

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Eve Gerber to Jason Furman at 09:04:21.00. Subject: story. (5 pages)	06/22/2000	Personal Misfile
002. email	TASwann to Mathew Murguia at 13:11:39.00. Subject: Ltr to John Perez on Gay Veteran Memorial. (4 pages)	07/05/2000	Personal Misfile

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[04/23/2000 - 07/10/2000]

2015-0017-F
ab1573

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: Lisa Graybill (Lisa Graybill <lgraybill@mmow.org> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-APR-2000 03:26:41.00

SUBJECT: MMOW News, Vol. 2, Issue # 7

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Welcome to the Official Newsletter of the Millennium March on Washington!

9 Days and Counting...!

Vol. 2, Issue # 7, Friday, April 21, 2000

Welcome to the final issue of the MMOW Newsletter! The March is now just over a week away, and this newsletter is dedicated to information about the March Weekend!

IN THIS ISSUE:

- * News
- * MMOW Gear Info
- * Final Events List for the MMOW Weekend
- * Travel Info
- * Thanks to our Sponsors
- * Contact Info

NEWS FROM THE MILLENNIUM MARCH!

We Need YOU!

We need tons of volunteer help during the March and Rally, and we want you to sign up! We have shifts available Sunday morning from 8-11 am, helping register contingents for the march, coordinating the line-up, marshalling the route, and staffing info booths. We also have shifts available Sunday afternoon from 12-3, 2.30-5.30, and 4.30-7.30, staffing info booths and handing out voter pledge cards. We need 1,000 volunteers, so please lend a hand! You'll meet cool new people from all over the country, help your community, and get a free, limited edition MMOW Volunteer t-shirt to boot! Email Michael Crawford at mcrawford@mmow.org to sign up! Include your name, phone number, and the time you are available. THANK YOU!!!

March Route and Rally Location and Details

March Line-Up: Line-up begins at 8am on the grounds of the Washington Monument;

The March: The March will begin at 10 am from the Washington Monument and proceed down the National Mall to the Rally stage in front of the US Capitol.

The Rally: The Rally will take place from 12pm-6pm and will feature speakers addressing each of the eight platform issues of the march, which include: hate crimes, racial justice, non-discrimination, the right to health, the right to privacy, the right to serve, GLBT youth and senior issues, and GLBT family issues, including marriage, adoption, and custody. Also featured will be numerous internationally-known entertainers and musicians.

MMOW Program Guide Available in the April Advocate

Get this month's issue of the Advocate for a full program and guide to the

Millennium March on Washington! The guide includes information on getting around DC, as well as a full description of the Rally platforms and a community services guide to GLBT organizations across the country! Guides will also be available at the March and Rally.

Tips on Navigating DC:

- * If you're driving, park your car at a Metro and take the train in-traffic in DC will be extremely heavy the weekend of the march, and parking is limited!
- * Make a meeting place to catch up with your group if you get separated
- * Lost children will be taken to the Family Garden at 7th and Madison during the Rally
- * Cell phones may not work, because call volume in the DC will be so heavy

Don't Forget to Bring:

- * Signs and banners for the March!
- * Any prescriptions, and your doctor's name and phone number, just in case
- * The name, location, and phone number of where you're staying-keep this on you!
- * Your ID
- * Sunscreen and water
- * A camera
- * An umbrella (to shade you from the sun, of course!)
- * Safer sex stuff, if you'll need it!

Hotel Rooms Still Available

While most DC hotels are now sold out for the MMOW weekend, accommodations

in Virginia and Maryland-as little as 10 minutes from downtown DC by Metro-are still available! Call DC Accommodations at 1.800.554.2220 M-F, 9am-5pm EST-they can help you find accommodations within your price range.

MMOW GEAR AVAILABLE

Official Millennium March Gear Available In Our DC Store During the March!

Come by the Rainbows and Stars Millennium March Store, located at 1739 Connecticut Ave. NW in DuPont Circle. The store is open seven days a week from 10am to 12 midnight! For more information, call 202.232.7700. You can also order merchandise on the web; go to <http://www.rainbowsandstars.com>. All purchases support the Millennium March on Washington!

FINAL EVENTS LIST FOR THE MMOW WEEKEND

We have included the events list one last time in our final newsletter! Still, we are hearing about new events every day, so feel free to contact us between now and the big weekend to request an updated list!

"(" Indicates an MMOW affiliated event.

* Indicates an event added or modified since the last calendar.

Events are listed in chronological order.

THURSDAY APRIL 27th, 2000

* (The United States Holocaust Museum presents "An Evening with Gad Beck," beginning at 7pm. Come hear the extraordinary story of a Gay Jew who survived Nazi Berlin. Beck escaped a deportation camp disguised as a Hitler Youth and led an underground resistance effort against the Nazis throughout World War II, all the while as an openly Gay man. To ensure seating, call tickets.com at (800) 400-9373. The program is free, but service fees apply. Located at 100 Raoul Wallenberg Place, SW. For more information, visit www.ushmm.org.

* ?lan presents a dance party for everyone, but especially for women of color, from 9pm to 2am, at 1129 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE. DJ One Love, cover: \$10. For more information, call (202) 544-6406, or visit www.elandcusa.com.

FRIDAY APRIL 28th, 2000

* (Millennium March on Washington Lobby Day. Lobby your Congressional representatives on issues of concern to the GLBT community, including hate crimes, immigration, employment non-discrimination, the right to marry, and reauthorization of the HIV/AIDS Ryan White Care Act. Brief "How to Lobby" trainings will take place every hour on the hour from 9am to 3pm at the Methodist Church on First and Maryland Sts., NE.

* (PFLAG National Conference: "Family Voices for Equality." Crystal Gateway Marriott, 1700 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA. Registration begins @ 9am, exhibits open from 6pm - 11pm. For more

information, go to www.PFLAG.org.

* LLEGà is hosting an Open House at their offices, 1612 K Street, NW Suite 500 from 9am - 6 pm. Drop in for refreshments, to see where we live or just to say hello. This will also serve as your opportunity to sign the "Los Recordamos" banner in honor of those we love who could not march with us. Nuestra casa es su casa! For additional information contact Tanya Headly at 202.466.8240 x103.

* (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum One-Day Symposium: "Persecution of Homosexuals Under the Nazi Regime." Hear leading scholars in the study of Nazi persecution of homosexuals discuss how and why homosexuals were persecuted, why many remained silent after the war, and what research opportunities in the field exist today. Made possible by a generous grant from the Wortman Family Trust. Located at 100 Raoul Wallenberg Place, SW. From 10am to 5pm. Seating is limited. For tickets, call tickets.com at (800) 400-9373 (attendance is FREE, though service fees apply). For more information, visit www.ushmm.org.

* (Family Diversity Projects, Inc presents Loves Makes A Family--a display of family pride:

This photo-text exhibit features portraits and stories of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered people and their families. The exhibit opens on April 16th at the Metropolitan Community Church of DC at 474 Ridge St. NW and will be on display through May 4. Throughout the MMOW weekend, the artists who created this exhibit -- photographer, Gigi Kaeser and interviewer/editor, Peggy Gillespie -- will be on hand to talk about the

creation of the exhibit and the positive impact this exhibit is having on communities as it travels nationwide. For more information, contact Anthony Carcaldi at 202.863.0333.

* The Lesbian and Gay Bands of America is hosting its national conference in DC and invites musicians of all skill levels to attend workshops and rehearsals to prepare for concert performances to be held during the MMOW weekend. For more information, contact Russell Williams at (713) 524-0218, e-mail LGBAinfo@aol.com, or visit www.gaybands.org.

* Gay.com is hosting a Welcome Center all weekend, from 9am to 6pm at the Doyle Hotel in Dupont Circle (at 19th and Q Sts. NW). The Welcome Center will include a Cyber Lounge, a press center, the HIV Life's Positive Living Room, and meeting spaces. Stop by to relax, check your e-mail, and grab a complimentary gift bag and survival kit (while supplies last). Check out www.Gay.com for more information.

* LLEGO is hosting an Open House at their offices between 9am and 6pm, at 1612 K St., NW, Suite 500. Drop in for refreshments, to say hello, and to sign the "Los Recordamos" banner in honor of those we love who could not march with us. For more information, call (202) 466-8240, ext.103.

* The Capital Area Log Cabin Republican Club and the Log Cabin Republican Club of Northern Virginia are hosting a Reception for Log Cabin members, other Republicans, and friends attending the Millennium March on Washington, from 6pm-8pm at the Capitol Brewing Company (2 Massachusetts Ave., NE). \$20 donation at the door, to benefit the Mautner Project for

Lesbians with breast cancer. For more information, visit

<http://welcome.to/lernova>.

* (Twice Blessed Reception for GLBT Jews, 6-8pm at the Jewish Community Center in Dupont Circle, Cost: \$20. For more info or to RSVP, email twiceblessed@hotmail.com.

* (Montage Events: March on Washington Opening Night Gala Dinner, International Trade Center Main Atrium, 6:30 - 10:30pm. Honoring "Millennium Awards" recipients Sir Elton John, Tim Gill, Jehan Agrama, Virginia Apuzzo, Jose Saria, Ellen DeGeneres and Anne Heche. Also, a "Tribute to Jerry Herman," featuring: Leslie Uggams, Rita Moreno, Charles Nelson Reilly, Carol Channing, Jerry Herman, and Sam Harris, with the Fairfax Symphony Orchestra, the "Stars" of the California Ballet, the Washington, DC Gay Men's Chorus, the Todd Schroeder Singers, and the Entertainment Plus Dancers. Ticket prices for this black-tie dinner range from \$250 to \$500 (for preferred seating), and special ringside VIP tables available for a limited quantity. Interested Table Captains will receive FREE tickets to the Midnight Galaxy Celebrity Party on Friday, and a VIP ticket to Montage's Saturday Party! If interested, please call (619) 846-4478, or e-mail john@montageevents.com. For tickets, call (800) 792-5919 or visit www.montageevents.com.

* (National Gay Pilots Association will hold a Reception and Dinner for the Entire Aviation Community from 7pm to 10pm at Phillips Seafood Restaurant, 900 Water Street SW. The cost is \$45 for an all-you-can-eat buffet. Reservations with NGPA are required. For more information,

contact Ron Swanda at (703) 660-3852, or visit www.ngpa.org.

