similar
to Nelson's was reinstated.

However, the EEOC affirmed the agency's final decision finding no discrimination, disagreeing with the AJ's conclusion that Nelson and the other employee were similarly situated.

It noted that the other employee was reinstated and his removal was converted to a long-term disciplinary suspension pursuant to the settlement of his grievance.

Thus, he was not similarly situated to the complainant and the Postal Service provided a legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for its actions.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 7, 2000

21 of 23 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 South Bend Tribune Corporation

SOUTH BEND TRIBUNE

February 29, 2000, Tuesday INDIANA, MICHIGAN, MISHAWAKA,
PHM, TRIBUNE

SECTION: OPINION, Pg. a7

LENGTH: 435 words

HEADLINE: Columnist conveniently skips Christianity's contributions
MICHIANA POINT OF VIEW

BYLINE: TOM UEBBING;

BODY:

I hope The Tribune's editors were simply inattentive to let syndicated columnist Robert Reno's virulently anti-Christian piece be published. It reeks of anti-religious bigotry. To address Reno's attacks, I'll have to divine (if he can tolerate the term) his basic assumptions and then make some observations.

He assumes religion has no role in American politics because of a false concept of the separation of church and state. He fails to recognize that religion and politics must always intersect at the crossroads of the big questions: What is man and his nature; what is the purpose of human life? Religious beliefs, or the lack of them, direct the political system that evolves from answers to these questions.

These answers do not take the form of sectarian religious dogmas about God,

but a philosophical world view concerning human existence. This is what the Founding Fathers embodied in the Constitution.

To apply Reno's approach logically, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and his Christian minister associates had no right to impose their Baptist belief that all men are created equal on the rest of the country through the civil rights legislation they pushed for. Reno tries to lead us down the road of the differences in Christian theologies to make the role of religion in politics look ludicrous. Religion's role in politics is not about sectarian dogmas concerning God, but about a philosophy of humanity's nature and life together.

Reno assumes that conflicts in Christianity were purely theological. In fact these differences often had political, ethnic, linguistic and cultural dimensions. Christianity has split up largely along ethnic and cultural lines. You can't blame everything on theology.

Reno's historical sketch of Christianity's divisions stops short of reporting the major gains in fraternal and theological reconciliation resulting from the modern ecumenical movement. While he condemns Christianity for its divisions he does not indict American democracy for all its political parties which are constantly at odds with one another and which even led to civil war.

He blames Christianity for certain wars. The facts are that Christianity will have a hard time catching up with the massive carnage and destruction of human rights caused by godless ideologies under Hitler, Lenin, Stalin, Pol Pot and Mao Tse-tung.

Whatever the failings of Christianity, a fair and open-minded review of history will acknowledge the magnificent contributions to civilization and in particular to the United States, made by the Christian faith.

Tom Uebbing lives in South Bend

LOAD-DATE: March 7, 2000

22 of 23 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Information Access Company,
a Thomson Corporation Company;
ASAP

Copyright 2000 Liberation Publications, Inc.

The Advocate (The national gay & lesbian newsmagazine)

February 29, 2000

SECTION: Pg. 8 ; ISSN: 0001-8996

IAC-ACC-NO: 59587017

LENGTH: 190 words

HEADLINE: THE ADVOCATE POLL; Brief Article

BODY:

From the February 1 issue:

Do you think the current political debate on "don't ask, don't tell" will lead to the policy's being overturned?

Yes 50%

No 50%

Reader comments from www.advocate.com

* "The current political debate is significant as an indicator of how much certain political candidates are willing to pander to gay voters, They don't really have a sincere commitment to our civil rights, and I doubt they'll do much to advance the cause in the future, no matter who is elected."

* "The debate has actually made people think about it rather than just have a knee-jerk reaction, and thinking seems to have led to logical conclusions for most of them."

* "Too many of the ranking officers are opposed to lifting the ban, and their positions of power give them a disproportionate voice in the national debate on this issue."

* "The current policy is so obviously flawed that anyone with a brain (which eliminates the Pentagon morons) will have to change it."

* "The policy is unworkable for both the military hierarchy and military personnel. Unfortunately, I think it will change for the worse."

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

IAC-CREATE-DATE: March 6, 2000

LOAD-DATE: March 07, 2000

23 of 23 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Information Access Company,
a Thomson Corporation Company;
ASAP
Copyright 2000 Liberation Publications, Inc.

The Advocate (The national gay & lesbian newsmagazine)

February 15, 2000

SECTION: Pg. 72 ; ISSN: 0001-8996

IAC-ACC-NO: 59410475

LENGTH: 682 words

HEADLINE: The youngest revolutionaries; need for militant youth movement;
Brief
Article

BYLINE: Kuehl, Sheila

BODY:

Along with nearly everyone else, I watched an endless series of wrap-ups of the 20th century at the dawn of the 21st. Like my family and friends, gathered around the glowing TV campfire, I was struck by the repeated emphasis on our various American civil rights movements and how they, among only a few other themes, seemed to define the 20th century for us. We are proud of them now, but that hasn't always been the case. Indeed, for much of the history of any movement, most of the population is either unaware or opposed, tossing bricks--verbal and physical--at the "strident" few who haltingly, and then courageously, articulate the problems, the inequalities, and the hoped-for solutions.

When I gather with friends at the dawn of the next decade, or perhaps the 2020s--when the great historical summary is written about the early days of the 21st century--I hope the report includes the story of the militant youth movement.

Young people are in many ways just like the members of other social groups, whether they be labor, women, people of color, or gays and lesbians. The liberation of these groups and the demands made by their members were unthinkable, laughable, and impossible at first.

Like many others who sought social change before them, youth are most often represented negatively: Boys are gang members. Girls are pregnant. They are a problem. Queer youth are unable to choose their sexuality for themselves. They are vulnerable to predatory adults. Children are unable to distinguish fantasy from reality. (Remember when this was the doctrine about women?) And they need protection. (Although it's usually because they are beaten, tortured, and murdered--often by the hands of the adults charged with their protection--more often than any other age group). Nevertheless, it seems strange to most of us to think of them as forming a movement to fight for their own rights.

I thought about all this a few weeks ago at a conference--organized by the Los Angeles Unified School District and a number of young activists--that brought together students from disparate schools to make sure that a new law I recently wrote would actually be implemented by schools. The law protects students in California public schools from discrimination and harassment based on actual or perceived sexual orientation as well as discrimination based on the actions of someone who harasses them because the perpetrator thinks the way they look or act is inappropriate for their gender.

But the law is just words. It requires vigilance for implementation and enforcement. These students know how often the actions of ill-intentioned students occur outside the presence of teachers or administrators and how, even more often, teachers and administrators turn their backs or even join in and ratify discriminatory behavior.

Now, with the law as a tool, these young people plan to educate and push their principals, teachers, and fellow students; to identify places to report unlawful behavior; and to meet and share strategies. They were, in a word now obsolete, awesome. They were tight (or, as we used to say, "cool"). And they

were organized, smart, and exhibiting all the tools available to the
disempowered.

I was there to make sure they understood the law and to tell them how
proud
I was. In addition, I wanted them to know that nothing wonderful would
come of
this law without them. It's work making a difference when you have no
power--heartbreaking, backbreaking, soul-wracking, dangerous work. And
they're
doggedly prepared to do it.

Well, we have to be there too, even though this is going to cause us
sleepless nights, in the same way that we have kept America awake with
those
issues of our GLBT movement. But at least we are awake. Like those white
marchers behind the ranks of African-Americans, like the men who tried to
carve
out a place for women to succeed, like the straight folks who have spoken
out
for us and never wavered, I want to be there for these student activists.
And I
want you to be there too. Hey, it's the 21st century. C'mon in.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

IAC-CREATE-DATE: March 6, 2000

LOAD-DATE: March 07, 2000

***** Email Completed *****

Time of Delivery: March 7, 2000 11:22 am EST

Email Number: 711:0:7130150

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "LEXIS ("LEXIS /NEXIS Print Delivery" <lexis-nexis@prod.lexis-nexis.com> (R) (R) [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-MAR-2000 11:34:17.00

SUBJECT: civil rights

TO: Irene Bueno (CN=Irene Bueno/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
LEXIS-NEXIS Universe Update Report: March 09, 2000 at 11:22

Results from this Update: 16

Next Update: March 09, 2000 at 16:00

Access your results at:
http://web.lexis-nexis.com/in.universe/pnews/emailAlert?_pnewsAlert=0x000101a9-0x00004b26%2f0x000101a9%2f20000309%2f11%3a22%3a27

1 of 16 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 The Atlanta Constitution

The Atlanta Journal and Constitution

March 9, 2000, Thursday, Home Edition

SECTION: CityLife Atlanta (Extra); Pg. 5JD

LENGTH: 726 words

HEADLINE: Civil rights activism 'alive and well' among students

BYLINE: Ernie Suggs, Staff

SOURCE: AJC

BODY:
Alisha Thomas had just walked off the steps of the Georgia Capitol, where she had stirred up a group of about 50 college students, when someone asked her how far she was willing to go for a cause.

"They asked me if I am willing to die for what I believe in and I said, yes,

" said Thomas, a 21-year-old senior at Spelman College. "Medgar Evers died for his beliefs. Martin Luther King died for his beliefs. Why shouldn't we be willing to sacrifice for what we believe in?"

College students, particularly African-Americans, definitely have had opportunities to take a stand over the last few months. In Georgia, there have been challenges to affirmative action programs that could affect hiring, education and financial aid; a brewing battle over whether the state flag should bear symbols of the Confederacy; John Rucker's comments; and the shooting of Amadou Diallo in New York.

"At this moment, activism seems to be alive and well," said Tobe Johnson, chairman of the Morehouse College Department of Criminal Justice. "There are things that are stimulating them."

Khalid Salaam, a reporter for the Clark Atlanta University newspaper, The Panther, said some students have begun speaking out on issues that relate to the general student population. Salaam said when issues arise, students use several outlets for expressing views --- including marches, rallies and student-controlled media. "I think we can, as students, do anything we want to do," said Salaam, 24. "We can actually have opinions that can make a difference. Why not here and now?"

But while students have been making noise recently, Thomas still senses apathy.

Thomas, a Miami native, is president of Georgia's youth and college divisions of the NAACP and the Spelman chapter of the NAACP. She said that while there are more than 500 paid members of the NAACP at Spelman, only about 15 attend meetings.

"I thought there was something wrong with what we were doing, but I think we are dealing with a lot of apathy. On the other hand, I choose not to be fooled by apathy," Thomas said. "When you look at the civil rights movement, I find it hard to believe that everyone was involved. Just like then, there are only a few people who are not afraid. I am one and not everybody can be in the 'Talented

Tenth."

Johnson, who has taught at Morehouse since 1958, said it is hard to determine when or if a movement will happen. And when one does, it usually starts small and slow.

"The civil rights movement didn't start out big," Johnson said. "When a social movement gets under way, there is no way to predict what is going to happen."

One of the main issues stirring students now appears to be the state flag. The NAACP has called for a boycott of South Carolina because the Confederate flag flies above the Statehouse.

In 1956, Georgia lawmakers changed the state flag to include symbols of the Confederacy. According to newspaper accounts at that time, as well as local historians, the move was made in response to efforts to integrate public schools.

Supporters of the Confederate flag say the flag was changed as a salute to the Confederate war dead.

"I think it needs to come down," said Stephanie Harrison, a sophomore at Georgia State University. "We are one nation now and we only need one flag. That flag represents a separate way of life, and separatism is not what (a flag) is supposed to stand for."

It would take legislative action to change the flag, and Gov. Roy Barnes said the flag isn't an issue at this time.

"I think the whole thing with the flag is outrageous," said Salaam, originally from Philadelphia. "Here in Georgia, our governor is saying it isn't an issue, but he is saying that because he doesn't feel the resentment that black people do."

Thomas had just left an anti-John Rucker rally on her way to a campaign speech by Vice President Al Gore, who is seeking the Democratic presidential nomination. She said it is going to be up to students to be more vigilant in demanding social change.

"Every person is born into the world to do something unique and something distinctive, and if he or she does not do it, it will never be done," said Thomas, quoting Benjamin Mays, the former president of Morehouse College and the first black president of Atlanta's school board. "It is my purpose in life to make a difference."

GRAPHIC: Photo

Taking a stand: Nicole Chisholm, a sophomore at Georgia State University, listens to a speaker while holding her sign during a recent student rally for affirmative action. / ERIK S. LESSER / Associated Press

LOAD-DATE: March 9, 2000

2 of 16 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 The Atlanta Constitution

The Atlanta Journal and Constitution

March 9, 2000, Thursday, Home Edition

SECTION: Local News; Pg. 3B

LENGTH: 377 words

HEADLINE: Savannah teacher's suit appealed to Supreme Court

BYLINE: Bill Osinski, Staff

SOURCE: CONSTITUTION

BODY:

The case of Sherry Hearn, the honored Savannah public school teacher who was fired in 1996 for refusing to take a drug test after police said they found a piece of a marijuana cigarette in her car, has been submitted to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Attorneys for the Rutherford Institute, a Charlottesville, Va.-based civil rights foundation, filed a petition this week asking the high court to review her suit against the Chatham County Board of Education. The suit had been dismissed by federal courts at the district and appellate levels.

Rutherford Institute lawyer John Whitehead called the case a highly important one because Hearn was a teacher of the U.S. Constitution who objected to

the
mandated drug test on constitutional grounds. In addition, the marijuana
was
found during a schoolwide "lockdown" search for illegal drugs, a practice
Hearn
repeatedly had criticized as being unconstitutional.

"Here's someone who really stood up for what they believe in,"
Whitehead said
of Hearn.

Termination was the cost of that stand for Hearn, who had taught in
Chatham
County schools for 27 years and was named that school system's Teacher of
the
Year in 1994.

Whitehead said Hearn's punishment raises a legal question that the
nation's
highest court should decide --- whether people's constitutional rights
are being
lost in the process of trying to operate drug-free schools, he said. "
Have we
gone too far?" he asked.

In a 2-1 vote in October, the 11th Circuit federal appellate court
dismissed
Hearn's suit. Writing the majority opinion, Senior Circuit Judge James C.
Hill
said Hearn's constitutional rights were not violated. He added that
Hearn's
contract with the school board, which states that employees must give
their
permission before their property is searched, did not override the
authority of
police to search the car.

However, Whitehead said he was encouraged by the strong wording of the
dissenting member of the appellate panel, District Judge Wilkie D.
Ferguson. He
wrote that the school board's firing of Hearn could have "chilling
ramifications."

"Expectations of privacy guaranteed by the (school board's) policy were
ignored and the penalty imposed was the professional equivalent of the
death
penalty," Ferguson wrote.

GRAPHIC: Photo
Sherry Hearn

LOAD-DATE: March 9, 2000

Copyright 2000 Times Mirror Company

Los Angeles Times

March 9, 2000, Thursday, Home Edition

SECTION: Part A; Page 5; National Desk

LENGTH: 802 words

HEADLINE: NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE;

CULTURE;

ACTIVISTS SEEK TO BRING ERA BACK TO LIFE;

THERE'S RENEWED INTEREST TO RESURRECT THE AMENDMENT, BUT MISSOURI BACKERS
AREN'T SURE WHAT IT WOULD DO.

BYLINE: STEPHANIE SIMON, TIMES STAFF WRITER

DATELINE: JEFFERSON CITY, Mo.

BODY:

Time warp?

Listen in on the rhetoric buzzing through Missouri's capital these
days, and
you might begin to think so.

Here's a state senator earnestly proclaiming that we must add the Equal
Rights Amendment to the U.S. Constitution "if this country is to be great
and
stand tall."