* (COLAGE Metro/DC and Rainbow Families/DC are holding an Open House from 3-7pm, at Lammas Bookstore, 1607 17th Street, NW. Following the Open House, there will be a dinner at the DuPont Italian Kitchen for children of GLBT parents, from 7pm to 11pm. For more information, contact Ryan Lalonde, at (202) 332-7380.

* (Dignity/USA Welcoming Reception will be held at 7:30pm at the Dignity Center, 721 8th St., SE (near Eastern Market Metro).

* Rivaga Art & Framing is hosting an opening night reception in honor of artist Chuck Smith, from 7pm to 9pm, at 1612 U Street, NW, Suite 102. The exhibit features photographed images of the male and homosexual image. The reception is free and open to the public. For more information, call (202) 986-2564.

o (The Warner Theatre presents comedienne Margaret Cho in her "I'm The One That I Want" tour. Show begins at 8pm. Tickets are available by phone through TicketMaster: (202) 432-SEAT. For more on Margaret Cho, check out www.margaretocho.net.

* (ServiceMembers Legal Defense Network presents a benefit performance of "Another American: Asking and Telling," written and performed by Marc Wolf. Performance time is 8pm, at The Studio Theatre (1333 P Street, NW), followed by a reception at the theater. Benefit ticket price: \$75. For more information, or to order tickets, call SLDN at (202) 328-3244.

* (Bet Mishpachah invites all who wish to join them for Erev Shabbat (Friday Evening) Services to do so at the National City Christian Church (Thomas Circle, 14th St. and Mass. Ave), beginning at 8:30pm. For more information, contact <http://betmishpachah.org/about.html>.

* American Brotherhood Weekend Leather Event and Contests, Washington Plaza Hotel, 10 Thomas Circle NW. For more information, go to www.AmericanBrotherhood.com.

* Women's Welcome to Washington Party, 9pm to 3am at The Hung Jury, 1819 H Street NW (in the alley). Come get your groove on with DJ Lady Tawanna, \$10 before 11pm, \$12 thereafter.

* ?lan presents a high-energy dance party from 9pm to 3am, at 1129 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE. DJ Christie James, cover: \$10. For more information, call (202) 544-6406, or visit www.elandcusa.com.

* (Youth Dance: Benefit for Youth Pride Alliance of Washington, DC, from 10pm to 2am. Ages 24 and under; cost is \$5. For more information, visit www.youthpridedc.org, call (703) 518-0631, or e-mail: youthpride@youthpridedc.org.

* (Cherry Fund presents the Cherry 5.0 Friday Night Welcome Party. Doors open at 10pm at Club Element, for Weekend and Host Pass holders only. For information about purchasing a Weekend or Host Pass, visit www.cherryfund.com

SATURDAY APRIL 29th, 2000

* (Millennium Festival - The Largest National Festival Ever for The Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered Community, Our Families, and Friends: 11am to 7pm, Pennsylvania Ave. b/w 3rd and 9th. Entertainment, vendors, food, drink, family area, and dances. Cost: \$5 donation. For information, call (202) 776-0100 or go to www.millennium-productions.net.

* (The Wedding, a demonstration and ceremony celebrating same-sex marriage. NEW LOCATION: the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, beginning at 10:45am and concluding by 1pm. Music by The Lesbian and Gay Bands of America. Cost: \$25.00 with certificate; free without certificate. For more information, call (310) 360-8640 or go to <http://www.ufmcc.com/wedding1.htm>.

* PFLAG Conference (continues): workshops, reception, and banquet. Exhibits open from 7am to 8pm.

* Family Diversity Project's Love Makes A Family exhibit (continues).

* Gay.com's Welcome Center (continues).

* (The National Gay Pilots Association is holding a Breakfast and Networking Meeting with Guest Speaker Bob Baker, Vice Chair of American Airlines. Meeting is from 8:30am to 12:30pm at the Holiday Inn Capitol, 550 C Street SW. There is no charge to attend the Networking Meeting.

The price for the full-breakfast buffet is \$33. Reservations with NGPA are required for breakfast. For more information, contact Ron Swanda at (703) 660-3852, or visit www.ngpa.org.

* (Dignity/USA will host a Drop-In Center and Open House from 9am until 5pm. Located at the Dignity Center, 721 8th St., SE (near the Eastern Market Metro).

* YWCA is sponsoring the Race Against Racism - a 5K Run/Walk and Children's Fun Run, beginning at 9am, with 7am registration on 15th Street, between H and I Streets, NW. Proceeds will allow the YWCA to strengthen its racial justice agenda in all program initiatives. For more information, to register, or to volunteer, call Coordinator Sarah Shultz, at (703) 714-2372.

* (Oral Majority presents a rally "To Honor Gays In The Military," from 9am to 10:30am, north of the Pentagon on Channel Boundary Road. For more information, contact Jerry McGuire at (301) 946-3016.

* Bisexual Insurgence presents "Bi2K: Bisexual Community Activism in the 21st Century." Conference lasts from 10:30am to 3pm. Registration cost: \$30. For more information, visit www.bisexualinsurgence.org, or call Rochelle Meyers at (301) 891-7428.

* (More Light Presbyterians and That All May Freely Serve present "Meditations on Faith and Justice" with Michael J. Adey, More Light National Field Organizer, and Janie Spahr, That All May Freely Serve, at the Church of the Pilgrims Presbyterian Church, 22nd and P Sts., NW, 11:30

am -1 pm. Lunch will be served. For more information or to RSVP contact Michael Adee at (505) 820-7082 or michaelAdee@aol.com.

* Khush (GLBT South Asians in Metro DC), AQUA (Asian Queers United in Action), and Al-Fatiha (LGBTQ Muslims) is hosting a luncheon for Asian and Pacific Islanders, LGBTQ Muslims, and their friends from 11:30am to 1:30pm at the Himalayan Grill, 1805 18th Street, NW (near 18th and U). The buffet will cost \$6.95 per person.

* Millennium Medical Marijuana March - 12pm Rally at Lafayette Park; 3pm March; 4- 8pm Rally and Concert at Henry Bacon Ball Field. For more information, contact Richard Eastman at (323) 661-1720.

* GALAXe Pride at Work is hosting a reception at America Restaurant (in Union Station on Massachusetts Ave., SE), from 12pm to 2:30pm. For more information, contact Sam Gatling at (773) 380-3794.

* Eagle at IBM diversity network group for LGBT "IBMers" is holding a reception for all IBM employees and their guests, from 12pm to 2:30pm at the Doyle Hotel, located at 1500 New Hampshire Ave., NW. For more information, contact David Chase via e-mail at dchase@us.ibm.com.

* National Gay and Lesbian Task Force presents "Honoring Our Allies 2000: Celebrating and Building Our Community," from 12pm to 2pm at the National Museum of Women in the Arts, 1250 New York Ave., NW. Honoring Wilson Cruz, The Indigo Girls, Kathy and Jennifer Levinson, Sandra Thurman, and Lawrence Tribe; Lifetime Achievement Award Recipient: Kate Clinton.

Tickets begin at \$75 per person. For more information, call (202) 332-6483, ext. 3219.

*** Gay and Lesbian Medical Association Continuing Medical Education**

Conference: from 1-5 pm at George Washington University, Ross Hall Room 117 (Foggy Bottom Metro Stop on the Orange Line). GALA to follow, 5:30pm to 7:30pm, at the Omni Shoreham, 2500 Calvert St. NW. For more information, call 415.255.4547, x 311, or go to www.glma.org.

*** (Palm Springs Gay Veterans will have a Memorial Wreath Laying Ceremony,** beginning at 1pm at the Congressional Cemetery, 1801 East Street, SE. For more information, contact Tom Swann at (760) 324-5670, or e-mail at TASwann@aol.com.

*** (The AIDS Memorial Quilt will hold a new panel dedication ceremony on** the National Mall between 12th and 14th Streets on Saturday, from 1- 5pm. Up to 150 12-foot-by-12-foot blocks of the AIDS Memorial Quilt will be dedicated. The dedication ceremony will feature new panels added to the Quilt in 1999 to illustrate the ongoing devastation of the AIDS epidemic, and to remind the nation and the world that lives are still being lost to this disease. For more information, call (415) 882-5500, e-mail jbosacki@aol.com, or visit www.aidsquilt.org.

*** The Gay and Lesbian Victory Fund presents "On the Way to RFK: A Cocktail Reception to Benefit the Gay and Lesbian Victory Fund." From 2pm to 5pm,** at the Capitol City Brewing Company (2 Massachusetts Ave., NE). Contribution of \$20 a the door. For more information, call (202)

842-8679, e-mail events@victoryfund.org, or visit www.victoryfund.org.

* (Delta Lambda Phi National Social Fraternity for Gay, Bisexual, and Progressive Men present a Discussion Group on Organizing Gay and Lesbian College Students. From 2pm to 3:30pm, location to be determined; Keg and Cocktail Party with College Fraternity Men, from 7pm- 9pm, location to be determined. Visit www.dlp.org for more information.

* (ServiceMembers Legal Defense Network presents a benefit performance of "Another American: Asking and Telling," written and performed by Marc Wolf. Performance time is 2pm, at The Studio Theatre (1333 P Street, NW), followed by a reception at the theater. Benefit ticket price: \$75. For more information, or to order tickets, call SLDN at (202) 328-3244.

* "A Celebration of the Spirit" - Interfaith Worship Service. Begins at 2pm at The National City Christian Church, 5 Thomas Circle NW (14th St. and Mass. Ave.); reception to follow service. Convened by the National Religious Roundtable and the Gay/Lesbian Fellowship of National City Christian Church. Participants include Dignity Washington, All Souls Unitarian Church, Seekers Church, Inner Light Unity Fellowship Church, MCC DS, MCC NOVA, Troy Perry, Equal Partners in Faith, Bet Mishachpah, Faith Temple, UMC Reconciling Congregations, AL-Fatiha (GLBTQ Muslims and Friends), Interfaith Fairness Coalition of MD, Hope UCC, DC Radical Faeries, Capitol Area Interweave, African American Women's Clergy Association, Bishop Rainey Cheeks, More Light Presbyterians, and Integrity. Contact Charles Keener at (202) 462-5934 or Charles.Keener@co.fairfax.va.us, Rev Ken South at ksouth@nglrf.org, or

Rev. Steven Baines at (202) 296-4672, x 14, or epfnatlofc@aol.com , for more information.

* Integrity/Washington, Integrity/Virginia, and National Integrity are sponsoring a Holy Eucharist Service. The service is scheduled for 3pm at St. John's Lafayette Square (1525 H Street - one block north of the White HouseouseH), and will be presided by Rt. Rev. Mary Adelia McLeod, Bishop of Vermont. Rev. Canon Gene Robinson will preach. For more information, call Joe Voelker at (202) 588-8375.

* Gay and Lesbian Alumni/ae of Notre Dame and Saint Mary's College is hosting a mixer from 3pm to 6pm, at the Dupont Italian Kitchen, 1637 17th Street (corner of 17th and R Sts., NW). \$5 donation at the door. To RSVP, or for more information, call Fran Freely at (773) 506-9689, or e-mail FranFreely@aol.com.

* Sophisticated Ladies Productions presents "Soft 'n' Wet" Ladies Party from 3pm to 8pm at the Wet Bar (52 L St., SE), with Bee Jay the DJ. \$10 Cover. For more information, call (301) 439-2267.

* (YouthUnited presents a national youth rally, 3- 4:30pm, in DuPont Circle. For more information, e-mail YouthUnited2000@hotmail.com, or call Josh Siegel at (202) 332-9262.

* Capital Roundup is sponsoring a Speaker's 12-Step Meeting at the United Methodist Church at 10th & G Sts. NW. The meeting begins at 4:30pm. For more information, contact capitalroundup@hotmail.com

o (Cherry Fund presents the Saturday Pre-Party Pump at Results - The Gym.

Available to Hosts only. For more information on becoming a Host, visit

www.cherryfund.com.

o American Brotherhood Weekend Leather Event and Contests (continues).

o Prime Timers and their friends are invited to a "Welcome to DC

Reception," from 4- 6pm at Windows (upstairs, above the Dupont Italian

Kitchen) at 17th and R Streets, NW.

* Two-Spirit Feast and Celebration, 6 pm, at the Tipis on the National Mall (exact location to be announced). Feast will be followed by social drumming and dancing. Open to all, including non-Two-Spirit people, provided they are respectful and just observe. Absolutely no alcohol or drugs will be allowed in the area. For more information, contact David Young at (303) 939-9021 or wenakuo@juno.com.

o (HRC - "Equality Rocks" Concert, RFK Stadium, 6pm (gates open at 4:30pm). For tickets, call Ticket-master in DC: (202) 432-SEAT; outside DC, call: (800) 551-SEAT. For more information, visit www.hrc.org.

* (Family Pride Coalition is sponsoring a Family Dance from 6-11pm, at the Doyle Hotel in DuPont Circle, 1500 New Hampshire Ave. NW. Cost: sliding scale \$10-20 per family or \$5 per individual. For more information call (619) 296-0199 or email program@familypride.org.

* (Dignity/Northern Virginia will hold a Catholic Mass at 6:30pm at the Immanuel-on-the-Hill Church, 3606 Seminary Road (at Quaker Lane), Alexandria, VA.

* People for the American Way Foundation is hosting a benefit concert with "out" artists Steve Gellman, Pat Humphries, Sonia (of Disappear Fear), Magpie, Kim and Reggie Harris, Greg Greenway, and Side by Side. Show starts at 7pm, at the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, at 1313 New York Avenue, NW. For more information, call (202) 467-4999.

* DC Lambda Squares presents "Swing Thru the Capital," from 7pm to 10:30pm at the Church of the Pilgrims, 2201 P St., NW (near 23rd, off Dupont Circle). Schedule and costs: 7-8pm, Introduction to Square Dancing, \$5; 8-10:30pm, mainstream through A2 dancing, \$10. For more information, visit www.iagsdc.org/dcls.

* (The Morris Mechanic Theatre presents Margaret Cho in her "I'm The One That I Want" tour. Show begins at 8pm. Tickets are priced from \$34.50 to \$36.50, and are available by phone through TicketMaster: (410) 752-1200. For more on Margaret Cho, check out www.margareto.net.

* ("Queer Moon Ball, On The Avenue - The First Ever Dance On Historic Pennsylvania Avenue" (Millennium Festival) - Circuit party DJ Brian Norwood, with performance by Erin Hamilton. Vendors, food, and drink. 8pm to midnight, Pennsylvania Ave. between 3rd and 4th. Cost: \$10 (at gate only, 21 and up only). For information, call (202) 776-0100 or go to www.millennium-productions.net.

* ("Playtime" - A Dance for Youth Under 21 (Millennium Festival) - From 8pm to midnight, at Constitution Ave & 8th Streets. DJ Victor Martinez, cost: \$5 (at gate only). For information, call (202) 776-0100 or go to www.millennium-productions.net.

* BABY (Benefit AIDS Babies and Youths) is hosting an Art Auction Fundraiser, from 8pm to 11pm, at the Creighton-Davis Gallery, Georgetown Park Mall. There is also a silent auction from April 24th to April 29th. Fundraiser to benefit BABY's new interactive website (talk2baby.org), where families with HIV-affected children can turn for resources, support, and education. For more information, contact Melissa Bitting by phone - (610) 924-0674, or by e-mail - pedspa@hotmail.com; or Lydia Robertson by phone - (703) 683-8711, or by e-mail - perropulga@aol.com

* LLEGO presents "Unified Groove", a dance celebrating LGBT communities of color, 9pm - 3am, at The Garage - 1214 18th Street, NW (@ Connecticut Ave. Two blocks south of Dupont Circle. Featuring some of DC's hottest DJs spinning Salsa, R&B, Reggae, Merengue, House & Hip-Hop Cost: \$10.

o Big Bi Bash: a party at a private residence, sponsored by Bisexual Insurgence from 9pm to ?. Location: Takoma Park. Admission: \$5. For more information/directions, call (301) 891-7428.

* ("Venus Rising" Premier Dyke Dance and Cabaret, 9pm to 3am at Washington Plaza Hotel, 10 Thomas Circle (near Massachusetts and 14th Streets). To benefit MMOW and the Mautner Project, for Lesbians with

cancer. DJ's Tracy Young and Lauren McGee. Cost \$20 advance and \$25 door. For more information, call (202) 728-7565, or visit www.millennium-productions.net.

* (Dungeon Dance, The Premier Leather-Fetish-S& M Event, 10pm - 4am at the 9:30 Club, 815 V Street, NW, to benefit The Millennium March on Washington and Metro Teen AIDS. DJ Julian Marsh. Cost: \$20 in advance and \$25 at the door. For more information, call 202-331-4455 or go to www.clubdesade.com.

* Sober and Serene Dance, cosponsored by Capital Roundup and the Triangle Club. From 10pm until 2am at the Reeves Municipal Building, 14th and U Sts. NW. Tickets are \$15 in advance, \$20 at the door. Advance purchases can be made at Outlook on 1706 Connecticut Ave. NW in Dupont Circle, (202) 745-1469, or via email at capitalroundup@hotmail.com.

* (Cherry Fund presents Saturday's Main Event - Cherry 5.0, at the Old Post Office Pavilion, at 12th St. and Pennsylvania Ave. Doors open at 10pm. DJ Warren Gluck. Cost: \$75.00; host and weekend passes also available. For more information, visit www.CherryFund.com.

* (Cherry Fund presents Aftershock(tm) DC, an afterhours party with DJ Neil Lewis, following Cherry 5.0's Main Event. From 4-10am at the Element, 714 6th St NW. Tickets are \$20 in advance and \$25 at the door. Advance sales begin April 1 on Ticketweb.com or April 28-29th at the Cherry 5.0 Welcome Center. For more information, visit www.CherryFund.com or www.jito.com.

* (Montage Events presents:

"MasterBeat" circuit dance party in the International Trade Center Main Atrium, with DJ David Knapp, from 10pm to 4am.

"Chaps and Skin" dance party in the International Trade Center Atrium Exhibit Hall, 9pm to 4am.

"Divas - Above All!" - a four-hour, non-stop cabaret concert featuring fifteen divas in the International Trade Center Atrium Ballroom, from 10pm to 2am (doors open at 9pm).

One ticket price of \$69 (advance sale price), or \$99 (V.I.P.) buys admission to all three Saturday night events. For tickets call (800) 792-5919 or go to www.montageevents.com.

* Sophisticated Ladies Productions presents the Back That Thing UP Dance Party and Show, from 10pm to 3am, at Jenny's Show Lounge (4th and M St., SW, inside Waterside Mall). DJ Lady India. Cover is \$12. For more information, call (301) 439-2267.

* Two2FAB presents Rapture, an afterhours party with DJ St. Peter of South Beach, immediately following Cherry 5 and Club Montage Events. Cost: \$20, advance tickets available at www.Two2FAB.com.

SUNDAY APRIL 30th, 2000

* (The Millennium March on Washington - (THE MARCH). 8am: Line up at The Ellipse. 10am to Noon: March to the National Mall. No cost.

To sign up a group for the march, please email MMOW Field Organizer

Yolanda Reyes at yreyes@mmow.org. Include the name of your group and the approximate size. Yolanda will keep a file of your inquiries and will respond with further instructions as the date of the March approaches.

* (Millennium March on Washington - (THE RALLY). National Mall, 12pm to 6pm. No cost.

* (Millennium Festival - The Largest National Festival Ever for The Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered Community, Our Families, and Friends: 11am to 7pm, Pennsylvania Ave. b/w 3rd and 9th. Entertainment, vendors, food, drink, family area, and dances. Cost: \$5 donation. For information, call (202) 776-0100 or go to www.millennium-productions.net.

* (MCC - Washington, DC: "A Blessing of the Millennium March On Washington," The Reverend Troy Perry, attending. 9am at the MCC Church (5th and Ridge Sts. NW).

* (Family Pride Coalition has organized a Family Pride March. Participants should meet at 8:30am in front of the Smithsonian Castle. For more information, contact Siobhan Hinckley, at (202) 467-8111.

* (Family Garden. 8am- 4pm. Will include music, entertainment, refreshments, art projects, diaper changing stations, family first aid, and a breast-feeding tent. Located at 7th and Madison, in front of the National Gallery of Art. For more information call 619.296.0199 or email program@familypride.org

* (Family Pride Coalition has organized a Family Pride March.

Participants should meet at 8:30am in front of the Smithsonian Castle.

For more information, contact Siobhan Hinckley, at (202) 467-8111.

* Two-Spirit Canupa Ceremony, 8:30 am, at the Tipis on the National Mall

(exact location to be announced). Open to indigenous people of Turtle

Island only. For more information, contact David Young at 303.939.9021 or

wenakuo@juno.com.