There's Phyllis Schlafly, the ERA's arch-foe, warning that the amendment
would legalize same-sex marriages and promote "abortion on demand."

Here's praise for righteous symbolism. There's scorn of constitutional
clutter. Coed bathrooms. Women in combat. Wasn't this all settled two
decades
ago?

Well, yes.

But then again, maybe not.

Most activists--most everyone, really--thought the ERA died in 1983. It had been ratified by 35 states but needed 38 to make it into the Constitution. The original ratification deadline had come and gone. So had a three-year extension. And Congress was not inclined to give ERA backers any more time. Even the Supreme Court pronounced the amendment dead.

Now, a few stubborn dreamers are attempting to revive it.

They consider the original 35 ratifications still valid. By that logic, all the ERA needs to win a spot in the Constitution is approval from three more states. Focusing on Missouri--but targeting Illinois and Virginia as well--ERA activists are pushing hard to get those three additional ratifications.

They take courage from precedent: In 1992, Congress revived an amendment that had languished for more than 200 years by ordering that the ratification tally pick up where it had stalled back in George Washington's day. In other words, Congress decided that states' 18th century votes still counted. New states then jumped to ratify. And the amendment--which requires a roll-call vote before Congress can grant itself a pay raise--is now part of the Constitution.

That episode gave ERA activists hope.

After all, they reasoned, if an amendment can be resurrected after two centuries, why not after two decades?

"It takes a long time to win the big ones, and this is a big one," said Roberta Francis, who leads a national effort to ratify the ERA. She then quoted women's suffrage champion Susan B. Anthony: "Failure is not an option."

It is, however, a distinct possibility.

For the three-state strategy has several potential flaws.

For one, Congress set a time limit--long since expired--on ERA ratification. (The pay raise amendment had no such deadline.) Congress could, presumably, pass new legislation reopening the ERA for debate. But then it might be hard to make the case that the original 35 ratifications should count.

Another hitch: Five states that ratified the ERA in the '70s later

passed
resolutions taking it back. ERA boosters insist it's illegal for a state
to
cancel its ratification. But that position, again, would be open to legal
challenge.

Then there's the issue of public support.

In the 1970s, the ERA stirred strong passions. However, it has since
dropped
out of view.

Kelly Anthony, a Missouri college senior trying to rev up student
support for
the ERA, acknowledges that "even some of my feminist friends don't know
what it
is." And while Francis says she's sure most Americans are behind her, she
couches her conviction this way: "They absolutely would care--as soon as
they
knew about it."

One group in the know is the Missouri Legislature, where ERA sponsors
in both
the House and the Senate are confident they can bring ratification to a
vote
this spring. The ERA has some powerful backers in both chambers. But it
also has
detractors who see the whole debate as a dispiriting waste of time.

"Maybe I'm from a different generation, but I feel that women have all
the
opportunities in the world," said state Rep. Vicky Hartzler, 39, a
Republican.
"Instead of sending women the message that we need to support the ERA
because
we're still victims, we should be telling them that the past is behind
us, we
have a bright future and it's time to move forward with confidence."

ERA advocates counter that women can't stride ahead with confidence
until
their rights are guaranteed.

Sure, there are federal laws granting women equal access to education or
equal pay for equal work. But those are laws, not constitutional
guarantees. A
future Congress could repeal them. Or gut the funding that supports them.

"Only by including women's equality in the Constitution can we grind it
into
the bedrock of our national policy," said Missouri House Speaker Steve
Gaw, a
Democrat.

Beyond that symbolism, however, even the ERA's most ardent backers find it tough to articulate just what the amendment would accomplish.

"It isn't concrete, not something you can see will immediately help me in my lifetime," said Mary Mosley, who heads Missouri's ERA lobby. "It's more the principle of the thing."

GRAPHIC: PHOTO: Shirley Breeze, left, and Mary Mosley are backers of the ERA.

PHOTOGRAPHER: MARY BUTKUS / For the Times

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: March 9, 2000

4 of 16 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Inc.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch

March 9, 2000, Thursday, FIVE STAR LIFT EDITION

SECTION: METRO, Pg. B1

LENGTH: 584 words

HEADLINE: RALLIES NEAR ADAM'S MARK WILL PROTEST RACIAL INJUSTICE ACROSS THE U.S.;
EVENTS ARE IN RESPONSE TO DISCRIMINATION LAWSUIT AGAINST THE HOTEL CHAIN

BYLINE: Lorraine Kee; Of The Post-Dispatch

BODY:

The National Park Service has issued a "First Amendment rights" permit to local organizers for rallies against racial injustice to be staged across from the embattled Adam's Mark Hotel.

The first rally is set for noon March 31 at Luther Ely Smith Square, the park between the south side of the downtown hotel and Market Street. A march is being organized for 7 p.m. on the same day from the square to Christ Church Cathedral at 1210 Locust Street.

"We'll be walking away from the Adam's Mark," said Leslie Brown, an

event
organizer.

Also, a "speak out" against racial injustice is set for noon April 1 at either the square or an alternate location downtown. The park service permit was issued Tuesday.

The rallies were sparked by a U.S. Department of Justice lawsuit filed in December against the 21-hotel Adam's Mark chain. The suit alleges discrimination in the treatment of African-American guests in Florida.

The Adam's Mark has denied any wrongdoing and offered the Justice Department a settlement that proposes an independent employment audit and diversity training for its employees. The Justice Department has not commented on the settlement offer.

Brown said the rallies will focus on racism generally but that Creve Coeur-based HBE Corp., which owns the Adam's Mark, will be on the minds of those in attendance. Brown is a professor of African-American history at Washington University and a member of the Organization of American Historians.

The historians organization, based in Bloomington, Ind., is sponsoring the march. Its president will speak at the cathedral. Both events coincide with the annual national meeting of the historians group, which will be here March 30 through April 2.

Among the groups involved in the events are the St. Louis chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Urban League of Metropolitan St. Louis and the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now.

Two new groups have sprung up around the controversy: the St. Louis Historians Against Racism and the Committee for a New Conference Site.

Urban League President James Buford, who has called for area residents and businesses to stop using the hotel until a settlement is reached in the suit, will speak. Longtime civil rights activists Percy Green and Norman Seay also are involved in the planning.

"It's a continuation of the battles and struggles we have had all

along,"
Seay said. "But it's not just the Adam's Mark."

Cases involving discrimination and the rollback of affirmative action nationwide make headlines daily, Seay said.

"All of these are signals that indicate that somebody needs to stand up and be counted," he said.

Among groups that have withdrawn events from the hotel here or in Denver since the suit was filed are the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the Episcopal Church in America, the Washington-based Human Rights Campaign, the central region of Alpha Kappa Alpha, the Gateway Classic Foundation, the historians organization and the Missouri Black Expo.

After the Justice Department sued, the National Park Service quietly moved its general conference in September from the Adam's Mark to the Regal Riverfront. About 1,100 people are expected at the event, including 500 park service employees.

The move wasn't meant as a political statement, said David Barna, a spokesman for the U.S. Department of the Interior. Organizers were concerned the event might be disrupted by demonstrations.

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: March 9, 2000

5 of 16 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 The Times-Picayune Publishing Co.

The Times-Picayune

March 9, 2000 Thursday, ORLEANS

SECTION: NATIONAL; Pg. A12

LENGTH: 555 words

HEADLINE: CITY AT ODDS OVER CONFEDERATE HERO;
HOMAGE TO ROBERT E. LEE IS BEING CHALLENGED

BYLINE: By Chris Burritt Cox News Service

DATeline: RICHMOND, VA.

BODY:

Driving along Monument Avenue, past the massive stone statues of Robert E. Lee and other Confederate warriors, Charles Chambliss said in disgust, "Somehow the Confederacy made the losers look honorable."

Next week, more than 500 patrons of the Museum of the Confederacy will, in fact, gather to salute Lee. They'll attend the museum's Grand Southern Ball, a fund-raiser selling, among other memorabilia, baseball caps inscribed with Lee's signature for \$15 each.

Though dead since 1870, five years after his surrender at Appomattox, Va., ended the Civil War, the Confederate general-in-chief is at the center of controversy. In recent weeks, a downtown mural of Lee has been torched and his reputation defended in a dispute over how history should be marked here in the capital of the Old Confederacy.

It's a fight that heritage groups say embodies a resolve by civil rights leaders to rid the South of Confederate symbols -- including the Rebel banner flying atop the South Carolina Statehouse and embodied in the state flags of Georgia and Mississippi.

But here in Richmond, a bastion of Confederate relics and remembrances, a growing chorus, including Mayor Timothy Kaine, says it's time for the majority black city to honor African-Americans. Or, just as importantly, some say it's appropriate to recognize the misery of the half a million African slaves who were bought and sold along the James River.

"Not one more dime should be spent on another Confederate rendering until African-American personalities and heroes are included in some kind of plan to accurately and fairly present history on public property," Chambliss said.

As a black lawyer practicing in Richmond since 1978, Chambliss, 52, fought on behalf of erecting a statue on Monument Avenue honoring Richmond native and African-American tennis great Arthur Ashe. It was raised in 1996, despite protests by heritage groups that the stately boulevard was hollowed

ground of
the Confederacy.

Now Chambliss is in position to wield even greater influence.

He is chairman of the city's ad hoc historical interpretation committee,
created by the City Council to advise it on how to reflect history in the
naming
of monuments, bridges and other public property.

The committee plans its second meeting March 23, hoping to agree on a
plan
that will avoid a replay of the nasty fight over the Ashe monument and,
last
month, over the renaming of two city bridges.

The City Council renamed the bridges in honor of two Richmond civil
rights
leaders, Samuel Tucker and Curtis Holt. Their names replaced those of
Confederate generals J.E.B. Stuart and Stonewall Jackson, who also are
honored
by Monument Avenue statues.

The most protracted fight has been over Lee, whose statue is the
biggest and
most ornate along Monument Avenue, reflecting adoration that is now being
challenged.

"There is historical fact about Robert E. Lee," said William Martin,
director
of Richmond's Valentine Museum. "But rather than deal with Lee as a
person, we
deal with him as a symbol." Last spring, the foundation redeveloping
Richmond's
waterfront sparked controversy when it hoisted a mural-sized portrait of
Lee in
his uniform. Richmond City Councilman Sa'ad El-Amin protested, comparing
Lee to
Nazi leaders and expressing a view simmering under the surface in
Richmond.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 9, 2000

6 of 16 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Multimedia Publishing of North Carolina, Inc.

Asheville Citizen-Times (Asheville, NC)

March 8, 2000, Wednesday

SECTION: Editorial; Pg. A6

LENGTH: 768 words

HEADLINE: IS AMERICA A NATION OF BARN RAISERS, OR A NATION OF COWBOYS?

BYLINE: ANDY REED

BODY:

I shouldn't be amazed, but I am, by the passions aroused over whether the Confederate battle flag should fly above the South Carolina capitol, and who should have custody of Elian Gonzalez. I find myself bemused by the intensity of the argument, though I know perfectly well that strongly held beliefs about Constitutional rights impel the controversies. Advocates for Elian's father and for his uncles, for flying the flag and for removing it, revive ancient arguments about the relationship between individuals and their government.

That relationship has divided Americans for more than two centuries. Great disputes have generated political ebbs and flows over such polarizing ideas as devolution and federalism, isolationism and manifest destiny, slavery and abolition, states rights and civil rights, the right to life and the right to choose, monopolies and trust-busters, the gold standard and a floating currency, economic Darwinism and Roosevelt's alphabet agencies, Vietnam and "peace now," the death penalty and life in prison without parole. Though we like to imagine social serenity as our historical norm, the moments when the schism seemed bridged, even healed, are in fact relatively rare.

Throughout our history ascendancy has shifted between advocates of a republic and of a democracy; between those who see, and most often live in, a shining city on a hill, and those whose vision encompasses the surrounding valleys, farms, and towns as well; between those who see a nation of "I"s and those who see "we"s.

In essence, we are a nation divided about whether the solitary cowboy or a barn raising is more symbolic of America.

Very often our perspective governs our perception. Bob Dole's bridge to

the
values of the 1950s would hardly mean the same thing to David Duke as to
Rosa
Parks, any more than does forest conservation to a timber baron and to a
biologist. The Confederate battle flag would be perceived very
differently by
John Brown, his body rolling in its grave, and by Strom Thurmond, somehow
still
ambulatory (does he really tell personal anecdotes about the burning of
Fort
Sumter?).

Frequently such disputes take on religious overtones, the fervor of
revival
overwhelming reasoned argument. Sometimes, as in the debate over
abortion, the
overtones become the argument. "The Constitutional right to ..." evolves
into
"you have no right to ..." and the sanctity of the unborn is elevated
over that
of the living.

Often enough, those who demand freedom from government intrusion for
themselves insist that the same government intrude on others. Many
opponents of
restrictions on abortion rights support restrictions on gun ownership,
and many
of those who would guarantee every unborn child the right to life eagerly
advocate applying the death penalty to teenagers. Politically powerful
religious
organizations demand the right to proselytize in public schools and
courtrooms,
but raise hell when people of other faiths speak out.

The delicate balance between each individual's rights and those of the
community reflect a tension between the twin ideals of freedom and order.
These
ideals are not mutually incompatible, as many on the extremes of both
sides
contend; they are essential to maintaining a political system organized
by a
free people who have chosen to govern themselves and, by extension and to
a
greater or lesser degree, each other.

There is, of course, confusion in the middle, where the majority live.
Few of
us agree about all issues, and fewer still thrive at the fringes. But I
imagine
most of us can easily determine where we stand by taking this simple test.

Draw a line down the middle of a page, writing "Positive" above the
left-hand
column and "Negative" above the right, and place the following words and

phrases

(listed alphabetically) in the appropriate column: 1) Affirmative action;

2)

freedom of choice; 3) a colorblind society; 4) community; 5)

conservation; 6)

cowboys; 7) Defense of Marriage Act; 8) democracy; 9) Elian's father; 10)

Elian's uncles; 11) EPA; 12) family values; 13) 1st Amendment; 14)

freedom; 15)

gay rights; 16) General Electric; 17) gun control; 18) logging; 19)

order; 20)

privacy; 21) republic; 22) right to life; 23) 2nd Amendment; 24) strict

construction; 25) tax cuts; 26) universal health care.

My more visceral positives are well known: 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 13,

14, 15,

17, 20, 26. Where do you stand? With the cowboys, or raising a barn?

Readers may write to Andy Reed in care of the Asheville Citizen-Times,

P.O.

Box 2090, Asheville, N.C. 28802 or email him at adreed@prodigy.net.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 9, 2000

7 of 16 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Madison Newspapers, Inc.

Capital Times (Madison, WI.)

March 8, 2000, Wednesday, ALL EDITIONS

SECTION: Editorial, Pg. 7A

LENGTH: 1077 words

HEADLINE: 2000 COULD BE TURNING POINT FOR GAY RIGHTS ACROSS U.S.

BYLINE: Steve Sanders

BODY:

Only 11 states -- including Wisconsin -- have laws that protect gays from

various forms of discrimination. That could change in November. Democratic leaders have pledged to pass a federal law barring anti-gay employment discrimination if they regain control of Congress.

The year 2000 has emerged as the most critical period in the history of the

gay rights movement. During the next eight months, state legislators, the U.S.

Supreme Court and voters will determine in important ways how gay and lesbian relationships are recognized, how effectively civil rights laws can be used to promote homosexual equality, and which side is ascendant in the culture war over America's most controversial minority.

On Tuesday, California voters approved a bitterly contested ballot initiative rejecting something so cutting-edge that it's not yet legal: marriage between members of the same sex. Also, legislators in Vermont are struggling with an order from that state's high court to grant gay couples the same rights as married heterosexuals.