* Augustana Lutheran Church is having an additional worship service at

8:30am, at 2100 New Hampshire Ave., NW. Coffee and pastries will be

served at 8am. For more information, visit www.AugustanaDC.org, or call

the office at (202) 234-5315.

* Dignity/USA (GLBT Catholics) will hold a Pre-March Gathering & Prayer

Service at 9am, in Pershing Park, 14th St. & Pennsylvania Ave., NW.

* More Light Presbyterians Together At Church, Breakfast, at 9am, Worship

at 11am. Sandy Brawders, the first out lesbian in the PCUSA , preaching.

Westminster Presbyterian Church, 400 Eye St. SW. For more information and

to RSVP for breakfast the church at (202) 484-7700.

* (First Congregational Church will be hosting a continental breakfast at

10am, followed by a special worship service at 10:30am. The Church is

located at 945 G St., NW (between 10th and G). For more information, call

(202) 628-4317.

* (PFLAG Conference (Concludes with March) Exhibits (open from 7am to 12pm), Faith Service, Special Meetings.

* American Brotherhood Weekend Leather Event and Contests (continues).

* (Family Diversity Project's Love Makes A Family exhibit (continues).

* Gay.com's Welcome Center (continues).

* More Light Presbyterians Together At Church, Breakfast, at 9am, Worship at 11am., Sandy Brawders, the first out lesbian in the PCUSA , preaching. Westminster Presbyterian Church, 400 Eye St. SW. For more information and to RSVP for breakfast the church at (202) 484-7700.

* (First Congregational Church will be hosting a continental breakfast at 10am, followed by a special worship service at 10:30am. The Church is located at 945 G St., NW (between 10th and G). For more information, call (202) 628-4317.

* ("Girldown," a Sunday Tea Dance, 5pm-9pm at Crush, 2323 18th St. NW (Adams Morgan). Cost: \$10 at the door. For more information, email girldowndc@aol.com.

* (Celebratory Tea Dance: "Equality and Pride Forever" (Millennium Festival). From 6pm to 8pm, at Constitution Ave & 8th Streets. International DJ Julian Marsh; performance by Kristine W. Cost: \$5 donation (for admission to both Festival and Tea Dance).

* (AfterGroove, the hottest WOMEN'S Dance Party at the March. Hosted by Curve Magazine, 5pm-2am, 605 12th Street NW (between "F" & "G" Streets), across from "Metro Center". A Multi-Level Dance Experience featuring DJs and Dancers from across the county, giveaways and special guests. \$10 in advance through <http://www.curvemag.com>, by calling (800) 998-5565, or at local LGBT bookstores. At the Door: \$15 before 10pm; \$20 after. The first 250 people receive a free 6-month (US) subscription to Curve Magazine. Curve Magazine hosts AfterGroove, a women's dance party to begin after the Rally at 605 12th Street (between "F" & "G" Streets).

* (The National Gay Pilots Association will host a Post-March Buffet Dinner and Social from 7pm until 10pm at the Holiday Inn Capitol, 550 C Street SW. The cost for the three-course buffet dinner is \$55 and reservations are required with NGPA. For more information, contact Ron Swanda at (703) 660-3852, or visit www.ngpa.org.

* Lesbian and Gay Chorus of Washington, D.C. (LGCW) Presents Pop/Jazz Artist Suede, 7:30pm (interpreted for the deaf). Hine Junior High School (accessible), 8th & Pennsylvania Ave., SE, \$20, general admission, (800) 494-TIXS or (202) 546-1549.

* A Catholic Mass & Thanksgiving with Dignity/Washington will take place at 7:30pm at the St. Margaret's Church. The address is 1820 Connecticut Ave., NW.

* SoundAdvice presents recording artist Karen E. Reynolds performing live at 8pm at SoHo Tea and Coffee (2150 P. St. NW). Admission is free. For more information, call (202) 463-7646.

* (Carioca Productions presents "Alegria," a dance party with DJ Susan Morabito. From 9pm to 4am, at Capitol City Brewing Company, 2 Massachusetts Ave, NE. Tickets are \$55. To order, call (202) 939-2560 during business hours M-F, stop by Universal Gear (1601 17th St., NW), or visit www.cariocaproductions.com for additional information.

* (Cherry Fund presents the Cherry 5.0 Sunday Night Closing Party at Velvet Nation, 1014 Half St. SE, with DJ Manny Lehman. Doors open at 10pm. For more information, or to order tickets, visit www.cherryfund.com.

* Two2Fab presents Exclamation, a Closing Party, at the Cage, 1811 14th St. NW, from 9pm to ?, with DJ Mark Vallese of Chicago, and lighting/effects by Guy Smith of NYC Saint-at-Large. Tickets are \$50 or \$75 (V.I.P.), and are available at www.Two2FAB.com, or at Universal Gear (17th and Q Sts., NW).

* Sophisticated Ladies Productions presents the After March Party, from 9pm to 3am, at The Hung Jury (1819 H St., NW, in alley). DJ Lucky. Cover is \$10. For more information, call (301) 439-2267.

* ?lan presents a dance party from 9pm to 2am, at 1129 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE. DJ Staci, cover: \$5. For more information, call (202)

544-6406, or visit www.elandcusa.com.

SPECIAL MENTION - Black & Blue supports MMOW

The BBCM Foundation, the non-profit organization responsible for the renowned Black & Blue Festival in Montreal, Canada, is a proud promo partner of the MMOW and Cherry Fund weekend. This year's 10th Anniversary Black & Blue Festival, from October 4 to 10, 2000, will feature over 60 different events catering to a wide range of gay and lesbian participants, including many cultural activities. BLACK & BLUE is the world's largest non-stop gay benefit festival and event passes are now available online. Check out the BBCM web site at www.bbcm.org for more information.

TRAVEL NEWS

Plane:

United Airlines is the official airline of the March. To check flight schedules and book United Airlines flights to Washington DC for the Millennium March, call 1.800.521.4041 and mention Code 596EB. This assures that you get the best fare available and credits the March for each flight.

Hotel:

Call DC Accommodations at 1.800.554.2220 to reserve a hotel room for the weekend of the March.

Train:

Call Amtrak at 1.800.USA.RAIL, or visit their website at

<http://reservations.amtrak.com/> to find out about train schedules and fares the weekend of the March.

Bus Info:

If you need information about parking your group's chartered bus, e-mail Outreach Director Lisa Graybill at lgraybill@mmow.org. Lisa will keep a file of your inquiries and disseminate the bus permit information as soon as arrangements are finalized.

Web Ride Board

If you're planning on driving to DC from Austin or Portland or Miami or Kansas City or ANYWHERE and you'd like to fill up your car with a few new best friends, or if you are looking for a ride, check out the Message Board at our new website! Go to www.mmow.org, click on "About the March," then click on "Message Boards."

THANKS TO OUR SPONSORS:

The Millennium March on Washington greatly appreciates the generosity of our corporate sponsors, whose support has been so important to us, and asks that you check out these great promotions while you're here!

SPONSOR PROMOTIONS AT THE MILLENNIUM FESTIVAL

We invite you all to visit the sponsor booths at the Millennium Festival,

open to the public from 11 am to 7 pm on Saturday and 11 am to 8 pm on Sunday. Here's just a small sampling of what you'll find:

At the SHOWTIME NETWORKS booths you can enter hourly prize drawings all through the Festival. And at the Showtime booth nearest the stage, you can meet selected performers as they come off of the Showtime Networks Millennium Stage.

At the WELLNESS PAVILION, you can visit nearly a dozen healthcare companies and non-profits for information on the latest on HIV/AIDS diagnosis and therapies and much more. Activities include a "hemocue" screening at the Ortho-Biotech booth to get an instant hemoglobin reading (anemia test), and the Gay and Lesbian Medical Association's launch of their new hepatitis awareness campaign.

At the TROPICANA RESORT AND CASINO booth you can enter to win one of four Rainbow Vacation packages, which include weekend accommodations for two at the Tropicana in Atlantic City, breakfast buffet, health club admission, show tickets and more.

DC LOTTERY's new "Lot-mobile" will make its debut at the Millennium Festival. Stop by... and get free gifts when you play the exciting DC Lottery games.

At the GAY.COM Rainbow Coffeehouse and Cabaret you can enter drawings for

prizes donated by Gay.com advertisers and receive free Gay.com giveaways.

At the LION'S GATE FILMS booth you can enter a raffle to win one of five scripts of their new lesbian-themed film "But I'm a Cheerleader, " signed by RuPaul.

Visit the ZERO KNOWLEDGE SYSTEM booth and find out how the world leader in Internet privacy protection can help you safeguard your private data and online communications. At the booth you'll find a wild assortment of giveaways, including free trial versions of Freedom(r) - the first and only software solution that empowers you to surf the Web, send email, post to newsgroups and chat in total privacy.

SPECIAL OFFER FROM THE ADVOCATE

Our National Major Sponsor, The Advocate, the national gay and lesbian newsmagazine, has created a special subscription offer for MMOW Supporters. As a bonus with your new subscription, you'll get a FREE copy of the essential web guide "Gay & Lesbian Online." This \$17.95 Alyson Press book lists over 3,300 web sites of GLBT interest. Get web empowerment when you subscribe to The Advocate at http://www.advocate.com/html/subscribe/subscribe_V30E03.html

CORPORATE SPONSORS

The Millennium March on Washington greatly appreciates the generosity of our corporate sponsors, whose support has been so important to us.

PlanetOut (planteout.com) is the National Presenting Sponsor of the Millennium March on Washington. The Advocate (advocate.com) is our National Major Sponsor, United Airlines (ual.com) is our Official Airline, and Showtime Networks (sho.net) is the Presenting Sponsor of the Millennium Stage.

Additional sponsorship support for the Millennium March and Festival has been provided by America Online, Balance Bar, Gay.com, Zero Knowledge Systems, Abbott Laboratories, K-Y Liquid, DuPont Pharmaceuticals, Serono Laboratories, Curve Magazine, Our Tribe Cardpack, Ortho Biotech, Roche Laboratories, Statscript Pharmacy, the Gay and Lesbian Medical Association, Christopher Street Financial, Tropicana Resort and Casino, GLOBE of Bell Atlantic, Bell Atlantic DC, the DC Lottery, Lion's Gate Films and the Rainbow Card.

TO CONTACT US:

For more information, contact the Millennium March office by phone at (202) 467-8100, by e-mail at mmow2000@aol.com, or by paper mail at 1000 16th St. NW, Ste. 300, Washington, DC 20036.

SEE YOU ON THE 30th!!