On April 29 and 30, tens of thousands of gays, family members and allies are expected to take part in the "Millennium March on Washington," a weekend of speeches, performances and prayers for gay and lesbian equality. This summer, the Supreme Court is expected to rule on only the third major gay-related case in its history, deciding whether state civil rights laws trump the Boy Scouts' policy against gay members and leaders.

Finally, in November, voters' decisions on who controls the White House and Congress might decide the fate of a proposed national nondiscrimination law, the future of the military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy and the tone on gay debates set by the nation's elected leaders.

These battles loom, as gays are enjoying steady gains in public acceptance and political influence.

A new review of public opinion by political scientists Kenneth Sherrill and Alan Yang, titled "From Outlaws to In-Laws: Anti-Gay Attitudes Thaw," shows that while 56 percent of Americans believe homosexual behavior is "morally wrong," larger majorities support equal job opportunities and laws against hate crimes.

Opposition to gay equality in areas such as housing, insurance and inheritance rights, and adoption has eroded significantly during the past two

decades. Moreover, at a time when gays are coming out as never before --
in
private, in public and on TV -- polls show support for equality increases dramatically when people say they have at
least one gay friend, family
member or
co-worker. But deep divisions over homosexuality remain, and nowhere more
starkly than in California, where voters in the nation's most populous
state
approved a law saying "only a marriage between a man and a woman shall
be valid
or recognized."

The issue is moot: No state gives marriage licenses to same-sex
couples. But
the multimillion dollar media war over the so-called "Knight initiative"
(named for its sponsor, Republican state Sen. William "Pete" Knight)
has come
to symbolize emotional, political and religious differences over how
society
should treat its gay citizens. As if to underscore the issue's ability to
polarize, Knight's son David revealed last fall that he was gay and
estranged
from his father.

While gay marriage remains theoretical, the Vermont Supreme Court ruled
in
December that limiting the benefits of marriage to opposite-sex couples
violated
the "common benefits clause" of that state's constitution -- an
unprecedented
victory in the quixotic campaign to legally recognize gay relationships.

Declaring gay couples' quest for protection and security nothing less
than
"a recognition of our common humanity," the court tossed a political hot
potato to the Vermont Legislature, which must decide this spring whether
to
grant marriage licenses to gay couples or erect an elaborate system of
"domestic partnership."

Domestic partnership would provide gay couples the same state-conferred
privileges -- such as the ability to make medical decisions for partners
or
inherit property in the absence of a will -- that married people get,
while
withholding the M word and the social recognition it implies.

Legislative leaders have signaled they intend to focus on domestic
partnership rather than on expanding marriage. Unlike marriage, however,
domestic partnership would not be recognized across state lines. Gays say
it
might represent a return to the "separate but equal" status the
nation's legal
system long ago rejected for blacks and other minorities.

While Vermont deliberates, the Supreme Court will hear arguments on another flash-point issue: whether a New Jersey civil rights law can be used to prohibit Boy Scout groups from enforcing policies that exclude gays.

The Scouts expelled James Dale as an assistant scoutmaster after learning he was involved with a gay student group at Rutgers University. In August, New Jersey's highest court ruled the Boy Scouts were covered by a state law prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. The Scouts have argued they have a special right to discriminate, because they are a private membership organization.

Only 11 states -- including Wisconsin -- have laws that protect gays from various forms of discrimination. That could change in November. Democratic leaders have pledged to pass a federal law barring anti-gay employment discrimination if they regain control of Congress. The Democrats have stepped up overt appeals to gays and lesbians, who make up an estimated 5 percent of the electorate -- as much as 9 percent in large cities.

In the presidential primaries, Democrats Al Gore and Bill Bradley have vied for invitations to gay community centers, fund-raisers, even online chats, and have denounced the military's policy on homosexuals.

The Republican race between George W. Bush and John McCain, by contrast, seems like a contest to demonstrate who would take a harder line on issues such as "don't ask, don't tell," marriage and adoption. Bush has waffled on whether he would appoint open gays to his administration, and he criticized the New Jersey Boy Scouts decision. Although McCain has had a cordial meeting with a gay Republican group and denounced figures such as televangelist Pat Robertson as being outside the mainstream, he has endorsed California's Knight initiative and said of homosexuality, "It's a lifestyle I don't approve of."

NOTES:

Steve Sanders teaches and writes about gay/lesbian politics at Indiana University.

LOAD-DATE: March 9, 2000

8 of 16 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 The Cincinnati Enquirer

The Cincinnati Enquirer

March 8, 2000, Wednesday KENTUCKY EDITION

SECTION: METRO, Pg. B02

LENGTH: 374 words

HEADLINE: NAACP enters Waynesville fray; Wants state probe of racial profiling

BYLINE: SHEILA McLAUGHLIN

SOURCE: The Cincinnati Enquirer

DATELINE: WAYNESVILLE

BODY:

The head of the NAACP in Dayton, Ohio, said Tuesday he will ask for a state investigation into racial profiling, including the Feb. 26 incident that has divided this northern Warren County village.

Jessie Gooding, president of the Dayton branch, monitored Monday night's heated Village Council meeting at which several African-Americans, including the mayor's father and sister, spoke of being stopped repeatedly by police.

"I think that citizens are trying to keep a good, clean white community without any blemishes," Mr. Gooding said Tuesday.

"It's not that clean. The fact is, if you had all that smoke, there's a fire somewhere."

The Dayton NAACP is documenting complaints in Waynesville and of three incidents in Dayton, Mr. Gooding said. The chapter intends to ask the Ohio Attorney General's Office for a statewide investigation into racial profiling.

Tensions between Waynesville Mayor Charles Sanders and Police Chief Allen Carter came to a head last week after three black men - Saul Plaza, a soldier from Monroe, and his passengers, DeAngelo Harrington and Dwenton Jackson - complained they were stopped by police for alleged traffic violations,

held at
gunpoint and handcuffed.

The incident is under investigation by the Warren County Sheriff's Office to determine whether Officers Marc Walters and Ryan Stanaford pulled the car over because the occupants were African-American. The three were released without any citations or charges after the officers checked the vehicle for drugs.

The three men and Mr. Plaza's parents have threatened a civil-rights suit against village police.

Village Manager Kevin Harper and Chief Carter have denied racial profiling occurs. However, Mr. Sanders contends it does, and has called for Chief Carter's resignation.

About 200 residents crammed makeshift council chambers at a restaurant Monday night to debate the issue and defend the police or the mayor, while two councilmen called for the mayor's resignation. That suggestion was met with heavy applause. But Mr. Sanders, one of three black adults in the community of 2,500 residents, refused to step down.

Council passed an ordinance Monday, changing police procedures and policies to outlaw racial profiling.

LOAD-DATE: March 9, 2000

9 of 16 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Cox News Service

Cox News Service

March 8, 2000

SECTION: Domestic, non-Washington, general news item

LENGTH: 888 words

HEADLINE: City at odds over Confederate general

BYLINE: Chris Burritt

DATELINE: RICHMOND, Va.

BODY:

Driving along Monument Avenue, past the massive stone statues of Robert E. Lee and other Confederate warriors, Charles Chambliss said in disgust, "Somehow the Confederacy made the losers look honorable."

Next week, more than 500 patrons of the Museum of the Confederacy will, in fact, gather to salute Lee. They'll attend the museum's Grand Southern Ball, a fund-raiser selling, among other memorabilia, baseball caps inscribed with Lee's signature for \$15 each.

Though dead since 1870, five years after his surrender at Appomattox, Va., ended the Civil War, the Confederate general-in-chief is at the center of controversy. In recent weeks, a downtown mural of Lee has been torched and his reputation defended in a dispute over how history should be marked here in the capital of the Old Confederacy.

It's a fight that heritage groups say embodies a resolve by civil rights leaders to rid the South of Confederate symbols _ including the Rebel banner flying atop the South Carolina Statehouse and embodied in the state flags of Georgia and Mississippi.

But here in Richmond, a bastion of Confederate relics and remembrances, a growing chorus, including Mayor Timothy Kaine, says it's time for the majority black city to honor African-Americans. Or, just as importantly, some say it's appropriate to recognize the misery of the half a million African slaves who were bought and sold along the James River.

"Not one more dime should be spent on another Confederate rendering until African-American personalities and heroes are included in some kind of plan to accurately and fairly present history on public property," Chambliss said.

As a black lawyer practicing in Richmond since 1978, Chambliss, 52, fought on behalf of erecting a statue on Monument Avenue honoring Richmond native and African-American tennis great Arthur Ashe. It was raised in 1996, despite protests by heritage groups that the stately boulevard was hollowed ground of

the Confederacy.

Now Chambliss is in position to wield even greater influence.

He is chairman of the city's ad hoc historical interpretation committee, created by the City Council to advise it on how to reflect history in the naming of monuments, bridges and other public property.

The committee plans its second meeting March 23, hoping to agree on a plan that will avoid a replay of the nasty fight over the Ashe monument and, last month, over the renaming of two city bridges.

The City Council renamed the bridges in honor of two Richmond civil rights leaders, Samuel Tucker and Curtis Holt. Their names replaced those of Confederate generals J.E.B. Stuart and Stonewall Jackson, who also are honored by Monument Avenue statues.

The most protracted fight has been over Lee, whose statue is the biggest and most ornate along Monument Avenue, reflecting adoration that is now being challenged.

"There is historical fact about Robert E. Lee," said William Martin, director of Richmond's Valentine Museum. "But rather than deal with Lee as a person, we deal with him as a symbol." Last spring, the foundation redeveloping Richmond's waterfront sparked controversy when it hoisted a mural-sized portrait of Lee in his uniform. Richmond City Councilman Sa'ad El- Amin protested, comparing Lee to Nazi leaders and expressing a view simmering under the surface in Richmond.

El-Amin said the city's Confederate monuments, erected in an era when white people controlled city government, are offensive to many black people.

The Historic Richmond Riverfront Foundation removed the mural, part of a pictorial city history consisting of 13 murals hanging from the tall concrete flood wall along the James River.

The foundation put up another mural of Lee, this time from a famous portrait of the downcast general taken a few days after his surrender at Appomattox.

Then on Jan. 17, which Virginia celebrates as a holiday honoring Lee, Jackson and Martin Luther King Jr., somebody set fire to the Lee mural. Leaders of the Sons of Confederate Veterans urged police to prosecute the yet-unsolved incident as a hate crime.

Around the same time, the Lee statue on Monument Avenue was defaced by graffiti reading "Kill the white devil," said Brag Bowling, central Virginia commander for the Sons of Confederate Veterans.

A third Lee mural now hangs from the flood wall, and it, too, appears to have been vandalized. What looks like a small burn appears at the cuff of Lee's right trouser leg.

What Bowling finds more upsetting is Lee's placement in a series of murals also honoring Abraham Lincoln and Powhatan Beaty, a black man who won the Medal of Honor fighting for the Union. In another mural, the city of Richmond is in flames, with soldiers retreating across the James River.

"Robert E. Lee had a huge role in this city," said Bowling, who serves on the historical interpretation committee. Committee member Rob Corcoran believes that the panel will spur constructive talk about race and, in the end, bring about respect for different views.

"The question is how does Richmond tell its story in such a way that is honest and inclusive?" said Corcoran, national director for Hope in the Cities, a Richmond-based group aimed at racial reconciliation. "Everybody's reality is important and needs to be respected."

Story Filed By Cox Newspapers

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 9, 2000

10 of 16 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Cox News Service

Cox News Service

March 8, 2000

SECTION: Washington - general news

LENGTH: 645 words

HEADLINE: 'DIGITAL DIVIDE' POSES CHALLENGE TO FIRST 'E-LECTION'

BYLINE: ANDREW J. GLASS

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

The nation's first Internet election, hailed by its backers as a historic breakthrough, risks running afoul of federal voting rights laws.

"After the process ends Saturday, there'll be a trial on the fundamental question of fairness" because many minority voters lack access to the Internet, said Miller Baker, a Washington lawyer.

A federal lawsuit being pressed by Baker seeks to nullify the online presidential primary being held by Arizona Democrats from Tuesday through Friday.

The suit could help decide whether the so-called "digital divide" raises legal barriers against virtual voting.

The Commerce Department reported last year that 19 percent of African-Americans and 16 percent of Hispanics have Internet access from any location, compared to 38 percent of whites.

"Internet voting may well be widely accepted in 10 or 15 years," Baker noted.

"But we're not there yet. As it stands, this process offers unfair access to remote Internet users."

Baker represents the Voting Integrity Project, a Virginia-based nonprofit group.

Last week in a Phoenix courtroom, U.S. District Judge Paul Rosenblatt refused the group's request for a temporary restraining order to halt the election, the first legally binding public election ever held on the Internet.

But he did not dismiss the case, saying the results might have to be set aside if it's proved that the voting was biased against minorities and the poor because they have less Internet access.

Since Arizona is one of the few non-Southern states covered under the

1965

Voting Rights Act, Attorney General Janet Reno also had to approve the online voting scheme. At the time, Reno noted that the Justice Department planned to monitor the virtual vote closely.

The lawsuit will have scant impact on the Democratic National Convention. If the election is eventually overturned, the slate of Arizona delegates chosen will be seated as unpledged, rather than as bound supporters of Vice President Al Gore or former Sen. Bill Bradley of New Jersey.

"We like to think we're helping democracy work," said Joe Mohen, the chief executive officer of election.com, which has been hired by the Arizona Democratic Party.

"The 'digital divide' is a misnomer," Mohen said, disputing the Commerce Department figures as outdated. "We're giving people more choices and more opportunities to vote."

Mohen also noted that the Democratic contest was the first one ever held in the United States where voters were free to enter any of 125 polling places in Arizona on Election Day, which is Saturday, and cast their ballots at an Internet kiosk.

Doug Lewis, executive director of the Houston-based Election Centre(cq) research group, said the mounting pressure for so-called E-lelections comes "before the necessary safety and security features have been built into the process."

However, Mohen said nearly all aspects of the virtual election were running smoothly, including the security features built into the company's Web site.

They require voters to furnish three separate pieces of personal authentication data, including a unique numerical code mailed to each of the state's registered Democrats last month.

What problems had arisen, Mohen said, mostly involved would-be voters with antiquated Internet browsers that proved unable to handle election.com's Java-driven technology.

By midday Wednesday, less than halfway through the online voting period, about 18,500 ballots had been cast online, Mohen reported. That compares

to the
12,200 conventional ballots cast in 1996, when President Clinton ran
unopposed.

Mark Fleisher, the Democratic party chairman in Arizona, also claimed
the
system was secure. "Somebody has to be first," he said. "If you want to
see
elections on the Internet, you have to jump in."

Andrew J. Glass's e-mail address is andyg(at)coxnews.com

ENDIT

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 9, 2000

11 of 16 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Sentinel Communications Co.

THE ORLANDO SENTINEL

March 8, 2000 Wednesday, METRO

SECTION: A SECTION; Pg. A1

LENGTH: 1236 words

HEADLINE: GOVERNOR PROMISES TO STAND FIRM

BYLINE: By John Kennedy, TALLAHASSEE BUREAU

BODY:

TALLAHASSEE - Gov. Jeb Bush, denounced by thousands of civil-rights
demonstrators outside the Capitol, vowed in a speech to lawmakers Tuesday
that
he would "not take one step backward in the struggle against racism and
discrimination."

While Bush's 32-minute State of the State address swept over a wide
range of
subjects, including tax breaks, education and the environment, it was his
defense of the controversial One Florida plan overhauling affirmative
action
that resonated loudest, touching an issue that has roiled state politics
since
he unveiled it in November.