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jesse_M._Hartness (Jesse_M._Hartness@who.eop.gov [who])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-MAY-2000 20:58:17.00

SUBJECT: Another American: Asking and Telling

TO: Anthony R. Bernal (anthony.r.bernal@ovp [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: arthur_coleman (arthur_coleman@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bernie.delia (bernie.delia@usdoj.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: chris_thomson (chris_thomson@ios.doi.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ckenngott (ckenngott@gipsa.usda.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cameron N. Cohen (CN=Cameron N. Cohen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason E. Rodriguez (CN=Jason E. Rodriguez/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Martin L. Yeung (CN=Martin L. Yeung/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul Oetken (CN=Paul Oetken/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Vicki Johnson (CN=Vicki Johnson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dlplumme (dlplumme@opm.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ekaplan (ekaplan@osc.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth_E._Towne (elizabeth_e._towne@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: fred.hochberg (fred.hochberg@sba.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gail.shibley (gail.shibley@fhwa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: hcreel (hcreel@fmc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jean_veta (jean_veta@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John_Berry (john_berry@ios.doi.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: juan.lopez (juan.lopez@ssa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jwhite (jwhite@arc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: kate_seelman (kate_seelman@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: martinrouse (martinrouse@ios.ssa.os.dc [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MEHUNKER (mehunker@opm.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mercedes_m._marquez (mercedes_m._marquez@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Norma.Krayem (norma.krayem@ost.dot.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: paul.richard (paul.richard@eeoc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: philip g. dufour (philip g. dufour@ovp [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ppappas (ppappas@fcc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: roan.conrad (roan.conrad@hdq.noaa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: romulo.diaz (romulo.diaz@hq.doe.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rpereahenze (rpereahenze@doc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: summers_t (summers_t@al.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: tmiller (tmiller@cfo.usda.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: todd.dickinson (todd.dickinson@uspto.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: vbasile (vbasile@peacecorps.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Elizabeth J. Potter

04/28/2000 04:37:00 PM

Record Type: Record

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

cc:

Subject: Another American: Asking and Telling

A one person solo performance play by Marc Wolf and directed by Joe Mantello
will be playing at the Studio Theatre in WDC April 28 - May 14.

The playwright felt that if he could give a dramatic voice to people who

had been silenced, maybe he could add to the country's exploration of the Military's "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy. At the same time, he knew it would be important to find people who could persuasively argue the military's point of view.

He interviewed straight, gay, and lesbian military personnel, veterans from WWII to Desert Storm, civil rights lawyers, federal judges, politicians, activists, and professors of sociology, constitutional law and military history. The interviews have been tape recorded, transcribed, edited and then used as verbatim monologues to construct the text for a one-person, multi-character play.

Sounds Interesting. It has been playing in NY and has had positive reviews from New York Times, Variety, New York Post, Village Voice and Time Out.

Would anyone like to join a group on Wednesday May 4th?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-MAY-2000 15:19:14.00

SUBJECT: civil rights

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

TEXT:
LEXIS-NEXIS Universe Update Report: May 02, 2000 at 11:18

Results from this Update: 11

Next Update: May 02, 2000 at 16:00

Access your results at:

http://web.lexis-nexis.com/in.universe/pnews/emailAlert?_pnewsAlert=0x000101a9-0x00004b26%2f0x000101a9%2f20000502%2f11%3a18%3a41

1 of 11 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 PR Newswire Association, Inc.

PR Newswire

May 2, 2000, Tuesday 10:57 AM Eastern Time

SECTION: STATE AND REGIONAL NEWS

DISTRIBUTION: TO NATIONAL AND POLITICAL EDITORS

LENGTH: 778 words

HEADLINE: HLI Staff Reporter Bored to Death at Gay Rally;

Last Words: 'I feel so misled.'

DATELINE: FRONT ROYAL, Va., May 2

BODY:

The following was issued today by Human Life International:

"It was inevitable when the first demonstrators tied the concepts of 'choice' to the idea of 'rights' that we would see those terms degraded until they have no meaning left. Those of us who have been active in the pro-life movement knew that when the death of an unborn child became a 'right,' that this was only the beginning of the reclassification of rights as entitlements. And as for responsibility or bearing the consequences of 'choice,' they are not rhetorically satisfying ... so they are no longer even considered. This weekend, we had the opportunity to witness the final perversion of the

concept

of 'rights.' Several thousand homosexual men and women marched in

Washington

D.C. this weekend demanding 'equality.' They tossed around terms like

'civil

rights,' 'sitting at the back of the bus,' and 'the freedom to love.'

Now,

every person there shares the same freedoms as every other human being in

this

country. But then 'We demand special privileges' isn't a very compelling

rally

slogan."

Fr. Welch referred to the Millennium March on Washington, a gay pride
march

and rally held Sunday, 30 April. Marchers chanted a variety of slogans,

from

"Tipper and Al!" to "Homophobia has got to go," to Dartmouth College's

"We're

here, we're queer, our parents think we're studying." While concern over

AIDS

and hate crimes were recurring march themes, the most commonly mentioned

cause

was "equality." A platform listed in the special march edition of The

Advocate

claims as the objects of the gay movement such things as adoption rights,

legalization of same-sex marriage, and lifting the ban on gays in the

military

and boy scouts.

Speakers at the rally pledged support for many of these goals, rejecting the notion of compromise. Conservatives and most religions were frequent targets of attack by the speakers. One Unitarian minister went so far as to call traditional religious objections to homosexuality the domain of "pornographers and prudes," and demanded the rejection of what he termed "so-called morality," claiming that morality could be based on relationships. Several other speakers attempted to tie the gay rights movement to the struggles of minorities through the civil rights movement -- a comparison that has often generated hostility from civil rights leaders who see the obvious differences between the two.

"The fact that our culture has become so desensitized to sin that we can allow such a celebration of immorality to pass without comment is shameful," continued Fr. Welch. "Especially when nearly every demand that issues from the gay community threatens to tear apart our social fabric."

"They claim this march was about civil rights. In truth, it was about uncivil wrongs. There is no such thing as a right to marry whomever you want --

ask a bigamist about that. There is no such thing as a right to have or adopt

children -- which is why adoption agencies need to screen parents. And there is

no such thing as a right to force an organization to accept you when it could

destroy their integrity, their reputation, and their effectiveness. What we are

speaking of here are privileges. And with each privilege comes responsibility.

The marchers on Sunday made a choice that rejects morality and responsibility

for selfish, godless, immoral gratification of their sexual impulses and their egos."

"This Gay Pride March was 'toned down' to attempt to gain acceptance of mainstream America. The most radical groups and outrageous dress and behavior

that truly mirror gay rights were discouraged. There were so many corporate

sponsors it seemed like a golf tournament. Don't be confused. What these marchers want is to destroy mainstream America, destroy the family, destroy

marriage, and destroy the innocence and purity of our children and their morals," concluded Father Welch. "What is most appalling is that this event

took place in our nation's capital, in the area where school trips and families

gather for weekends. Our capital was invaded by perversion, perversion trumpeted and demonstrated before the eyes of the most vulnerable and pure."

Founded in 1981, Human Life International (<http://www.hli.org> , 1-800-549-LIFE) is the world's largest pro-life, pro-faith, pro-family educational apostolate, with chapters in the United States and a network of international branches and affiliates serving 90 countries.

SOURCE Human Life International

CONTACT: Andy Blom of Human Life International, 540-622-5204

URL: <http://www.prnewswire.com>

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: May 2, 2000

Copyright 2000 Southam Inc.

The Gazette (Montreal)

May 2, 2000, Tuesday, FINAL

SECTION: News; B4

LENGTH: 42 words

HEADLINE: S.C. to honour King

DATELINE: UNITED STATES

BODY:

South Carolina became the last state in the U.S. to honour slain civil-rights leader Martin Luther King, Jr., with a statewide holiday in January despite opposition from the NAACP to a compromise designating May 10 as Confederate Memorial Day.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: May 2, 2000

3 of 11 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Times Mirror Company

Los Angeles Times

May 2, 2000, Tuesday, Home Edition

SECTION: Part A; Part 1; Page 3; Metro Desk

LENGTH: 589 words

HEADLINE: CALIFORNIA AND THE WEST;

BORDER PATROL AGENT PLEADS GUILTY OVER TRAFFIC STOP INCIDENT

BYLINE: KEN ELLINGWOOD, TIMES STAFF WRITER

DATELINE: SAN DIEGO

BODY:

A U.S. Border Patrol agent pleaded guilty Monday to obstructing justice for trying to cover up a traffic stop during which he used force and left a motorist injured.

Kenneth L. Stewart, 34, of Murrieta faces up to 10 years in federal prison for obstruction of justice. Sentencing for Stewart, who resigned Monday, is scheduled for July 24.

Prosecutors said Stewart urged his partner, who was not charged, to keep quiet about the stop and later instructed the agent to omit mention of the encounter from an incident report.

Gregory A. Vega, the U.S. attorney for San Diego and Imperial counties, said the plea was a "fair disposition" of a case that the federal government investigated for more than a year.

"An officer who engages in such misconduct not only violates his oath, but also undermines public trust. By pleading guilty, Mr. Stewart accepts responsibility for his criminal behavior and forever forfeits his place among the ranks of law enforcement," Vega said in a statement.

The incident occurred on the night of March 15, 1999, as Stewart, assigned to the Temecula station since joining the Border Patrol in 1992, and a partner patrolled a rural highway near the northern San Diego County community of Santa Ysabel.

The agents saw a pair of vehicles--a Ford Bronco and a Ford Escort--traveling close to each other and suspected they might be driven by immigrant smugglers.

Smuggling vans are often accompanied by a scout car.

When the agents sought to stop the pair, the Bronco sped away and the Escort pulled over. After Stewart's partner questioned the car's passenger, Stewart took the driver to the Border Patrol vehicle and "used physical force against him" that resulted in an eye injury and facial bleeding, according to federal prosecutors.

The driver, 31-year-old Alejandro Vega Cano, was slammed against the trunk of

the Border Patrol sedan and then shoved to the ground by Stewart,
according to
the man's lawyer.

Vega Cano was released at the time but later was charged with
misdemeanor
aiding and abetting an illegal entry in connection with the incident,
said his
attorney, Jeffrey Kerrane. Kerrane said Vega Cano has filed a federal
civil
rights lawsuit against the federal government and the two agents involved
in the
stop.

Both Vega Cano and his passenger were permanent residents of the United
States.