"The place we are heading is a place where opportunity is real and
lasting -
not false and forced by government," Bush told 160 lawmakers, Cabinet

members

and Supreme Court justices in the flower-festooned House chambers on the Legislature's opening day.

Bush's speech, however, went unheard by the One Florida protesters who were gathered outside the Old Capitol just yards away.

Demonstrators heard speeches by the Rev. Jesse Jackson, Martin Luther King III and NAACP President Kweisi Mfume, among others, who insisted that the second-year governor leave affirmative action alone. They also urged demonstrators to register to vote and to become more active in combatting Bush's policies.

That's a dramatic departure from only two years ago, when Bush was elected with 14 percent of the black vote, a record for a Republican in a Florida governor's race.

Such support appears long gone, as the Florida Democratic Party, labor unions and women's organizations fan opposition to One Florida, which ends race- and gender-preference programs in university admissions and most state agency contracting and hiring. In his speech, Bush did not stray an inch from his belief in One Florida.

"Here is the stark reality: Just as we have seen in other states where the issue has been tested, the vast majority of Floridians favor the elimination of all affirmative action programs," Bush said.

"It would have been politically expedient to simply let these programs be dismantled, with nothing to replace them. But there is a difference between being politically smart and doing the right thing. And so in this case, I sought the advice of many to find a better way to affirmatively increase the opportunities for all Floridians, but in fair ways."

While Bush was warmly received by the senators and House members, several black Democratic lawmakers took the unusual step of skipping the governor's address, joining protesters outside.

After his speech, Bush implied that criticism of his plan is largely rooted in partisan politics - as Democrats try to make gains in a state where Republicans control the House, Senate and Governor's Mansion.

Demonstrators "are here because they've been told by somebody that we're taking a step back in the fight against discrimination - against racism. And I can assure you we're not," Bush said.

Bush, who would not address the protesters, said he would tell them the same thing - if he had the opportunity. Last week, Bush quietly sent letters to a handful of civil-rights leaders, inviting them to talk with him by phone over the weekend, or in person Monday or early Tuesday. His office said there was no response.

But even that gesture, apparently, backfired.

King, the son of the slain civil-rights leader, condemned the late-hour Bush invitation, saying, "In a real sense, it is an insult to the national leadership."

Overall, Bush appeared on more solid ground laying out other initiatives during his speech, which was interrupted a dozen times by applause. His proposals to offer \$578 million in tax breaks, chiefly to businesses and investors, was well-received by fellow Republicans, as was his plan to speed up road construction by spending \$4 billion during the next five years.

He also drew applause when he urged the 2000 Legislature to be bold with its political decision-making. Because of term limits, 63 lawmakers must leave office this year, creating the prospect of great change in the makeup of the Legislature.

"Some say we moved too quickly last session to address the pressing needs of our state," Bush said. "Some accuse us of rushing to effect change without methodically studying the problems that face us."

But the governor added, "The people sent us here not for study, but for action. And I hope this session is a session of action."

Bush said he was seeking support from lawmakers to increase public school funding by \$720 million, a 6.5 percent boost from last year, and enhance aid to failing schools. More money to expand residential facilities for juvenile offenders and \$100 million in extra state funding for Everglades restoration also were outlined by Bush.

The 47-year-old governor, known for his devotion to e-mail and the Internet, also unveiled something new to State of the State speeches in Florida: six short video presentations by supporters of his policies.

The video stars included Adam Gross, a Naples fifth-grader who thanked Bush for his efforts on behalf of the Everglades; and Tracy Richardson, a Pensacola woman whose daughter, Khaliah, goes to a private school using a state-funded voucher introduced under Bush last year.

America Online Chairman Steve Case hailed the state's efforts to offer government services over the Internet. Case, who has contributed at least \$1,000 to George W. Bush's presidential campaign, was the only celebrity video guest.

Three Tampa-area people, a working couple and a retiree, all of whom had earlier written to the governor, also hailed Bush by video for his advocacy of phasing out the state's intangibles tax on investments.

Bush calls the tax, mostly paid by upper-income Floridians, an "insidious tax."

"Now it's our turn to do what's right," Bush told lawmakers.

Reaction to the governor's speech broke along party lines, with House and Senate Democrats largely skeptical of Bush's claims.

In one part of his speech, Bush seemed to credit last year's record \$1 billion tax cut - pushed largely by Republicans - with having been responsible for Florida's vibrant economy.

"You returned over \$1 billion to the Florida taxpayer. ... And look how the economy responds," Bush said. "You have helped reduce Florida's unemployment to the lowest levels in an entire generation, while personal income is increasing much faster than inflation."

Said Senate Democratic Leader Buddy Dyer of Orlando: "I find it hard to stretch that last year's tax break did all he claims it did for Florida's economy.

"I think it's more what happened to the national economy under President Clinton."

Rep. Debbie Wasserman Schultz, D-Davie, said she doubted the sincerity of Bush's claim that he was willing to cooperate with lawmakers of both parties.

"The results of this legislative session will not reflect the words that we heard today," she said.

Republicans, however, said Bush unfolded an effective roadmap for legislators to track during the 60-day session.

Rep. Tom Feeney, R-Oviedo, who is in line to become House speaker next year, said that by emphasizing tax breaks, education, road-building, education and crime-fighting, Bush brought Republicans back to core issues - overshadowed in recent weeks by the One Florida controversy and other political flashpoints.

"I see the issue of One Florida slowly and steadily subsiding, and that will allow us to get back on our message," Feeney said.

GRAPHIC: PHOTO: In Miami. Miami-Dade County school buses sit in a parking lot as more than 600 drivers stopped work to protest Gov. Jeb Bush's One Florida plan on Tuesday. Students were stranded temporarily.; ASSOCIATED PRESS

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

COLUMN: March on Tallahassee

LOAD-DATE: March 9, 2000

12 of 16 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 The Cincinnati Enquirer

The Cincinnati Enquirer

March 7, 2000, Tuesday ALL EDITIONS

SECTION: EDITORIAL, Pg. A09

LENGTH: 1366 words

HEADLINE: READERS' VIEWS; Seat belt laws are necessary

BODY:

TO THE EDITOR: Many readers have written to the Enquirer to denounce the proposed compulsory seat belt law. They complain that it is a violation of their civil rights to be forcibly protected. How many of them would object to the need to pasteurize milk? How many would object to a fire department for which they must pay a compulsory tax? It may be of interest to note that a Swedish study in the 1960's of 28,000 accidents with Volvo cars demonstrated that no belted driver or passenger was killed until the crash speed exceeded 60 mph. Fatalities started at 15 mph with unbelted drivers.

However, there is another reason I have for desiring the compulsory seat belt law. There have been studies, especially overseas where compulsory laws are enforced, that show that unbelted drivers involved in accidents involve more other cars than belted drivers do. The unbelted driver loses control more easily. I remember my wife being hit and pushed onto a railroad track, but being belted did not lose control and was able to move the car off the tracks in time.

Therefore, I want the other driver to be belted for my protection when I am an innocent bystander. By all means, make the seat belt law compulsory for my personal protection and my wallet. WALTER SCHNUR Finneytown

Homeless children have an equal chance to learn

What a pleasure to read about CPS's Project Connect ("Agency guides homeless kids through studies," Feb. 25). The work of teacher Debbie Reinhart, school community coordinators Paul McDole Jr. and Loni Sander, and the CPS tutors, in support of Cincinnati's homeless children so often goes unrecognized. They provide consistent programs for our school district's most under-served population. Their efforts have increased the awareness of the needs of homeless children in our community. They are unequivocal emissaries for both the homeless students and CPS. JO ANNE F. CUDDY Springfield Township

Zoo board let director get away

Regarding Ed. Maruska resigns as director of Cincinnati Zoo on Feb. 26,
I cannot tell you how shocked and disgusted I was to read the announcement in the Enquirer, a few weeks after the resignation of Thane Maynard as director of Education at the Zoo.

Five years ago, the board of trustees of the Cincinnati Zoo named Mr. Maynard next director of the Zoo. This was reported in the Enquirer and other media outlet which was approved by the community and praise for the board for taking steps to insure that Cincinnati not lose a true local treasure.

Relying on the board's action, Mr. Maynard ceased searching for career advancement outside the city and sat on the sidelines for five long years. Now the board is conducting an international search to fill Mr. Maruska's position. I know that the board and Mr. Maruska have deprived this city of the talents of Mr. Maynard. It's a shame. CHRISTINE CHRONIS Hyde Park

Diallo verdict causes outrage

I am writing to express my extreme disappointment in the "not guilty" verdicts handed down recently in the Amadou Diallo murder trial in New York City.

At its worst, the shooting had the appearance of a gangland-style mob hit. At best it was a foursome of men who were each individually so scared that they emptied their guns on an unarmed man. Statistically, the latter seems very improbable.

Forty-one bullets shot at an unarmed man cannot be justifiable homicide in anyone's book. What kind of message does America send to the victim's family, to the black community, to society in general, when an innocent man checking his mail box at night is gunned down by four police officers in a hail of gunfire?

We all know by now that what is black and white to the common man must become a unique shade of gray in a jury box - one that I doubt even Crayola has ever heard of. Here's hoping that justice will eventually be served. If justice can't

be served, then let's at least have the decency to change the street signs in the Bronx from "No Loitering" to "No Checking Your Mailbox After Sundown." After all, Mr. Diallo had a right to know the rules. TOM WULKER Mount Carmel

What can black men carry safely?

I'm confused by the actions of police. Michael Carpenter was killed for being armed with a car; Lorenzo Collins was killed for being armed with a brick; Amadou Diallo was killed for being armed with a wallet. Please, tell us black men what we can possess that cannot be judged a weapon after you shoot us. THOMAS W. PITTS Madisonville

Former student praises Cadet

I am extremely disturbed with the story about Jean Robert Cadet and Maderia Junior High School. While I was a student at the School for the Creative and Performing Arts, Mr. Cadet was my 10th-grade History teacher and, later, my French teacher during my junior and senior years.

His diligent teachings and dedication to his students of all races contributed to my desire to go to school for Ancient History and Western Civilization. While it is true that racism will never leave us, it is even more disturbing that it is so strong among our children. In my opinion, the Maderia School District will sorely miss one of the great teachers. But this incident only supports the lack of appreciation and support we hold for our educators. ELIZABETH TAYLOR Westwood

Butler Co. residents should watch Holcomb

John Holcomb, the Butler County prosecutor, has developed a political system through his employees that has allowed him to raise millions of dollars to gain re-election. He gives away money to various groups to get political favors and support. Last year alone, he spent over \$ 4,600 on ball tickets. In essence, this is taxpayers' money. Taxpayers' have lost \$ 6,500 when Mr. Holcomb had a riverboat drinking seminar. What's next?

Something has changed, because he's not the person he used to be.

Robin Piper received an overwhelming endorsement from the Republican Party.

He has been active in the community and has a fantastic criminal prosecution record. Equally important is his attitude and demeanor. I am not the fool Mr. Holcomb believes us all to be. For every season there is a change. Let's make it this November. FRED P. BOUNDS West Chester

People with disabilities praised for job well done

We were pleased to see the outstanding feature on Feb. 13 written parents highlighting the gifts and talents of their family members who have disabilities. Thanks for a great feature on how individuals with disabilities contribute to their families and our community. As an organization whose mission is to inspire, support and celebrate the efforts of our community to include people with disabilities, we appreciate families sharing their perspectives. SANDY KERLIN Director Inclusion Network

Atheist did not start children's camp

Regarding the news story "Atheist candidate has crusade" (Feb. 24): It is incorrect to credit the start of the children's camp to Edwin Kagin and his wife. It was started by by the Free Inquiry Group of Cincinnati - Northern Kentucky.

The camp, Camp Quest, was developed and operated in 1996 by a committee of several people, of which I was the chairman. Mr. and Mrs. Kagin were members of that committee. Furthermore, the camp was not for atheist children, but for children mostly, though not exclusively, from secular humanist families. The camp was not intended to preach or criticize any doctrine. It was offered as an alternative to church-sponsored camps which do focus on traditional religious doctrine. Camp Quest continues to exist, but I am no longer involved. It is important to point out that Mr. Kagin does not represent the majority of secular humanists - atheists, and his activities and methods are offensive to some. The majority of secular humanists - atheists in this community and nationwide are not outrageous or zany, nor disrespectful of other people's rights to their

beliefs. Most are respected, active individuals and families, who make positive contributions to the community, who lead normal lives, and who want the same constitutional guarantees of freedom of belief or nonbelief as those who practice traditional God-centered religions. VERNON A. UCHTMAN Covington

LOAD-DATE: March 9, 2000

13 of 16 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 The Commercial Appeal

The Commercial Appeal (Memphis, TN)

March 6, 2000, MONDAY, FINAL EDITION

SECTION: NEWS, Pg. A1

LENGTH: 641 words

HEADLINE: IN SELMA, CLINTON DECRIES RACIAL BREACHES THAT ENDURE

BYLINE: Charles Babington The Washington Post

DATELINE: SELMA, Ala.

BODY:

Standing at the bridge that became an Alabama icon of the American civil rights movement, President Clinton on Sunday hailed the black marchers who endured state troopers' nightsticks and tear gas 35 years ago to insist on the right to vote.

Their courage, he said, freed not only the South's black people but also its white people.

"Without Selma, Jimmy Carter and Bill Clinton would never have been elected president of the United States," the President said in a ceremony at the foot of the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma. "I too am a son of the South, the old, segregated South. And those of you who marched 35 years ago set me free, too, on Bloody Sunday - free to know you, to work with you, to love you, to raise my child to celebrate our differences and hallow our common humanity."

At the bridge on March 7, 1965, stick-wielding Alabama state troopers turned back Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and about 600 other marchers who were

protesting
the state's refusal to allow most black people to register and vote.
Televised
accounts of the brutality shocked the nation and helped spur the 1965
Voting
Rights Act and the further breakdown of segregationist laws.

In his 15-minute speech, which preceded his march across the bridge
with more
than 10,000 attending the commemoration, Clinton praised the 1965
marchers as
heroes and patriots. But he said the United States still has far to go to
bring
social equality to all its people.

"As long as African-Americans and other minorities suffer two, three,
even
four times the rates of heart disease, AIDS, diabetes and cancer, we have
another bridge to cross," he said. ". . . As long as the power of
America's
growing diversity remains diminished by discrimination and stained by
acts of
violence against people just because they're black or Hispanic or Asian
or gay
or Jewish or Muslim - as long as that happens to any American - we have
another
bridge to cross."

The President linked the 1965 march with two issues animating the
current
presidential campaign: displays of the Confederate battle flag and some
police
agencies' use of race as a factor in deciding which motorists to stop and
search.

"As long as the waving symbol of one American's pride is the shameful
symbol
of another American's pain, we have another bridge to cross," Clinton
said. ".
. . . As long as African-Americans and Latinos anywhere in America believe
they
are unfairly targeted by police because of the color of their skin - and
police
believe they are unfairly judged by their communities because of the
color of
their uniforms - we have another bridge to cross."

The Arkansas-born Clinton has enjoyed a deep affinity with black voters
throughout his political career, but rarely has he stood on a spot so
steeped in
the nation's memory of snarling police dogs, chanting marchers and Jim
Crow laws
doomed by the violence of those hoping to preserve them.

"It has been said the Voting Rights Act was signed in ink in Washington," the President said. "But it first was signed in blood in Selma.

"It must be hard for the young people in this audience to believe, but just 35 years ago, Americans - both black and white - lost their lives in the voting rights crusade," he said. "Some died in Selma. . . . We honor them for the patriots they were. They did not die in vain."

Alabama troopers stationed at the bridge saluted the marchers.

Among those who spoke before the President was King's widow, Coretta Scott King, who did not attend the 1965 march but recalled hearing early reports of those who were injured. Clinton was introduced by Rep. John Lewis (D-Ga.), who was at the front of the 1965 march and was badly beaten by Alabama troopers.

Reminding his audience of what has been achieved, Lewis said, "Today no one will lose their lives for the precious right to vote."

GRAPHIC: photo (2);

By J. Scott Applewhite/AP;

(Color) Jesse Jackson (third from left), Coretta Scott King, President Clinton and Rep. John Lewis (D-Ga.) lead thousands of marchers across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Ala., Sunday.;

CAPTION: By Dave Martin/AP;

(Color) The ceremony marks the 35th anniversary of Bloody Sunday when Alabama state troopers beat civil rights marchers.

LOAD-DATE: March 9, 2000

14 of 16 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 American Lawyer Newspapers Group Inc.

Legal Times

March 6, 2000, Monday

SECTION: POV; Pg. 59

LENGTH: 473 words

HEADLINE: First Ally of Racial Remedies

Under Attack, He Held the Line for Affirmative Action

BYLINE: Randall Kennedy

BODY:

President Bill Clinton will deserve considerable credit or blame, depending on your politics, if affirmative action survives many more decades.

Early on, he boasted that he would select a Cabinet that (in a now-famous phrase) "looks like America." Then he proceeded to seek out and appoint racial mi-norities and women.

That a Cabinet-or faculty or jury or firm-should demographically resemble its jurisdiction is not, of course, an idea conceived by Clinton. But he popularized the idea and helped make it a norm by which many people judge leaders and organizations.

Later in his first term, after initiating a highly publicized review of the policy, the president declared in July 1995 that "affirmative action has been good for America." He conceded that some programs had been sloppily or even corruptly administered and that others had become obsolete. But his central point was that affirmative action had addressed real racial and gender injustices and that such programs needed to be continued. "Mend it, but don't end it," he declared.

Following his re-election, Clinton once again spoke up for the policy. In June 1997, he began his yearlong conversation on race with a speech that pointedly criticized Proposition 209, the initiative that had outlawed affirmative action in California public education, employment, and contracting. Noting that enrollments of racial minorities had plummeted at various campuses, Clinton averred that "we must not resegregate higher education."

Most recently, in December 1999, he supported affirmative action by

urging
resistance to the efforts of Florida's Republican governor, Jeb Bush, to
replace
the practice.

In addition to embracing affirmative action himself, Clinton has
repeatedly
appointed people who are sympathetic to it. His two Supreme Court choices,
Justices Ruth Bader Ginsburg and Stephen Breyer, typically assist
remedial or
compensatory race- and gender-conscious policies. And so too do his
influential
deputies throughout the federal bureaucracy.

Clinton suffered a terribly embarrassing defeat in his first term when
he
abandoned Lani Guinier, his nominee to head the Civil Rights Division of
the
Justice Department, after conservatives labeled her a "quota queen." But
the
people he elevated in her stead have shared her core pro-affirmative
action
views.

What Clinton has not done is reshape the intellectual or political
terrain on
which affirmative action sits so precariously. But he has masterfully
defended
the status quo.

The fate of affirmative action now rests largely in the hands of whoever
captures the White House in November. Whatever the future brings, it is
clear
that Bill Clinton's effort to keep affirmative action alive constitutes an
important part of his legacy.

Randall Kennedy teaches at Harvard Law School.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 9, 2000

15 of 16 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 The Tribune Co. Publishes The Tampa Tribune

The Tampa Tribune

March 6, 2000, Monday, FINAL EDITION

SECTION: NATION/WORLD, Pg. 1

LENGTH: 1449 words

HEADLINE: State's black voters central;

BYLINE: WILLIAM MARCH, of The Tampa Tribune;

BODY:

TAMPA - Displeasure with Gov. Jeb Bush's One Florida plan may bring out a black Democratic vote.

Florida's black voters in this year's primary and general elections are feeling tugs from many directions: the need to fight threats to affirmative action, unprecedented Republican attempts to be more racially inclusive, and abiding loyalty to a damaged president who is still a political hero to many of them.

How they respond could decide how this year's primary and presidential elections go.

In Florida, blacks who became disillusioned with the Democratic Party in the 1998 election are returning, their political interests aroused by the affirmative action battle.

That could threaten the Republican Party's hold on the state if the issue draws black voters to the polls in November. Democratic activists are pushing the issue hard as a unifying force against Republican Gov. Jeb Bush and his brother, front-running Republican presidential candidate and Texas Gov. George W. Bush.

The affirmative action fight, and George W. Bush's rightward drift as he seeks to fend off a primary challenge from Arizona Sen. John McCain, are jeopardizing the efforts he and Jeb Bush have been making for two years to bring more blacks and other minorities into their political base.

Within the Democratic Party, black voters, President Clinton's strongest supporters, are transferring much of that loyalty to Vice President Al Gore,

giving Gore a strong advantage in his race against former New Jersey Sen. Bill Bradley.

For these reasons and others, including racial profiling by police and racial imbalance in use of the death penalty, race is becoming the dominating issue in this year's Florida and national elections, said University of South Florida political scientist Susan MacManus.

"We've seen more (race issues) than (in) any year in the last decade, and that's going to continue because America is becoming a more diverse country," she said.

BRADLEY'S CAMPAIGN has failed to take hold among blacks even though he made racial issues the focus of his platform from the start. A recent Florida poll showed black Democrats leaning 77 percent to 14 percent for Gore.

Several Tampa Bay area black voters, both Bradley and Gore backers, said that's because Clinton has long had a special empathy with blacks.

Black poet Toni Morrison even called him "the first black president."

"He relates," said Lyn Harris of St. Petersburg, a black Bradley supporter.

Hillsborough County Commissioner Tom Scott, another black Gore backer, attributes black loyalty to Gore to the administration's record of minority and female appointments.

During Clinton's impeachment trial, Scott said, black TV viewers noticed something different from whites: several black people in positions close to the president, including assistant White House counsel Cheryl Mills.

Seeing a black woman representing Clinton when his political life was on the line "gave people a sense of pride for the community," Scott said.

That frustrates black Bradley supporters like Bertha Smith of Fort Lauderdale.

"A lot of people just look at it as 'Clinton-Gore' and cannot separate the two," she said. "I'm trying to tell them, you are not voting for President Clinton, you're voting for Al Gore."

BUT IF RACE issues are working for Gore, they seem to be working against his likely Republican opponent.

On Tuesday, the opening day of the Florida Legislature's 2000 session, opponents of Jeb Bush's One Florida plan will hold a march in Tallahassee, hoping for thousands of participants.

Bush's plan would end race and gender criteria for admission to state universities and state contracting.

But some of the marchers will have a political agenda as well as a race- or gender-based one - directed at the Bush brothers.

At a small rally in downtown Tampa on Thursday, aimed at drumming up enthusiasm for the march, National Organization for Women activist Barbara

DeVane Gilberg told a crowd that if the opponents have their way, "Jeb Bush is not going to get a second term as governor ... George W. Bush is not going to get a term as president." Sensing a unifying issue, Democrats are looking for any way to hang the charge of racism on the Bush brothers. The issue has become a trap for the Bushes.

When George W. Bush appeared at the conservative Christian Bob Jones University in South Carolina, hoping to energize conservative voters to stop

McCain in that state's primary last month, Democrats seized on the school's historical segregationist policies.

And when Jeb Bush defended his brother by citing his own recent appearances

before groups whose views he didn't share, including a synagogue and a crowd of

One Florida opponents, Democrats promptly accused him of comparing Jews and minorities to the segregationist university.

Bush could only protest that his remarks were taken out of context and that he never made any such comparison.

THE SITUATION is a clear contrast to 1998, when Jeb Bush's campaign, with its heavy emphasis on inner city education and the problems of minorities, helped him peel several black legislators away from the Democratic Party, and, some

analysts say, won him a significant number of black votes.

One of those legislators, state Sen. Willie Logan of Opa-locka, helped spark disaffection among black Democrats when he declared independence of the party in 1998 after being ousted from a party leadership post.

He endorsed Bush for governor and is now running for the U.S. Senate as a no-party candidate.

But Ward Connerly's petition drive to abolish affirmative action undercut Bush's effort by polarizing the state.

Bush proposed One Florida at least partly in hope of forestalling Connerly's petition drive, which would likely create a massive minority voter turnout - dangerous for Republicans - if it was on the ballot.

Now, Logan and other black legislators who endorsed Bush are being pushed back toward the Democratic fold, in the face of the widespread opposition to his plan. Logan, for example, hopes to speak at Tuesday's march, "so I think it's clear he has some problems with the plan," his campaign adviser Mike Abrams said.

IN TEXAS, George W. Bush escaped a racial backlash because a court struck down race and gender preferences in university admissions.

In response, he instituted a plan that later served as the model for One Florida: guaranteeing public university admission to the top 10 percent of all high school graduates. One Florida makes that 20 percent.

The result, said David Hill, Republican political consultant from Houston, was that George W. Bush was perceived by some Texas minority leaders not as destroying affirmative action, but saving some remnant of it.

"They could trot out Hispanic and black leaders who will say George W. stood up for diversity," Hill said.

Even so, there's a chance Jeb Bush's bad luck still could rebound against his brother.

"Presidential politics has always been a family affair," which means the Florida governor's problems could reflect on the Texas governor's campaign, said USF's MacManus.

An anti-Bush minority vote in Florida could hurt the Texas governor's chances of winning the state, a key building block in assembling enough Electoral College votes to capture the presidency.

"Only with a sizable black turnout can a Democrat carry Florida," MacManus added. "That could be decisive in the presidential race in Florida, and in the U.S. Senate race."

In that race, a well-known Democrat, Insurance Commissioner Bill Nelson, and two well-known Republicans, Education Commissioner Tom Gallagher and U.S. Rep. Bill McCollum of Altamonte Springs, along with Logan, are seeking to replace Connie Mack.

But outside of Florida, George W. Bush may be immune from any damage, partly because of his actions back in Texas, said David Bositis, analyst at the Joint Center, a leading black think tank.

"I have no doubt the Democrats will use affirmative action to mobilize minority voters as much as they can," Bositis said. "But George W. Bush has shown some sensitivity with regard to affirmative action, and so has Jeb Bush. They haven't come out attacking it and have proposed alternatives that some people may find in some ways as generous as the status quo." William March covers politics and can be reached at (813) 259-7761 or wmarch@tampatrib.com
INSIDE

Republican John McCain and Democrat Bill Bradley express hope of catching their parties' presidential front-runners on "Super Tuesday."

THIS SECTION-3

GRAPHIC: PHOTO 3(2C),

State Sen. Willie Logan may be being pushed away from Gov. Jeb Bush.

LOAD-DATE: March 9, 2000

Copyright 2000 The Commercial Appeal

The Commercial Appeal (Memphis, TN)

March 5, 2000, SUNDAY, FINAL EDITION

SECTION: NEWS, Pg. A4

LENGTH: 416 words

HEADLINE: ALABAMA RALLY PROMOTES SOUTH'S INDEPENDENCE

BYLINE: Jay Reeves The Associated Press

DATELINE: MONTGOMERY, Ala.

BODY:

A group that wants the South to secede from the Union staged a Confederate flag-waving rally Saturday, a day before President Clinton was to lead marchers across a Selma bridge to mark the 35th anniversary of the civil rights movement's "Bloody Sunday."

Rebel yells rose from the steps of Alabama's Capitol. Bagpipers playing Dixie joined Civil War re-enactors dressed in gray and butterscotch uniforms in a parade to the building where Jefferson Davis took the oath as president of the Confederacy in 1861.

Afterward, members of the Southern nationalist organization that staged the rally signed a "Declaration of Southern Cultural Independence," described as the first step in what they hope is a second secession.

"The national culture of the United States is violent and profane, coarse and rude, cynical and deviant, and repugnant to the Southern people and to every people with authentic Christian sensibilities," the document reads.

"Independence now!" chanted the crowd. Hundreds signed petitions demanding that the flag with its familiar X-design be returned to the Capitol dome, where it used to fly.

"We have a cultural heritage we are proud of and we will defend it by all honorable means," said Michael Hill, president of the Tuscaloosa-based League of the South, which put the event together.

Police and Hill estimated the crowd at 2,500.

As speakers criticized groups that say the Confederate flag is a symbol of racism and hate, a congressional delegation led by Rep. John Lewis (D-Ga.) toured civil rights sites in Birmingham and Montgomery.

Lewis's group is to join Clinton today in Selma for the anniversary of "Bloody Sunday," the day that scores of black voting rights demonstrators were beaten by state troopers and sheriff's officers as they crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge on a march to Montgomery.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is trying to pressure South Carolina through a tourism boycott to remove the flag from its Capitol dome.

In Alabama, a judge ruled in 1993 that only the state and national flags were allowed to fly above the seat of government. Then-Gov. Jim Folsom Jr. did not follow the ruling.

As the rally began, a biracial group called One Montgomery met at the nearby Civil Rights Memorial, with Mayor Bobby Bright on hand, to promote racial harmony.

"We want to stay in the Union. We don't want racism and hate," said Anne Torma of Birmingham, a U.S. flag draped over her shoulder.

GRAPHIC: photo;

By Dave Martin/AP;

An estimated 2,500 supporters of a "Declaration of Southern Cultural Independence" rally at the Alabama state Capitol Saturday. Hundreds signed petitions calling for the resumption of flying the Confederate battle flag over the Capitol.

LOAD-DATE: March 9, 2000

***** Email Completed *****

Time of Delivery: March 9, 2000 11:23 am EST

Email Number: 59:0:7212474

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Kimberlin L. Love (CN=Kimberlin L. Love/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:24-MAR-2000 17:25:53.00

SUBJECT: Gays in the Military Document

TO: Paul J. Weinstein Jr. (CN=Paul J. Weinstein Jr./OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Could you two please read and respond ASAP.

Thanks, Kimberlin===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D77]ARMS22091798Q.046 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

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

GAYS IN THE MILITARY
March 24, 2000

Background: Today, the Pentagon released a report by the Inspector General on "The Military Environment with Respect to the Homosexual Conduct Policy." This report provides results from a survey of military personnel in each of the Services asking their views on how the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Harass" policy is being implemented. The survey found that:

- *80% of the respondents had heard derogatory comments about homosexuals in the last 12 months;*
- *85% believe such comments were tolerated;*
- *37% had witnessed harassment;*
- *5% had witnessed some form of physical abuse; and*
- *46% believed the current policy is only slightly or not effective.*

What is your reaction to the Pentagon report on harassment directed at homosexuals serving in the military?

- As the results of this report clearly indicate, the current policy is not working.
- Homosexuals should be allowed to serve their country without discrimination.
- I am committed to changing the policy to end this form of discrimination.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	The RDG to Sarah T. Holewinski at 10:04:57.00. Subject: Re: mardi gras pictures. (1 page)	03/27/2000	Personal Misfile

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[03/06/2000 - 04/22/2000]

2015-0017-F
ab1572

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: "LEXIS ("LEXIS /NEXIS Print Delivery" <lexis-nexis@prod.lexis-nexis.com> (R) (R) [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-MAR-2000 11:46:04.00

SUBJECT: civil rights

TO: Irene Bueno (CN=Irene Bueno/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
LEXIS-NEXIS Universe Update Report: March 30, 2000 at 11:18

Results from this Update: 10

Next Update: March 30, 2000 at 16:00

Access your results at:
http://web.lexis-nexis.com/in.universe/pnews/emailAlert?_pnewsAlert=0x000101a9-0x00004b26%2f0x000101a9%2f20000330%2f11%3a18%3a07

1 of 10 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 The Financial Times Limited

Financial Times (London)

March 30, 2000, Thursday USA Edition 1

SECTION: WORLD NEWS: THE US AND CANADA; Pg. 5

LENGTH: 380 words

HEADLINE: WORLD NEWS: THE US AND CANADA: Coca-Cola meets Jackson over race suit

BYLINE: By BETTY LIU

DATELINE: ATLANTA

BODY:

Civil rights leader Jesse Jackson met senior Coca-Cola officials yesterday to press the company to settle a racial discrimination suit and warned that campaigners would go ahead with a protest tour if an agreement is not reached quickly.