Stewart's lawyer said the agent shoved Vega Cano to the ground only
after the
motorist grabbed Stewart's arm during questioning. The agents were
suspicious
before the stop because the car slowed and shifted lanes in an apparent
attempt
to hinder the agents' pursuit of the Bronco. The Bronco was subsequently
stopped
and found to hold an unspecified number of undocumented immigrants.

"There is no plea to any sort of assault. Nobody has ever said this was excessive force," said James Gattety, who represented Stewart.

The incident has angered San Diego activists who believe Stewart--and his partner--should have been prosecuted for civil rights violations. "This is just a slap on the wrist," Roberto Martinez, who heads a border project of the American Friends Service Committee, said Monday. Martinez's group initially reported the incident to the Justice Department.

A Border Patrol spokesman said Monday that better training and oversight have contributed to a 65% drop in the number of complaints of abuses by agents in the past five years. There were 34 such complaints made to the U.S. government last year, said Border Patrol spokesman Roy Villareal.

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: May 2, 2000

4 of 11 DOCUMENTS

The New York Times

May 2, 2000, Tuesday, Late Edition - Final

SECTION: Section A; Page 18; Column 4; National Desk

LENGTH: 663 words

HEADLINE: Mediator Helps Settle Baltimore School Suit

BYLINE: By NEIL A. LEWIS

DATELINE: WASHINGTON, May 1

BODY:

Lawyers involved in a case that has dragged through the federal courts
for 16

years said today they had reached a tentative settlement concerning
charges that

the Baltimore public school system had woefully neglected physically and
mentally disabled students.

The settlement sets goals for evaluating children with special needs

and for
putting special education students into regular classes and calls for
annual
monitoring.

What may be most notable, however, is the unusual procedure used to
settle
the case, which was scheduled to go to trial today. The parties chose a
federal
judge -- one not involved in the case -- to serve as a mediator.

Such a procedure, the lawyers and the trial judge said, had been used
only
once before, and it proved unsuccessful. That occurred this year in the
Microsoft antitrust trial. The judge in that case, Thomas Penfield
Jackson,
asked Richard A. Posner, chief judge of the United States Court of
Appeals for
the Seventh Circuit, in Chicago, to mediate the dispute, but his efforts
failed
to produce a solution.

In the Baltimore case, both sides agreed in January to ask Judge David
S.
Tatel of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia
Circuit
to help them reach a settlement. Lawyers for both sides said today that

they
were delighted with the results.

The suit dates to 1984, when the Maryland Disability Law Center sued
the city
and state, charging that little was being done to accommodate the needs
of the
estimated 18 percent of the enrollment of slightly more than 100,000
students
who qualified for special education. Similar lawsuits have been filed in
about a
dozen major cities, including New York and Los Angeles.

At one point in the litigation, the city was so discouraged about its
ability
to do anything that it came up with the idea of simply giving televisions,
videocassette recorders and computers to students to make up for its
neglect.

In his earlier career as a private lawyer in Washington, Judge Tatel
represented the Baltimore school board in the case.

Judge Marvin J. Garbis, who was presiding over the trial, said, "it has
to be
a pretty extraordinary person who once sat with the defense" to be deemed
acceptable to both sides.

But lawyers who were suing the city said they had confidence in Judge Tatel because he had also once been director of the Office for Civil Rights in what was the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Steven Ney, legal director of the disability center, said the settlement "sets a road map for the ultimate disposition of the case."

The courts had ruled that the city and state had neglected children in need of special education, and the last several years have been about how to remedy that. Under the settlement announced today, the federal courts will "disengage" from monitoring the city's schools if all the goals are substantially met.

Among the requirements of the agreement, the school district will have to place nearly 60 percent of the special education students in regular classes, or "mainstream" them, in three years. About 40 percent of such students now attend regular classes at some point in the school day.

The reading gap between special education and other students will have to be

narrowed in three years, and there will be annual reporting to a special master,

Amy Totenberg.

Judge Garbis said that while the Microsoft case involved great amounts of money the Baltimore case involved the "precious resource of our children." He led the lawyers in a standing ovation to Judge Tatel, saying, "the people of Baltimore and its children owe a great deal to Judge Tatel."

In addressing the court, Judge Tatel, who was not compensated for his work, said he believed that both sides had achieved their goals. "They produced an agreement that calls for educationally sound but realistic outcomes that have a good chance of improving the quality of education in the Baltimore public school system."

<http://www.nytimes.com>

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: May 2, 2000

5 of 11 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 The Chronicle Publishing Co.

The San Francisco Chronicle

MAY 2, 2000, TUESDAY, FINAL; CONTRA COSTA EDITION

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. A13

LENGTH: 635 words

HEADLINE: Alarm Firm Accused of Race Bias;

4 black employees claim they were denied promotions

BYLINE: Bernadette Tansey, Chronicle Staff Writer

DATeline: WALNUT CREEK

BODY:

A Walnut Creek security alarm firm that prides itself on its community service

work in Oakland and other cities is facing a discrimination suit by four

black

employees who say they were routinely passed over for promotions.

In a federal civil rights complaint, the African American women accuse Bay Alarm Co. of promoting less-qualified white applicants without posting the jobs and giving them the chance to apply.

A former personnel manager backed the discrimination claims in a recent deposition, saying Bay Alarm co-owner Roger Westphal repeatedly instructed her to limit the number of blacks hired by the firm. Another former manager testified that on about four occasions, Westphal saw him interviewing black applicants and told him to deny them jobs.

The firm's attorney, AnnaMary Gannon, said the discrimination claims are completely unfounded.

"At no time did Roger Westphal, or any other executive of Bay Alarm, direct that employees of any race be excluded from the company, the company said in a letter responding to The Chronicle's inquiries.

"The company's hiring record speaks for itself," the company said. "Bay Alarm employs 485 people; 37 percent of whom are minorities. African

Americans

are represented at every level of the company, from entry jobs to vice president."

The complaint by three longtime Bay Alarm employees who have left the firm

and one current employee cites incidents as far back as the 1980s to allege a pattern of discrimination against blacks.

Bay Alarm, now the leading independent alarm company in California, was founded in Oakland in 1946 by Everett Westphal, whose two sons Roger and Bruce now operate the firm. It was recently ranked as the 12th-largest alarm company in the country.

Bay Alarm vice president of sales Howard Himmelman said the company made news during the holiday season last year when it donated thousands of turkeys and hams to the Oakland food bank run by Mother Mary Wright and installed a free alarm system after another food bank was burglarized.

One of the plaintiffs in the racial discrimination suit, Linda Johnston, had

been promoted to a management position but was later demoted after the company moved its headquarters to Walnut Creek in 1989, the lawsuit contends.

Former personnel manager Lila McCarthy said in a deposition that Roger Westphal told her that he wanted to limit the number of blacks visible on tours for potential clients. According to McCarthy, Westphal was afraid the clients "would think we didn't have a very good service" if they saw black employees.

McCarthy said Bruce Westphal, however, told her, "Those people can work here."

McCarthy said she felt she was eased out of her position in favor of a younger worker as part of a company move to change its image after the move to Walnut Creek.

Former manager Gordon Randy Spencer said in a deposition that he advocated promotion for Johnston because she was already acting as his assistant, but a white man was hired instead. Spencer, who left the firm in 1988, said he felt he lost his job at Bay Alarm in part because he supported Johnston.

Spencer said Roger Westphal told him three or four times not to hire black

applicants he observed being interviewed, but did not give his reasons.

Gannon

said Spencer also testified that Westphal would sometimes veto hiring for white

interviewees and members of other ethnic groups.

Three other employees -- Ollie Wills, Karen Phillips Wright and Vernestyne

Marshall -- claim the company passed them over for promotions, sometimes advancing white candidates they had trained. Marshall still works at the firm,

said Mike Meadows, the Walnut Creek attorney representing the four women.

Gannon said a trial of the case set for September 11 will vindicate the company's record.

LOAD-DATE: May 2, 2000

6 of 11 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Inc.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch

May 2, 2000, Tuesday, FIVE STAR LIFT EDITION

SECTION: METRO, Pg. B3

LENGTH: 440 words

HEADLINE: TITLE TO GREENWOOD CEMETERY IS TRANSFERRED TO ST. LOUIS COUNTY;
BURIAL GROUND CONTAINS REMAINS OF EX-SLAVES AND BUFFALO SOLDIERS

BYLINE: William C. Lhotka; Of The Post-Dispatch

BODY:

A judge transferred title of Greenwood Cemetery to St. Louis County on Monday so restoration can begin at the historic but run-down burial ground in Hillsdale.

In his order Monday, St. Louis County Associate Circuit Judge Patrick Clifford also dissolved a deed of trust that businessman Dan Jewell held for the cemetery in lieu of a delinquent loan to former cemetery owner Solomon Rooks.

And Clifford ordered Randy Hayman, the previously appointed receiver for Greenwood, to liquidate a company controlled by Rooks and turn over any remaining assets to the county.

Clifford's order paves the way for the county to forge agreements with the Missouri National Guard and a charitable group, the Friends of Greenwood.

They plan to clean up the cemetery, which contains among its 30,000 graves the remains of former slaves, black civil rights leaders and Buffalo Soldiers - a group of African-Americans who rode with the 9th and 10th U.S. cavalry regiments from the Indian Wars until the end of World War II.

At a hearing last week, Jewell claimed a financial stake in the cemetery. His attorney, Elkin Kistner, said Jewell had lent Rooks \$ 50,000 and got a deed of trust to the cemetery as collateral. Jewell was "an innocent bystander" in Rooks' failure to maintain the cemetery, Kistner said. Rooks defaulted on the loan, and Jewell now has a financial interest in the property, the lawyer said.

Robert C. Moore, an assistant county counselor, said the National Guard

and

charitable groups would not get involved in the cleanup if the title to

the 33

acres at 6571 St. Louis Avenue remained clouded.

Found to be abandoned

Clifford found Greenwood to be an abandoned cemetery under Missouri

law. The

judge said Jewell has had ample time to exercise his property rights

through

foreclosure but hasn't done so.

And the judge concluded that it is "within the legal and equitable

powers of

this court to transfer title free and clear of all liens, mortgages and

deeds of

trust" to St. Louis County.

Citing the deplorable conditions at the cemetery, Missouri Attorney

General

Jay Nixon brought the civil action over Greenwood against Rooks last

summer.