Mr Jackson, long an outspoken critic of the lack of diversity in the higher echelons of business, has helped turn the battle against Coke into a larger fight against racism in corporate America, noting that in spite of the end of segregation, there are still "artificial barriers" against minority workers that must be torn down.

Flanked by local civil rights leaders and former and current Coca-Cola employees in Atlanta, Mr Jackson told reporters that the plaintiffs want a "fair and honourable settlement". He called on Coke to open its doors to minorities and outlined four steps he said the company should take to avoid confrontation with black employees and consumers.

Apart from reaching a quick settlement, Mr Jackson said Coke needed to include more minorities in business partnerships, ensure that black employees who spoke out against the company were not punished and that workers were promoted on merit alone, not as the plaintiffs allege, on the basis of race.

Eight former and current employees are suing Coca-Cola for discrimination, accusing the company of paying them less than white counterparts and repeatedly passing them over for promotion in favour of whites.

Mr Jackson emphasised the importance of blacks to Coke, noting how they constitute 25 per cent of the consumer base in the US and 44 per cent of the youth market.

Mr Jackson met Douglas Daft, Coke chairman, and president, Jack Stahl, at corporate headquarters yesterday morning and will again today. He noted that Mr Daft and his team are committed to working on a speedy settlement and that they are "forward-looking".

"The ball is in Coke's corner" to settle the lawsuit.

About 150 former Coke employees plan to tour several cities in mid-April to rally against the company, finishing their ride on the front steps of the building where Coke will hold its shareholders meeting April 19.

The tour, if it takes place, would be a huge embarrassment to Coke which

touts a public image of being one of the most diverse global companies.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 30, 2000

2 of 10 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Inc.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch

March 30, 2000, Thursday, FIVE STAR LIFT EDITION

SECTION: EDITORIAL, Pg. B6

LENGTH: 350 words

HEADLINE: TIME FOR EQUALITY

BODY:

MISSOURI LEGISLATURE

THIS morning, the Missouri Senate Rules Committee will hear testimony on an idea apparently as radical and subversive today as it was a century ago: the equality of women under the law.

Partisans on both sides will state their views on the Equal Rights Amendment, the simply worded constitutional guarantee of equal rights: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex."

To be sure, it is strange that the Equal Rights Amendment has been resurrected -- and in Missouri, of all places, where the unsuccessful battle to pass it was particularly hard fought. The ERA died in 1982 after only 35 of 38 states needed for its ratification approved it.

The ERA's defeat was one of the signal events in the emergence of the New Right. Even so, the conservative victory didn't reverse all the changes in women's, and men's, lives. Women's equality has not yet been achieved, but immense progress toward that goal has been made. And -- guess what? -- civilization is still standing.

What's most baffling about the return of the ERA is the opposition to

it. At
a time when women have served with honor and distinction in the military,
when
two women sit on the U.S. Supreme Court, when a woman is secretary of
state and
when girls in record numbers are shooting hoops and kicking soccer balls,
the
ERA and women's equality should be about as controversial as apple pie and
motherhood.

Instead, the hoary, scare stories get trotted out: The ERA will lead to
taxpayer-financed abortions and same-sex marriages. There's no evidence
that any
of that is true, but that's not the point anyway. Abortion and
homosexuality are
emotional buzzwords, like the famed unisex toilets before them, meant to
short-circuit rational debate.

Before legislators vote on the ERA, they should look into the trusting
eyes
of their daughters and granddaughters and think about their futures. Do
they
really want to have to explain some day why they voted to deny them the
constitutional guarantee of equality?

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: March 30, 2000

3 of 10 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 The Cincinnati Enquirer

The Cincinnati Enquirer

March 29, 2000, Wednesday TRISTATE EDITION

SECTION: METRO, Pg. B02

LENGTH: 796 words

HEADLINE: Pregame prayer in schools to be debated; U.S. Supreme Court will
hear
Texas case

BYLINE: BEN L. KAUFMAN

SOURCE: The Cincinnati Enquirer

BODY:

Pregame team prayer was a jolt to basketball player Heather Livingstone
when

she transferred to Northern Kentucky University last fall.

A Wisconsin Synod Lutheran, her prayer always has been a "personal thing."

But there they were, new teammates and coaches, in a prayer huddle in NKU's locker room before warm-ups.

"In the beginning, I just did it because that's what we did," Ms. Livingstone recalled Tuesday. "I saw it not as weird but as different."

Ms. Livingstone, 21, of Winneconne, Wis., said she soon found moments in prayer huddles comforting. "It's something that I enjoy now."

Today, the constitutionality of pregame prayer will be argued in the U.S. Supreme Court in a case arising from Texans' civil religion of football.

It will be the first major appeal involving public high school prayer since 1992, when the justices barred clergy-led invocations at graduation.

At issue is whether public school districts can allow students to initiate and lead prayers over the public-address system before the football games.

Identities of the two families that brought the suit - Catholic and Mormon - were sealed by the courts. They said the Santa Fe, Texas, school district's policy of allowing students to lead prayers at home football games violated First Amendment church-state separation by creating a "pervasive religious atmosphere."

A federal trial judge disagreed and allowed student-led "nonsectarian and nonproselytizing" prayer at public high school football games.

However, a year ago, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 5th Circuit reversed that decision. It said football games are not solemn enough to warrant organized prayer.

That's wrong, said Dave Hazelwood in Trenton, Ohio, who wishes everyone would keep hands off pregame prayer in public high schools.

"Christians have rights, too," he said Tuesday from his office as athletics director for Edgewood schools. "It's a right that we have."

He said Edgewood parents, players and educators have embraced pregame prayers as part of school life for 30 years. "It's their belief that it should be done."

Mr. Hazelwood gives the schedules for varsity football and boys basketball to the local ministerial association. Volunteer clergy lead pregame prayers in the gym or on the field.

Some pray in Jesus' name, some don't, Mr. Hazelwood said. "We have never had any serious complaint," he said, adding that visiting coaches and players often praise the prayers, wishing their schools did the same.

The clergy pray for good sportsmanship and injury-free games rather than for the home team to win, he added.

No one expects a civil rights suit over NKU student-led team prayers, largely because federal courts worry less about coercive peer pressure on college students than on high schoolers.

Ms. Livingston's teammate, freshman Kristin Polosky, 18, said she always prayed before a game at Mapletown High School in Greensboro, Pa.

At NKU, Ms. Polosky said, no one tells the women to pray before a game. "It's kind of a ritual thing."

Another teammate, Suzie Smith, 19 and a Baptist, said she was comfortable with the prayer huddle because it was a tradition at her alma mater, Boone County High School.

Ms. Polosky, a Roman Catholic, doesn't even mind using the Protestant version of the Lord's Prayer.

"It's all praying to God, so it doesn't bother me," she said.

Norse women don't pray to win, Ms. Polosky said. Rather, the teammate chosen to lead the prayer frequently gives thanks for the players' gifts and skills and asks God's care for fans and families who travel to see them play.

If anyone objected to team prayer because NKU is a public campus, Ms. Polosky said, "We'd probably do it ourselves."

Civil rights lawyers said they knew of no challenges to such prayers on public college campuses.

Similarly, the American Jewish Committee in Cincinnati and the American Civil Liberties Union in Ohio and Kentucky said they had no complaints about prayer in Tristate public schools, whether over public address systems or in locker rooms or on the field before athletic competitions.

However, the head football coach at a London, Ohio, high school resigned in January after being sued by the ACLU for leading his players in prayer.

Dave Daubenmire continued to coach after the case was settled in October but became frustrated by the publicity.

The suit describes an eight-year period during which coaches delivered religious sermons, coordinated student prayer sessions and conducted mandatory prayer sessions before and after games.

The complaint, which also named assistant coaches and the London school board, was filed on behalf of parents who complained that the prayer sessions violated the separation of church and state.

LOAD-DATE: March 30, 2000

4 of 10 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Sun-Sentinel Company

Sun-Sentinel (Fort Lauderdale, FL)

March 29, 2000, Wednesday, Broward Metro EDITION

SECTION: EDITORIAL, Pg. 31A

LENGTH: 858 words

HEADLINE: STATE COURTS BEING USED TO ADD RIGHTS

BYLINE: ROBERT A. SCHAPIRO

BODY:

The decision earlier this month by the Vermont House of Representatives to recognize same-sex "civil unions" was a milestone in a three-year crusade by a

lesbian couple in Vermont -- and marked a step forward for gay activists in their drive for social recognition. The case also sheds light on what will probably be the future direction of judicial efforts to ensure civil rights in America.

Lois Farnham and Holly Puterbaugh have been a couple for almost 30 years. Together, they own a house and a Christmas tree farm and have raised an adopted daughter. And together, they sought a marriage license. When they appeared at the town clerk's office, they were turned away.

Feeling that they were being discriminated against, Farnham and Puterbaugh filed suit, asserting along with two other same-sex couples that state law violated their constitutional rights. But, in keeping with a growing trend in civil rights cases, the constitution whose protection they invoked was the state constitution, not the U.S. Constitution.

At a time when federal courts generally take a narrow view of individual rights -- a far cry from the expansive vision of the 1960s and '70s -- state courts have provided a significant alternative avenue for relief. In a variety of settings, they have interpreted their states' constitutions to protect rights beyond those guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution.

But don't look to state courts to make the sweeping rulings associated with the era of Supreme Court Chief Justice Earl Warren. Because of the cautious, cooperative nature of state courts, plaintiffs often fail to receive full satisfaction there -- as the Vermont case amply illustrates.

In December, the Vermont Supreme Court ruled in favor of Farnham and Puterbaugh, arguing that the state could not deny them the benefits that it accorded to couples of different sexes. But the court left it up to the state Legislature to implement its decision. The bill approved by the Vermont House allows same-sex couples to form civil unions that carry many of the benefits and responsibilities of traditional marriages, but stopped short of legalizing gay marriage. Members of the Vermont Senate have raised questions but are expected to approve the bill, and the governor says he'll sign it.

In recognizing significant new protections for individuals, the Vermont Supreme Court was not alone. The Georgia Supreme Court struck down the state's ban on sodomy. Courts in dozens of states have required greater equalization of funding for public schools throughout the state. In each instance, the U.S. Supreme Court had rejected the same claim when asserted under the federal Constitution.

That is not to suggest that state constitutions have rendered the federal Bill of Rights obsolete. Not all plaintiffs fare well in state court. Truly unpopular groups, such as prisoners and fringe religious sects, have found little success there.

Further, even when courts recognize state constitutional rights, effective remedies may prove elusive. The distinguishing features of federal courts in the 1960s and '70s were not simply their broad aspirations for recognizing rights, but also their deep commitment to providing remedies. Federal courts assumed day-to-day control of schools, prisons and mental hospitals, even ordering tax increases to fund reform efforts. State courts have been far more reluctant to intrude on traditional legislative terrain.

That stems in part from the differing natures of the federal and state constitutions. The cumbersome amendment process makes the U.S. Constitution relatively impervious to change; in more than 200 years, it has been amended only 27 times. State constitutions, on average, have been amended more than 100 times each -- some far more than that.

If citizens disagree with the Supreme Court's interpretation of the U.S. Constitution, their likely response might be to organize massive demonstrations.

If people are outraged by a decision granting a right under a state constitution, their response might be to try to change the constitution.

But perhaps most significant is the fact that state judges enjoy less insulation from politics than their federal counterparts. Unlike federal judges, who are appointed for life, most state judges are subject to regular electoral review.

Sensitive to popular sentiments, then, state courts tend toward

cooperation
rather than confrontation. This spirit both limits the scope of any legal
right
and allows substantial delays in its implementation.

Some scholars, such as University of Chicago political scientist Gerald
Rosenberg, have questioned whether the apparently dramatic federal court
decisions of the Warren era were the true cause of meaningful social
change. The
reforms that did occur, Rosenberg argues, required an underlying political
consensus.

So it may be that the practical results of federal litigation depend
just as
much on popular opinion as do state constitutional rulings.

Schapiro teaches constitutional law at Emory University School of Law.
He
wrote this for The Washington Post, 1150 15th St. NW, Washington, DC
20071.

LOAD-DATE: March 30, 2000

5 of 10 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Chicago Tribune Company

Chicago Tribune

March 29, 2000 Wednesday, CHICAGO SPORTS FINAL EDITION

SECTION: Commentary; Pg. 19; ZONE: N

LENGTH: 777 words

HEADLINE: LOCKED UP IN THE CENSUS COUNT

BYLINE: By Tracy Huling and Marc Mauer. Tracy Huling is producer of "Yes,
In My
Backyard," a documentary examining rural dependence on prisons. Marc
Mauer is
the assistant director of The Sentencing Project and the author of "Race
to
Incarcerate."

BODY:

As the nation prepares to complete the census, a little-known counting
provision portends what might appear to be an unheralded triumph of
integration--significant black and Hispanic populations in once
lily-white rural
towns. These demographics are not the legacy of the civil-rights movement,
though. Rather, the new minority denizens of rural America are part of the
nation's burgeoning prison population.

The census counts inmates, mostly residents of inner-city communities, as part of the populations of towns where they are incarcerated. The combined impact of this regulation and the near doubling of the prison population since 1990 could yield a substantial shift in government dollars and political power from urban to rural areas.

Prisons have become a growth industry in rural America and the majority of new prisons are now built in rural communities. Between 1980-1991, 213 prisons were constructed in rural communities.

Prison officials have long sought to locate prisons in rural areas, in part due to lower land values and often against the wishes of local residents. But many local elected officials now actively lobby for new prisons. Last year, 27 communities in Illinois offered financial incentives to the state in a bid to secure a new prison. In large part this reflects the changing economics of rural areas. The decline of the family farm and the relocation of manufacturing jobs overseas have left many towns bereft of a strong economic base. Compounding this is the prison system's reduced emphasis on rehabilitation. Why bother locating prisons near an inmate's family and community when warehousing has become the primary rationale for incarceration?

Housing prisoners in rural counties across America is reversing a long-standing trend of population loss. In Coxsackie, N.Y., 3,000 of the town's 7,000 residents are inmates; more than half of Corcoran, California's population of 21,000 are locked in prison. And as rural communities gain inmates, these communities harvest federal cash and political clout through funding formulas tied to population counts.

As the deadline for the census approaches, more localities are rushing to get their piece of the pie. Last year, an Arizona law permitting municipalities to annex prisons set off a bidding war between the towns of Gila and Buckeye for neighboring prisons. Buckeye won and as a result expects to receive \$1.3

million
in additional government revenue.

Federal legislation introduced last year by Wisconsin Rep. Mark Green would allow states to count the prisoners they ship out of state as their own. In introducing the legislation, Green noted his concern for the loss of a congressional seat for his state as a result of its contracting to house thousands of prisoners out of state.

Not surprisingly, the benefits that rural communities derive from the census count come at the expense of urban neighborhoods, whose members represent a substantial portion of the inmates in rural prisons. In New York State, for example, while 89 percent of prisoners are housed in rural areas, three-quarters of the inmate population come from just seven neighborhoods in New York City. These neighborhoods, and prisoners generally, are disproportionately composed of low-income minorities--half of all inmates are African-American and one-sixth Latino. Thus, the urban communities hit hardest by both crime and criminal justice policies are now similarly disadvantaged by losing funding and political influence through the reapportionment process.

The rural rush to build prisons is especially disturbing given that much of the growth in incarceration stems from the "war on drugs" that began in the 1980s. With 11 times as many drug offenders now incarcerated as in 1980, national drug and sentencing policies have vastly accelerated the transfer of inmates from urban to rural communities.

The impact of an expanding prison system on political influence is but one of a set of what might be considered unintended consequences of America's zeal to incarcerate. What does it mean, for example, for black males born today to know that three of every 10 can expect to do time in prison in their lifetimes? Or that nearly 4 million Americans will be locked out of voting in the presidential election as a result of a current or past felony conviction?

Both urban and rural communities face serious economic problems. But the elaborate shell game of ever-increasing incarceration distracts us from pursuing

more constructive economic development while failing to address the underlying problems of poverty and substance abuse that contribute so significantly to crime.

GRAPHIC: GRAPHICGRAPHIC: Illustration by D.B. Johnson.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 30, 2000

6 of 10 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 The Des Moines Register, Inc.

The Des Moines Register

March 28, 2000, Tuesday

SECTION: Metro Iowa Pg.6

LENGTH: 413 words

HEADLINE: Bills

SOURCE: Staff

BODY:

SIGNED BY THE GOVERNOR:

HF2333 -Relates to authorization to provide emergency and non-emergency medical care services.

HF2105 -Adopts the nurse licensure compact.

PASSED IN THE SENATE:

SF2416 -Regards appropriations of petroleum overcharge funds. Vote: 46-0.
Sent to the House.

SF2429 -Regards appropriations to the Department for the Blind, Iowa State Civil Rights Commission, Department of Elder Affairs, Iowa Department of Public Health, Department of Human Rights, the Governor's Alliance on Substance Abuse and the Commission of Veterans Affairs. Vote: 30-19. Sent to the House.

HF2512 -Relates to certain violations attributed to motor vehicles rented

from motor vehicle rental companies. Vote: 46-0. Sent to the governor.

PASSED IN THE HOUSE:

SF2212 -Regards administration of Clerk of Court offices. Vote: 99-0.
Sent to
governor.

SF2303 -Regards benefits applicable to Judicial Branch employees, the allocation of magistrates, and manner of making certain non-court and administrative appointments. Vote: 95-2. Sent to Senate.

HF683 -Regards mediation services related to custody, visitation and support
of a child. Vote: 97-0. Sent to Senate.

SF2321 -Regards eligibility categories and transfer of assets for medical
assistance. Vote: 100-0. Sent to governor.

SF2036 -Repeals the Upper Mississippi River Compact. Vote: 97-0. Sent to governor.

SF2411 -Regards public retirement systems. Vote: 96-0. Sent to Senate.

HF2172 -Regards polygraph examinations of applicants for certain law enforcement positions. Vote: 93-7. Sent to governor.

SF2266 -Changes the number and the qualifications of general officers in the
Iowa National Guard and increases the membership of the Emergency Response Commission. Vote: 100-0. Sent to governor.

SF 228 -Authorizes school districts and non-public schools to perform certain
criminal and abuse record checks. Vote: 99-0. Sent to Senate.

SF2079 -Prohibits shipping or importing into the state, or the offering for
sale, selling, transporting, distributing, or possessing within the state of
cigarettes and tobacco products which were previously exported from or manufactured outside the United States. Vote: 99-0. Sent to Senate.

SF2371 -Establishes a water quality initiative program by the
Department of
Agriculture and Land Stewardship and DNR. Vote: 99-0. Sent to the Senate.

To learn more about these and other bills, check out the Legislature's
Web
site at: www.legis.state.ia.us

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: March 30, 2000

7 of 10 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 American Lawyer Newspapers Group, Inc.

The American Lawyer

March 2000

SECTION: Slings & Arrows

LENGTH: 460 words

HEADLINE: Affirmative Defense

BYLINE: By Randall Kennedy

BODY:

When it came to affirmative action, Clinton stood firm. President Clinton will deserve considerable credit or blame, depending on your politics, if affirmative action survives many more decades. Early on he boasted that he would select a cabinet that "looks like America" and then proceeded to seek out racial minorities and women appointees. That a cabinet (or faculty or jury or firm) should demographically resemble its jurisdiction was not conceived by Clinton. But he popularized the idea and helped make it a norm by which many people judge leaders and organizations. Later, after initiating a highly publicized review of the policy, the president declared on July 15, 1995, that "affirmative action has been good for America." He conceded that some affirmative action programs had been sloppily or even corruptly administered and that others had become obsolescent. But his central point was that affirmative action had addressed racial and gender injustices and that such programs needed to be continued. "Mend it, don't end it," he declared. Two years later, with a second presidential campaign in the offing, Clinton once again supported the policy. He began his yearlong conversation on race with a speech that pointedly criticized Proposition 209, the initiative that had outlawed affirmative action in California public education. Noting that enrollments of racial minorities

had plummeted at various campuses, Clinton averred that "we must not resegregate higher education." In December 1999, Clinton again supported affirmative action, urging resistance to efforts by Florida's Republican governor Jeb Bush to replace it. In addition to embracing affirmative action himself, Clinton has appointed people who are also sympathetic to it. His two appointees to the Supreme Court, Ruth Bader Ginsburg and Stephen Breyer, typically assist remedial or compensatory race and gender conscious policies. And so too do his influential deputies throughout the federal bureaucracy. Clinton suffered a terribly embarrassing defeat in his first term when he abandoned Lani Guinier, his nominee to head the civil rights division of the Justice Department, after conservatives labelled her a "Quota Queen." But the people he elevated in her stead shared her core pro-affirmative action views. Clinton has not shifted the intellectual or political terrain on which affirmative action is precariously situated. But he has masterfully defended the affirmative action status quo. Its fate, of course, will depend largely on who captures the White House in November. Whatever happens, though, it is clear that Bill Clinton's effort to keep affirmative action alive constitutes an important part of his legacy. Randall Kennedy teaches at Harvard Law School.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 30, 2000

8 of 10 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 American Lawyer Newspapers Group, Inc.

The American Lawyer

March 2000

SECTION: Slings & Arrow

LENGTH: 1117 words

HEADLINE: Gay Rights Bashing

BYLINE: By Andrew Sullivan

BODY:

Clinton's performance wasn't simply hypocritical; it was cynically retrograde.

"I have a vision for America and you're part of it," candidate Bill Clinton told

awe-struck gay fund-raisers in his first run for the presidency eight years ago.

And it's true that, at the time, few presidential candidates had ever reached

out to gay voters as explicitly as Bill Clinton did. He was rewarded with unprecedented gay funding and gay support. Like many other groups wowed by Clinton's instant empathy, homosexual Americans soon learned their lesson. On

the plus side, it's undeniable that Clinton appointed more openly gay men and

lesbians to positions in his administration than any previous president.

With

Congressman Barney Frank's support, he outlawed antigay discrimination in federal employment, met frequently with gay groups, appointed a political liaison to the gay community, and made an openly gay man ambassador to, er,

Luxembourg. But these efforts fell squarely into the category of the minimum

payback necessary for the vast financial resources that gay men and women had

plowed into his candidacy. On the substantive issues of civil rights, where

there was even the minimal political price to pay, Clinton punted. The two related issues that would dominate his presidency, military service and marriage

rights, saw Clinton take positions squarely in the middle of the Republican party. In fact, no president has ever been the author of so much explicitly

antigay legislation. As commander in chief, Bill Clinton made the mistake of

raising such a tricky issue without committing the political capital to see it

through. The result was the tortured compromise of "don't ask, don't tell," the

main result of which was almost a doubling of the rate of discharge of gay and

lesbian members of the armed services. On Clinton's watch, military harassment

of gay soldiers, as recorded by the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, sharply increased. Witch-hunts became common; one young sailor had his face

smashed beyond recognition against a urinal in Japan by his fellow sailors; and

a young gay soldier was brutally battered to death with a baseball bat by U.S.

servicemen. Throughout this period of increasing violence and discrimination,

the Clinton Defense Department insisted that its policy was working, and

aggressively defended it in the courts. By the end of Clinton's term, the United States was the only NATO member except Turkey to maintain a ban on openly gay service members. It is very hard to see how a Republican president would have done worse. Indeed, President Bush did markedly better. On the other central gay issue of the decade, marriage rights, President Clinton, citing his personal convictions, signed the Defense of Marriage Act, barring equal rights for gay couples under federal law. He could have vetoed the bill, or let the bill pass without his signature, but, for political reasons, he actively endorsed it in the run-up to his reelection. His Justice Department did all that it could to support the bill in the committee hearings by endorsing the Republican position that the bill raised no constitutional concerns. His reelection campaign subsequently aired political ads on religious radio stations boasting of his position. (His Justice Department also refused to file an amicus brief in the Colorado Amendment 2 case. The amendment barred gay citizens from lobbying for non-discrimination law in the state of Colorado. The amendment was subsequently overturned by the U.S. Supreme Court in a ruling written by Anthony Kennedy, a Reagan appointee.) On AIDS, Clinton inaugurated his presidency by signing a law barring all HIV- positive immigrants from entering the United States, even for a vacation. Under the Clinton law, HIV is still an automatic bar to an immigrant becoming a permanent resident or citizen of the United States, unless he or she is already married to an American citizen of the opposite sex. No other developed country has such a punitive law. Clinton also signed a law that would have expelled all HIV-positive personnel from the military, a law that was subsequently repealed. In his second term, he consistently asked for less AIDS research funding than the Republican Congress eventually appropriated, and personally vetoed any federal involvement in needle exchange programs to prevent the spread of HIV among IV drug users. Under his administration, the rate of HIV infection, especially among the young, remained steady. Clinton's gay defenders argue that his emphasis was less on the volatile issues of marriage and the

military and more on the safe liberal terrain of employment nondiscrimination and hate crimes law. In these areas, they point out, Clinton

was hobbled by the Republican Congress after 1994, and that is undoubtedly true.

But it is also true that, after eight years, neither the Employment Nondiscrimination Act nor the extension of the federal Hate Crimes Law to include homosexuals has become law, or even close to it. It is also true that

Clinton made no effort to pass such laws in his first two years, despite a Democratic House and Senate. It is, then, another Clinton paradox: the most

progay president in history authoring the most antigay legislation ever passed.

My own view is that Clinton's support for gay rights, as with many other positions, is only understandable through the prism of money-politics. His record in Arkansas was execrable, and he took up the cause only when it seemed a

money-winner in the presidential race, and when it made available a critical new

constituency in the Democratic base. He has stuck to this calculation ever since, supporting gay rights only when the polls suggests he is on safe ground,

or when he can gain political money without causing offense. At no point in his

two terms did Clinton ever give a full-throated defense of gay equality to a

nongay audience; at no point did he take even the slightest political risk to

make progress. Sometimes, as when he signed the Defense of Marriage Act while

conducting an extramarital affair with an intern, the cynicism was breathtaking.

Most of the time, it was so deep as to be unnoticeable. And by co-opting a crucial part of the gay political leadership, Clinton also succeeded in dividing

the gay community and weakening it to a degree not seen since the early 1980s.

He used gay men and women as he used so many others, as political fuel for his

own ambition. They, and not he, have to live with the consequences. Andrew Sullivan is a contributing writer and columnist for The New York Times Magazine,

a senior editor at The New Republic and the author of *Virtually Normal: An Argument About Homosexuality*.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 30, 2000

9 of 10 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 American Lawyer Newspapers Group, Inc.

March 2000

SECTION: Slings & Arrows

LENGTH: 479 words

HEADLINE: The Judicial Tipping Point

BYLINE: By Clint Bolick

BODY:

Clinton's deceptively liberal appointments leave a federal bench in precarious balance. The most important issue by far in the coming presidential election is the judiciary. Whichever party prevails will get a rare "two-fer", winning not just the presidency but the judiciary as well. The federal judiciary is at a tipping point: President Clinton has appointed almost exactly half of all federal judges. Moreover, the U.S. Supreme Court is precariously balanced, with a 5-to-4 majority prevailing in the most divisive cases. Clinton has not expended significant capital on judicial nomination, and Republicans did temper his picks. But his judges are demonstrably more liberal than those appointed by Presidents Ronald Reagan and George Bush, especially on the Supreme Court. Most analyses have focused too much on the usually dominant majority, consisting of five Reagan/Bush justices. Rarely noticed is that the four-member minority, which includes Justices Ruth Bader Ginsburg and Stephen Breyer, is far more cohesively liberal. They are a mere vote away from taking the Court seriously leftward. On civil rights, Ginsburg and Breyer have voted consistently to uphold racial classifications in employment, contracting, voting, and school assignments. Their views show little evolution from decisions of the 1960s and 1970s that routinely sustained quotas and forced busing. On issues such as property rights and religious establishment, the pair strays far from the jurisprudential consensus developed over the past decade. Most distressingly, the Reagan/Bush appointees are much more likely to protect civil and economic

liberties. My colleague Scott Bullock and I tracked such cases from 1993 to 1996 and found that Ginsburg and Breyer were the most likely justices to side with the state against individual liberties. The impact carries over to the federal judiciary as a whole. In an assessment of the first two years of Clinton judges, I found that Clinton appointees tended to be more sympathetic to criminals and defendants, more inclined to favor civil rights plaintiffs and civil rights remedies, more disposed to plaintiffs in civil liability suits, and more hospitable to the sweeping exercise of judicial power. Whether the Clinton legal "evolution" is good or bad depends on one's perspective. Yes, Clinton shied away from fire-breathing liberals. And his judges often upheld precious freedoms, just not as often as Reagan/Bush judges. If you believe that the federal court's prime constitutional role is to protect individual liberties against majoritarian abuse, however, the trend is ominous. That it could be worse is slight consolation: It may get worse, and fast. Clint Bolick is litigation director at the Institute for Justice in Washington, D.C., and author of Transformation: The Promise and Politics of Empowerment (ICS Press, 1998).

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 30, 2000

10 of 10 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Information Access Company,
a Thomson Corporation Company;
ASAP

Copyright 2000 American Management Association

Management Review

February 1, 2000

SECTION: Pg. 38 ; ISSN: 0025-1895

IAC-ACC-NO: 59025288

LENGTH: 2721 words

HEADLINE: RELIGION in the Workplace; Brief Article

BYLINE: LEVY, TRACEY I.

BODY:

THE ISSUE

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 requires employers to accommodate employees' religious beliefs unless doing so would impose an undue hardship.

WHAT'S HAPPENING

Religious discrimination cases filed with the EEOC have been steadily increasing in recent years, and the 9th Circuit recently weighed in on the issue.

THE IMPLICATIONS

Employers who are uncertain of the legal standards in this area regularly struggle to balance their Title VII obligations with their needs for scheduling continuity.

ACTION PLAN

Managers should carefully consider requests for religious accommodation, assess their feasibility and base determinations on demonstrable evidence.

Over the past five years, the number of religious discrimination cases filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) has steadily increased.

Many of these cases charge that the company did not provide an accommodation that would allow the employee to observe his or her religious beliefs.

Requests for religious accommodation often come from employees who want to observe the Sabbath or take time off during the week for a religious holiday.

In either context, a company's obligations are the same. Under Title VII, employers are required to make a "reasonable accommodation" for an employee's "sincerely held" religious beliefs unless doing so would impose an "undue hardship."