Clifford then named Hayman, a St. Louis lawyer, to serve as receiver

and run

Greenwood while the case was pending. Hayman now has the assignment of

liquidating one of Rooks' companies; finding assets, if any; and turning them over to the county.

At the hearing last week, Rooks once again alleged that he was the victim of a conspiracy and suggested that he would appeal any ruling by Clifford Jewell also may appeal, his lawyer told Clifford.

GRAPHIC: PHOTO Photo by LARRY WILLIAMS/ POST-DISPATCH -Flowers adorn a grave site Monday in the overgrown Greenwood Cemetery. The ruling clears the way for cleanup of the property.

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: May 2, 2000

7 of 11 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 News World Communications, Inc.

The Washington Times

May 02, 2000, Tuesday, Final Edition

SECTION: PART A; COMMENTARY; Pg. A17

LENGTH: 947 words

HEADLINE: Etched in a personal memory

BYLINE: Balint Vazsonyi

BODY:

For reasons which are now irrelevant, I kept aloof of the Elian Gonzalez affair - resisting, even, questions by journalists and radio talk show hosts.

The circumstances and images of his arrest have changed all that.

When I was 8 years old, an enormous handgun was held to my head by a member

of Hungary's Nazi Party. (He suspected my mother of hiding food.)

Earlier that

year, and then again when I was 20, I woke to dawn raids on Sundays by various

socialist forces, first German then Russian.

A gun pointed at a child is a gun pointed at a child. And the Easter weekend in America is easily the equivalent of a Sunday in Hungary.

An American network, CNN, reporting merely that "Elian has been reunited with his father" is not much closer to the truth than Radio Moscow announcing in November 1956 that "counterrevolutionary elements in Hungary financed by the American imperialists have been beaten back by the progressive forces of the Peace Camp."

I shall therefore devote this column to an enumeration of other manifestations in today's American vocabulary and practices that remind me of socialist-occupied Hungary. May it awaken millions of decent, ordinary Americans who promote socialism unbeknownst to themselves - and may it expose those who do it deliberately.

We have adopted labels such as reactionary, progressive, capitalist, working people, exploiter, the oppressed, imperialist, racist (to which we added sexist and homophobe), warmonger, peace . . . (anything), private sector,

politically

correct, sensitivity training (read: indoctrination), social justice,

economic

justice (to which we added environmental justice).

We have recast our system of education by accepting that "It takes a village

. . ." (which, rather than in some obscure African proverb, has its

origins in

the works of Anton Semionovich Makarenko, Lenin's education specialist),

by

introducing federal funding of public schools, dumbing down the

curriculum,

constantly changing terms of evaluation, and by introducing

School-to-Work. The

concepts that the state, rather than parents, decides what is best for

young

people, and that the young ought to inform on their parents were

ultimately

embodied in the Pioneer and Komsomol organizations of the Soviet Union

and the

Hitler Youth of the Third Reich.

We have created all sorts of new occupations such as judicial inquiry

officer, affirmative action officer, sensitivity counselor, civil rights

this

that and the other - all of which has nothing to do with rights in the

American

mold, and everything to do with the position known as "political officer"

where

I grew up.

And where political officers roam, political crime is not far behind.

Renamed

"hate speech" and "hate crime," the utterly un-American concept of

political

crime has been successfully introduced in the land of the free.

We have begun to change the names of our streets, the names of our
holidays,

the days on which holidays are celebrated. And, if the authors of

National

Standards for U.S. History have their way, we will change our calendar
altogether by replacing B.C. and A.D. with "before and after common
time."

We have introduced affirmative action and attendant preference quotas,
originally conceived in the Soviet Union to manipulate admission to
schools and

hiring based on the class of the applicant's parents, as in "worker,"
"peasant,"

"capitalist." We have abandoned the quality standard and tolerate,
increasingly,

persons in positions for which they are not qualified. The cumulative

damage to

society has been devastating everywhere else, and even a country with
America's

vast reserves cannot long maintain standards in the face of fewer and
fewer

qualified people carrying more and more unqualified people.

We have traded our nationhood for an old German mirage, proposed two
centuries ago by the poet Friedrich Schiller and confirmed by Karl Marx.

It is

called "One World," and is about as likely as the sun rising in the West,
and as

desirable as the United Nation's control of our armed forces.

But the worst comes from an invention of Joseph Goebbels, introduced
initially in Adolf Hitler's Third Reich. He called it "Gleichschaltung,"
which
means switching to parity.

The first American incarnation arrived as "multiculturalism." Disguised
as an

invitation for all "to be proud of their heritage," it elevates sets of
habit

and custom to the level of culture, and reduces true cultures to sets of
habit

and custom. It calls literary masterworks "texts," and the greatest music
merely "sound in space." It deprives all who need to and desire to rise by

eliminating heights to which to rise.

Gleichschaltung in America then proceeded to declare all beliefs and religions to be equivalent, and went on to propose that all forms of cohabitation were essentially the same. First came the elimination of illegitimate children as a category, then the "naturalization" of the one-parent family, finally the denunciation of mankind's entire past history during which marriage had required two adults of different sexes, so they might procreate.

After its success in changing domestic designations, Gleichschaltung also has been applied to those coming from other parts. For the longest time, persons arriving without proper papers were called illegal aliens. Recently, they turned into "undocumented immigrants."

That is, until the Saturday before Easter.

Apparently, Elian Gonzalez was found to be an illegal alien. Ah, so .

...

Balint Vazsonyi, author of "America's 30 Years War: Who Is Winning?" and director of the Center for the American Founding, grew up in Hungary under

various socialist regimes.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: May 2, 2000

8 of 11 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 News World Communications, Inc.

The Washington Times

May 02, 2000, Tuesday, Final Edition

SECTION: PART A; Pg. A1

LENGTH: 849 words

HEADLINE: Panel opposes normal trade for China;

Clerics, academics seek more religious freedom

BYLINE: Tom Carter; THE WASHINGTON TIMES

BODY:

A congressionally mandated panel of religious and academic leaders said yesterday that China should be denied permanent normal trade relations until it makes "substantial improvement" in allowing its people the freedom to worship.

The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, established in 1998 by an act of Congress, used its first annual report to accuse China, Sudan and Russia of hindering religious practices.

China and Sudan "are countries in which there are systematic, egregious, ongoing manifestations of religious persecutions," said Rabbi David Saperstein, chairman of the commission at a news conference. The group is required to report each year by May 1.

"We were convinced that for Congress to simply grant China permanent normal trade relations at this moment, with no significant improvement in the state of religious freedom, would be to send Beijing a signal that these awful, inexcusable, inhumane policies did not require a more immediate response," said

Michael Young, dean of the George Washington University Law School and

one of 10

co-authors of the report. "This we could not recommend."

Mr. Young told reporters that most members of the commission were "free traders," and did not wish to see China isolated but there has been a "serious deterioration in religious freedom during the past year in China."

This went beyond harassment and arrests, he said. "We are talking about three-year labor-camp sentences without trial, about multiyear prison terms, about people - including women - beaten to death by police."

Zhang Yuanyuan, spokesman for the Chinese Embassy in Washington, said he was sorry to see the report released just two or three weeks before Congress is to vote on the bill, which would renew China's normal trade relations status, known as NTR.

"We look forward to a smooth passage of the bill so we can begin to enjoy the great benefits of the World Trade Organization agreement that both countries worked so hard over the years to reach."

Mr. Zhang said there are now some 7 million Roman Catholics in China

compared with 70,000 at the time of the Chinese revolution, and that there are 25,000 functioning mosques in western China.

Describing some of the stories cited in the report as "unreliable" and "hearsay," he quoted Han Wenzao, president of the China Christian Council, who said during a visit to Washington this spring that "now is the best time in the history of the People's Republic of China in terms of enjoyment of religious freedom."

The commission's report says that NTR for China should be based on progress in five areas. China should:

- * Agree to high-level dialogue with the United States on religious freedom.

- * Ratify the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights.

- * Permit access to Chinese religious leaders, including those imprisoned, detained or under house arrest.

- * Answer questions about individuals detained for religious reasons or

last

seen in the custody of Chinese authorities.

* Release all those imprisoned for their faith.

The report recommends that before granting NTR to China, Congress should announce hearings on religious freedom in that country and invite the Dalai Lama, Tibet's spiritual and secular leader, to address a joint session of Congress.

Mr. Young said the commission was not asking China to meet each and every recommendation in order to win NTR, but it should show willingness to improve religious freedoms.

The commission was equally harsh on Sudan.

The report describes a 17-year-old civil war, waged by an Islamic government against mainly Christian rebels in southern Sudan, in a "genocidal" effort to impose its strict interpretation of Muslim law.

It said the war has claimed some 2 million lives and displaced an additional

4 million to 5 million "mostly Christian and followers of animist religions." It accuses the government of "crimes against humanity" and the deliberate bombing of churches.

The report recommends that the United States increase food aid to the south, outside U.N. channels, and encourage other governments to follow suit.

In addition, the reports recommends that the president begin a 12-month campaign of incentives and disincentives to prompt Sudan's government to improve religious freedom.

If that fails, the report recommends that the United States provide nonlethal humanitarian aid to the opposition groups.

The report said religious freedom in Russia is better now than before the breakup of the Soviet Union.

However, "Russia took a significant step backward in 1997" by enacting a law that undermines religious freedom, it said.

The commission also noted that Russian President-elect Vladimir Putin
had

decreed in March that all religious groups that do not register with the
government by the end of this year should be liquidated.

The panel criticized the State Department for withholding documents
related
to Sudan, including embassy cables, despite government security clearances
covering commission staff.

"This violates the spirit of Congress' intent," the report said.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: May 2, 2000

9 of 11 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 News World Communications, Inc.

The Washington Times

May 02, 2000, Tuesday, Final Edition

SECTION: PART A; COMMENTARY; OP-ED; Pg. A19

LENGTH: 815 words

HEADLINE: White flag or battle flag?;

No surrender in the culture war

BYLINE: Pat Buchanan

BODY:

To near universal press applause, John McCain has confessed to
deceiving the
South in defending the Confederate Battle Flag, and he has repudiated the
cause
of his forebears: "Those ancestors of mine . . . fought on the wrong
side of
history."

Now, the South was surely on the losing side of history; and had the
issue
been slavery, it would indeed have been the wrong side. But is this true
history, or bogus history written by the winners?