Although simply stated, the standard is difficult to apply. How do you know if an employee's religious beliefs are "sincerely held"? Is that an

appropriate
thing to ask? What types of accommodations are "reasonable"? What is
meant by
"undue hardship"? These questions regularly perplex employers who are
trying to
meet their legal obligations without creating unnecessarily cumbersome
scheduling arrangements. Fortunately, the courts and the EEOC have
clarified
many of these issues.

SINCERITY IS RARELY QUESTIONED

The courts have consistently held that employees must demonstrate they
hold
a sincere religious belief that conflicts with the employer's
requirements. In
theory, sincerity may be questioned where an employee acts in a manner
inconsistent with his or her religious belief.

A company may also have evidence that the employee is using religious
doctrine as an excuse to disguise purely secular interests.

The burden of proving sincerity is not a heavy one, however, and the
courts
generally do not probe too deeply into this issue.

In one case, for example, a federal appellate court upheld a district
court's finding that a Jewish employee's request for a day off to observe
Yom
Kippur was prompted by a sincere religious belief, even though the
plaintiff had
readily conceded that she is not a very religious person and does not
observe
every Jewish holiday. The plaintiff credibly cited a series of recent
family
events that had led her to become more observant.

In another case, a Seventh Day Adventist sought an exemption from union
membership because it was contrary to his religion. The court accepted the
sincerity of the plaintiff's religious conviction, despite evidence that
other
Seventh Day Adventists were union members and that the plaintiff had
apparently
engaged in some conduct that conflicted with the tenets of his religion.

ACCOMMODATION REQUIRES SOME EFFORT

Assuming an employee's religious beliefs are sincerely held, the
company
must "reasonably" accommodate those beliefs if doing so would not pose an
undue
hardship.

The EEOC's Guidelines on Discrimination Because of Religion, along with

court decisions, suggest a variety of accommodations that might be considered reasonable. For example, a manager might facilitate a voluntary substitute and swap of work shifts among employees, use flexible scheduling, or offer a lateral transfer and change of job assignments.

Employees may suggest other accommodations.

Although the company should consider an employee's suggestions, it need not adopt the accommodation he or she has proposed. Rather, any reasonable accommodation is sufficient to meet the obligation. No attempt at accommodation is required if the employer can show that all possible options would impose an undue hardship on the business.

In the seminal case *TWA v. Hardison*, the U.S. Supreme Court held that an employer need not breach a collectively bargained seniority system to accommodate religious observances. Violating the seniority system, the Court concluded, would be unreasonable. However, the full Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit recently held in *Balint v. Carson City, Nevada* that the mere existence of a bona fide seniority system does not obviate the duty of reasonable accommodation.

Rather, an employer must actually explore whether the seniority system precludes all possible accommodations.

Only then can a request for accommodation be denied.

Even if a company has a seniority system, the courts generally expect employers to at least explore the feasibility of voluntary shift swaps (if needed) to accommodate employees' religious observance.

Companies have been held liable for religious discrimination when, at trial, employees testified that had they been asked, they would have been available to swap shifts with a plaintiff who wanted to observe the Sabbath. Liability has also been found when employers did not allow employees to post notices on the company bulletin board or otherwise make inquiries to secure voluntary replacements.

In departments that are continuously staffed year-round and where all employees do their share of weekend and holiday shifts, it may be feasible to allow a Saturday Sabbath observer to swap shifts and work Sundays,

holidays or other undesirable shifts. The State of California was held liable for religious discrimination a few years ago when it failed to accommodate a Seventh Day Adventist who worked in this type of round-the-clock environment. The plaintiff had offered to work his share of undesirable shifts on days other than Saturday, to trade shifts with other employees or to transfer to another position in the department.

The court held that California should have permitted him to arrange voluntary shift swaps or considered revising the shift schedule to accommodate the plaintiff. At the very least, the court reasoned, the state should have allowed these types of accommodations on a temporary basis so that it could determine what actual hardships (such as low morale or a trend of similar requests from other employees) would result.

This trial period also would have enabled the plaintiff and the state to attempt to locate another suitable position in the department that did not conflict with the plaintiff's religious observance.

LOW THRESHOLD FOR UNDUE HARDSHIP

While voluntary shift swaps generally do not impose any additional cost on the employer, the Supreme Court has held that any accommodation that would impose more than a "de minimis" cost is an undue hardship and is not required under Title VII.

This standard is considerably more deferential to employers than the "undue hardship" standard for excusing a failure to reasonably accommodate a disabled individual under the Americans with Disabilities Act. The more lax standard appears to reflect, at least in part, the Court's concern that granting one employee his Sabbath off by depriving another employee of his shift preference or incurring extra personnel costs would impermissibly favor the practices of the religiously observant over those of other faiths or the religiously nonobservant.

Thus, in the TWA case the Court held that the airline was not required to grant the plaintiff's request for a four-day work-week.

The employee worked in a critical department that had to be fully staffed at all times. Accordingly, TWA would have had to pull personnel from other departments to accommodate the plaintiff's reduced work schedule (thereby short-staffing those other departments) or employ someone at premium wages who was not regularly assigned to work Saturdays.

The Court found that either of these options would impose more than a de minimis cost and therefore was unreasonable.

In contrast, a federal appellate court held that General Motors did not suffer an undue hardship by allowing the plaintiff, a Saturday Sabbatarian, to leave work before sundown on Friday because GM had not incurred any additional cost during the three months that the plaintiff actually left work early. The plaintiff was not paid for the hours he did not work, and GM staffed his position from its regular crew of replacement workers at no additional cost.

Under the circumstances, the court held that the employee's termination was improper because GM did not suffer an undue hardship by permitting him to leave work early on Fridays. The court rejected as speculative the concerns that increased absenteeism might exhaust the replacement workers and halt production.

The court reasoned that undue hardship must be based on the situation as presented, and not on an anticipated hardship or the possible effect of multiple (as yet unreceived) requests for accommodation.

Similarly, the EEOC has adopted the position that undue hardship must be based on actual burdens, rather than speculative assumptions about the cumulative hardship that might result from meeting accommodation requests from other employees. The EEOC maintains that temporary financial costs, such as the infrequent payment of premium wages for a substitute while a more permanent accommodation is being sought, are de minimis and may be required under Title

VII. The EEOC has also indicated that an employer may reasonably be expected to incur administrative costs to arrange an accommodation and such costs would not be considered an undue hardship.

MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

Where does all this leave employers?

When a manager is approached about a need for a religious accommodation, several steps should be considered:

- * Meet with the employee to discuss accommodations. Consider the type of accommodation needed in each case-whether it's time off for a religious holiday or workday ceremony or a schedule change to accommodate Sabbath observance-and then explore possible accommodations.

When the Supreme Court held that TWA was not liable for religious discrimination, one of the factors it cited in the decision was that the company had met with the plaintiff several times to discuss possible accommodations.

Also, from a litigation standpoint, it is easier to defend a claim that you have failed to provide a religious accommodation if you can demonstrate that you considered all of the alternatives presented by the employee.

- * Facilitate voluntary shift swaps where appropriate. As noted earlier, the EEOC Guidelines clearly require- and TWA and subsequent decisions appear to establish-that companies consider arranging voluntary shift swaps for employees if they would satisfy the need for accommodation. The employer need not actually arrange the swap, but it should facilitate the process, such as by providing bulletin board space for employees to post requests to swap shifts. If the seniority system under a collective bargaining agreement precludes such swaps, the employer should ask the union to consider a waiver of that restriction.

- * Look for an alternative position for the employee. The EEOC and the courts have cited a reassignment to another position as a possible accommodation.

This option might work if a weekday position is available for the employee or if an employee has a religious objection to working in a particular department.

Last year, for example, a federal appellate court held that the City of

Chicago reasonably accommodated a police officer's religious objections to guarding an abortion clinic by offering to transfer him to a district that did not have any abortion clinics. The same was true for a hospital that reassigned an employee who objected to admitting patients for abortion procedures to a different clerical position that would not conflict with her religious beliefs.

A company needs to consider reassignments only when another position requiring the same degree of skills and abilities is actually available. It does not need to create a new position or demote an employee to address a request for religious accommodation.

- * Assess the cost of a replacement.

Before you reject any option that would require you to hire a part-time replacement for the employee, determine the actual financial burden involved. If the requesting employee is willing to work four days each week and the part-timer works the fifth day, the only costs may be to identify a replacement.

If, on the other hand, the cost of a replacement would be more than de minimis and require, for example, the payment of premium wages, extensive training costs or a serious loss in terms of productivity, the company will not be required to incur that expense. In any event, the process of calculating these costs should be documented.

- * Attempt an accommodation for a trial period. Even if an employer believes that shift swaps or a part-time replacement would not be feasible due to costs, the effect on morale or the risk that too many employees would request similar accommodations, the safest course would be to try the accommodation for a two-or three-month trial period.

A trial period will provide an accurate assessment of the costs involved and provide further evidence of a good-faith effort at accommodation. And if the inquiring employee is interested in switching shifts or positions but none are presently available, this period will give you a chance to identify alternative positions that would not conflict with the employee's religious observance. MR

Tracey I. Levy, an associate in the labor and employment law department of Proskauer Rose LLP, represents management in all types of federal and state employment litigation and related administrative proceedings, as well as labor arbitrations. She also provides advice and guidance to clients on a wide range of employment and labor law matters. E-mail: tlevy@proskauer.com

BRIEF CASES

SETTLEMENT OVER MINIMUM HEIGHT REQUIREMENT

Kohler Corp. agreed to pay \$ 886,500 for up to 2,000 women who may have been rejected for jobs because they did not meet the company's 5' 4" height requirement for positions such as machine operators, tub and enamel casters, brass finishers and assemblers. The Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance negotiated the settlement after performing a routine compliance review of hiring practices at one of Kohler's facilities. The height requirement was criticized as an arbitrary requirement that statistically tended to exclude women.

\$ 2.8 MILLION VERDICT FOR HARASSMENT BY FEMALE COWORKERS

A federal jury in Indiana recently awarded \$ 2.8 million in damages to the only male employee in a hospital's outpatient billing unit who claimed that his employment was terminated in retaliation for his complaint of sexual harassment. The employee had complained about a lewd flyer circulated by his female coworkers and claimed that he was "shunned and ostracized" by his coworkers and then terminated after complaining that female coworker had made a pass at him.

The hospital said he had been fired because he was rude to a patient, but the plaintiff presented evidence that his performance had been commended, that the hospital had failed to follow its grievance procedure and that no female employee had been disciplined or fired for rudeness.

JURIES RULE MORE FAVORABLY FOR PLAINTIFFS IN STATE COURT

According to a recent analysis of 1996 state court verdicts by the

Department of Justice, plaintiffs prevailed in 48 percent of employment discrimination cases tried before jury, but only 26 percent of those tried before a judge. Jury verdicts also tended to be much higher (with a median award of \$ 250,000) than judge verdicts (median award of \$ 75,000). According to the analysis, the median verdicts in all employment discrimination cases considered was \$ 200,000, compared with a median of \$ 33,000 in all civil cases. Punitive damages were awarded four times as often (19 percent) in employment discrimination cases than in all cases (4.5 percent).

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

IAC-CREATE-DATE: March 29, 2000

LOAD-DATE: March 30, 2000

***** Email Completed *****

Time of Delivery: March 30, 2000 11:19 am EST

Email Number: 711:0:7892238

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: TASwann (TASwann@aol.com [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:22-APR-2000 17:44:36.00

SUBJECT: Rep. Barney Frank's Historic Breakthrough

TO: TASwann (TASwann@aol.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

REP. BARNEY FRANK RECEIVES PRAISE ON TWO GAY

RADIO NETWORKS

THIS WEEKEND

Please Post on LGBT and AIDS Internet List Serves

By Tom Swann - President

Palm Springs Gay Veterans

(760) 324-5670

TASwann@aol.com

Memorial Wreath Laying Ceremony

To Remember the Holocaust and 55th Anniversary of the Liberation of NAZI

Concentration Camps and

Victory in World War II

Also To Honor All Veterans

Who Served Our Country

Historic Congressional Cemetery

1801 E Street SE

Washington DC 20003

Saturday April 29, 2000

1:00 P.M.

(Seattle, WA) - Tom Swann, America's Proud Gay Veteran announced this weekend

the exciting historic news that the United States military has agreed to provide an honor guard and bugler for taps at the April 29 ceremony at Historic Congressional Cemetery.

Jim Darby, national secretary of the Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Veterans of America (GLBVA) said, "This is the first time ever that the active duty military has agreed to participate in a ceremony sponsored by gay veterans."

There have been military honor guards at funerals for gay veterans like late

SGT Leonard Matlovich but not at a memorial ceremony where much of the focus will be the issue of gays in the military.

Swann made his remarks on two national gay radio networks. The Grethe Cammermeyer Show which is heard in the United States, Canada, Alaska and Hawaii and Fred's Circle on Triangle Broadcasting. Swann gave the credit to

Mr. Peter Kovar, Chief of Staff for Rep. Barney Frank. Swann said it was

Mr.

Kovar who "did all of the hard work to make this historic opportunity become reality."

Ed Clayton, national GLBVA President joined Swann on the Grethe Cammermeyer show and gave information about the March on Sunday April 30. Swann praised

Ed Clayton and all of the national GLBVA officers for their perseverance.

He also reiterated thanks that Ed Clayton and the GLBVA national officers had accepted invitations to speak at the cemetery event.

The 12 x 16 foot stage will be located directly behind the chapel overlooking the hillside where FBI founding director J. Edgar Hoover and late SGT Leonard

P. Matlovich are buried. On stage will be Swann, Margarethe Cammermeyer and Miriam Ben-Shalom who WON discrimination suits against the Pentagon. Also leaders of the Alexander Hamilton American Legion Post 448 that according to

the New York Times, "won an important civil rights victory" in a case vs. the

California Department of the American Legion. The suit settlement is confidential.

On stage will be a rare display of national unity with Servicemembers'

Legal

Defense Network, GLBVA, Human Rights Campaign, Metropolitan Community

Church,

California Alliance for Pride and Equality, Stonewall Democratic

Federation,

Shalom International, Department of Veterans Affairs and the United States

Military. At press time the Log Cabin Republicans had not released

information about their invitation to participate in the non-political

solemn

memorial wreath laying ceremony.

Tom Swann also said,

"This is not a traditional funeral service for a veteran. This is a

memorial

ceremony with wreaths and speeches from a diverse group of civil rights

leaders from across America. We have Ed Clayton from Alabama, Grethe

Cammermeyer from Seattle, Morris Kight from Los Angeles, Chris Lenz from

Palm

Springs, Jim Darby from Chicago, Jim Donovan from Illinois, Dr. Frank

Kameny

from Washington D.C., Tony Benfield from San Francisco, Rev. Robert Griffin

from Maryland, Wendy Cohen from Virginia, Miriam Ben-Shalom from Milwaukee,

Eric Astacaan from Sacramento, Steve Valkenburg from Anaheim and Bob Kunst

from Florida. This is a national event and we have over a dozen memorial

wreaths already scheduled from the florist."

The Grethe Cammermeyer Show is part of the GAYBC radio network. The show began in October 1999. The web address is WWW.GAYBC.com Listeners can connect on the web page to hear the show or join the chat room. The toll free phone number in the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii and Canada is 1-877-429-2269. Colonel Cammermeyer changed her normal Saturday broadcast schedule in order to speak at this ceremony.

Grethe will do a LIVE broadcast from the MMOW on Saturday April 29 from 11:00 A.M. to 1:00 P.M. EDT (8-10 PDT) and then drive to the cemetery for her speech. At the cemetery she will do taped interviews for her show.

The memorial wreaths on a tripod stand cost \$75 with free delivery to the cemetery. You can place your orders by calling Joan Talley at Avenue Florist at (202) 546-8830.

Thanks for reading and sharing with others.