For in his First Inaugural Abraham Lincoln proposed a 13th amendment to
the

Constitution to make slavery permanent in the 15 states, and even offered a new federal law to help run down fugitive slaves. Six weeks later, when the Confederates fired on Fort Sumter, there were eight slave states in the Union, seven in the Confederacy. Lincoln was prepared to appease the South - on slavery. How, then, could the evil of slavery have been the cause of the war?

To Horace Greeley, Lincoln protested that if he could restore the Union without freeing a single slave, he would do so. In his Emancipation Proclamation, Lincoln denied freedom to the slaves in Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky, Missouri, West Virginia and parts of Tennessee. Lord Palmerston noted in amusement that Lincoln had undertaken to abolish slavery where he had no power to do so, while protecting slavery where he had the power to destroy it.

The cause of the war was, thus, not slavery. The cause of the war was the iron will of Abraham Lincoln who, like Andrew Jackson, believed first in the dictum: "Our Union . . . it must be preserved!" Rather than see a house divided, Lincoln would reunite it in blood.

Which brings us to the St. Andrew's Cross, a banner of bravery and defiance that flew over battlefields, not slave quarters. If that flag, as the left insists, is but a symbol of racism and the cause of Southern independence would simply, in Mr. McCain's words, have perpetuated the grave injustice of slavery, we ought not to stop at removing it from the capitol in Columbia.

All replicas of that flag, as in the Georgia state flag, should be removed, as should all the statuary to the rebellion leaders: Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson and legendary cavalryman Nathan Bedford Forrest, whose statue stands in Memphis and whose name graces street signs all across Tennessee.

To defend the battle flag, says Albert Gore, is to pander to the extreme right wing. Well, then, let Mr. Gore lead the fight to pull down all statues of Forrest, the victor of Fort Pillow where black soldiers were massacred, and grand wizard of the KKK. Let Albert Gore demand that every Southern street and the town in Arkansas named for Forrest be renamed for civil rights leaders

-King, Abernathy, Young, or Jackson (Jesse). Mr. Gore has written off South Carolina; but he hopes to carry Tennessee. Let us see if he will pander to the extreme right wing.

As for conservatives, it is past time they declared what it is, if anything, they will fight to conserve. For this assault on the battle flag, which they prayerfully wish would end, is a minor skirmish in a culture war where the end goal is extirpation of every symbol that testifies to America's Christian and Western character and heritage. Where and when will the right stand and fight?

Decades ago, it milled around like grazing cattle as a renegade court drove its God, commandments, Bible and prayers out of the public schools of a nation whose institutions, even Justice William Douglas conceded, presuppose the existence of a Supreme Being.

The de-Christianization of our institutions complete, our militant secular church has begun the deconstruction of our country.

Washington's name has been removed from a New Orleans school,
Jefferson's
name dragged through the gutter. On the 500th anniversary of Columbus'
voyage,
he was trashed as a genocidal exploiter of Native Americans.

Custer's name is gone from Little Big Horn battlefield. Our poems have
been
bowdlerized for political correctness; the calendar we grew up with
rewritten.
Birthdays of Lincoln and Washington have disappeared into Presidents Day.
Easter and Christmas are now spring and winter break. In public schools,
Christmas carols are forbidden; in public places, songs like "Dixie" and
"Carry
Me Back to Old Virginny" are hate crimes.

Were these changes brought about by popular clamor? Or were they
imposed by
the high priests of an intolerant church many Americans are terrified to
contradict, lest they receive the heretics brand of racist, bigot or
extremist?

The real value of Mr. McCain's extraordinary remarks "would be if they
shamed
all politicians who pander," writes The Washington Post. Fair point.
But what
do we do with those sorry politicians who spend whole careers pandering

to the
media elite?

Pat Buchanan is a candidate for the Reform Party presidential
nomination.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: May 2, 2000

10 of 11 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Phoenix Newspapers, Inc.

THE ARIZONA REPUBLIC

April 30, 2000 Sunday, Final Chaser

SECTION: VALLEY & STATE; Pg. B9

LENGTH: 649 words

HEADLINE: BILL MAHONEY FOUGHT RACIAL BIAS WHEREVER HE FOUND IT

BYLINE: By John Stanley, The Arizona Republic

BODY:

Bill Mahoney would have made a great Jesuit.

He was intelligent, idealistic, devout and fiercely dedicated to social justice.

Mahoney was a superb athlete and a talented musician who won a scholarship to

Notre Dame, earned a law degree, and fought to desegregate Phoenix schools. He

served as an ambassador in John F. Kennedy's administration and worked tirelessly to improve conditions for the Navajo Nation.

He grew up among African-Americans, Hispanics and Native Americans and saw

plenty of discrimination firsthand.

"He never forgot where he came from," said Mahoney's son, Richard, former

Arizona secretary of state. "He was a poor Irish Catholic kid who knew bigotry, and he never forgot it."

William Patrick Mahoney Jr. died April 27 after a long bout with Alzheimer's

disease. He was 83.

Mahoney was born in Prescott and raised in Kingman and Winslow. He was salutatorian of the Winslow High School class of 1934, where he was student body president.

Mahoney won a full scholarship to Notre Dame where he acquired the nickname "T-Bone" after a radio show character. He excelled in the classroom and on the track, setting a world's record for the 220-yard hurdles as a 19-year-old.

He graduated in 1939, but stayed to earn his law degree. He remained in South Bend, Ind., as a track coach and English teacher until 1942, when he entered the Navy.

He met Alice Phelan Doyle of San Francisco in 1943 and, after only a handful of dates, they became engaged. Then he left for the South Pacific. Among other duties, he wrote a newspaper column named after his mongrel dog, Fubar. The troops loved it, but his superiors were not much amused.

At war's end, Mahoney prosecuted war crimes and secured the conviction of

Japanese Adm. Shigematsu Sakaibara for his role in the massacre of more than 100 American prisoners of war.

After a three-year engagement, Mahoney married his fiancée in 1946.

They settled in Phoenix, and Mahoney jumped into civil-rights issues. In 1947, he helped found the Phoenix Council for Civic Unity to fight segregation.

Thanks to his efforts, Phoenix schools were desegregated in 1953, a full year

before the landmark Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka ruling that found segregation unconstitutional.

Mahoney was elected Maricopa County attorney in 1952 and re-elected in 1954.

He lost a 1956 congressional bid to John Rhodes.

Mahoney was instrumental in delivering Arizona to John F. Kennedy in the 1960 Democratic caucus.

Thanks to that, and his superb record on civil-rights issues, Mahoney was appointed ambassador to Ghana in 1962 and served there three years.

Mahoney was particularly proud of his work for the Navajo Nation. He was a founding board member of the Navajo legal aid group, DNA-People's Legal Services and escorted Robert Kennedy to the reservation several times in the late 1960s.

Mahoney was to have coordinated Kennedy's Arizona campaign in 1968. Kennedy's assassination marked the end of Mahoney's active involvement in politics.

Mahoney was the co-founder of CASS, the Central Arizona Shelter Services, a model for groups fighting homelessness around the country.

Mahoney was scholarly and somewhat reserved, but had a great singing voice and was a talented mimic. His impression of Lyndon Johnson was devastating.

Mahoney is survived by his wife of 53 years, Alice; children, Bill of Houston, Gladys of Phoenix, Mary of Washington, D.C., Richard of Costa Rica, Eileen of Phoenix, Lawrence of Denver, Emmet of Prescott, Noel Shambayati of Phoenix, Sheila Patton of Phoenix; and five grandchildren.

There will be a visitation Monday from 6 to 8 p.m. at SS. Simon and Jude Cathedral, 6351 N. 27th Ave., Phoenix. The funeral will be Tuesday at 11:30 a.m. at the cathedral.

Donations may be made to the Cathedral's Help-a-Student Fund, or to the Missionaries of Charity, 1414 S. 17th Ave., Phoenix, AZ 85007.

GRAPHIC: Photos (2) courtesy Mahoney family; During John F. Kennedy's administration, William Mahoney spent three years as ambassador to Ghana. Mahoney and his wife, Alice (right, in a 1994 photo), were married in 1946.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

COLUMN: A LIFE REMEMBERED

LOAD-DATE: May 2, 2000

11 of 11 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Inc.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch

April 28, 2000, Friday, FIVE STAR LIFT EDITION

Correction Appended

SECTION: EDITORIAL, Pg. B6

LENGTH: 533 words

HEADLINE: MOVING TOWARD EQUALITY

BODY:

GAY RIGHTS

UNTIL this week, picturesque Vermont was known primarily for maple syrup, fall foliage and quaint towns. On Wednesday, though, this New England state made history. Gov. Howard Dean signed a bill creating civil unions, which allow gays and lesbians to enjoy many of the legal benefits of marriage.

Earlier this month, Reform rabbis decided to permit same-sex unions, joining the Unitarians as the only mainstream religious denominations to bless same-sex

unions.

At roughly the same time the Vermont governor was signing the bill on civil unions, the U.S. Supreme Court was hearing arguments in a New Jersey case involving the Boy Scouts' ban on gays. In a potentially landmark decision, the court has to decide whether the Boy Scouts was within its rights to expel James Dale, an exemplary Eagle scout and assistant scoutmaster, when it discovered he was gay. The justices' questions were probing, but not particularly revealing of the direction the court might take.

Last year, the New Jersey Supreme Court rejected the Boy Scouts' argument that it is a private group, with the right to be selective in its membership.

The Boy Scouts, it ruled, is a public accommodation sponsored by many public agencies - and subject to the state's anti-discrimination law. Most extraordinary about the decision, though, was its blistering indictment of anti-gay discrimination as bigotry based on "little more than prejudice."

In recent years, many Americans have come to believe that gays shouldn't be

discriminated against in job hiring, promotion or housing - traditional
arenas

of civil rights. These stands reflect a view that homosexuals shouldn't be
punished or penalized for who they are.

But the developments that coincidentally happened this month continue
to take

the debate to a higher level, toward equality. They speak to the full
integration of gays and lesbians into the daily life of their
communities, into
the warp and woof of our social fabric.

If they seem like familiar battles, they are. Remember when blacks
couldn't

be Mormons? When women couldn't be clergy? Or Jaycees? Or when military
cohesiveness would be irreparably harmed by the integration of blacks -
and then

women? The arguments endorsing those views now sound shallow,
self-serving and
rife with stereotypes.

The same holds true for arguments to bar homosexuals from the
institutions of

daily life. The perceived harm to society of inclusion is mostly
imaginary. Mr.

Dale did no injury to the Boy Scouts, judging from his success in the
organization. And, after Rick Rockwell and Darva Conger, it's hard to

argue that

allowing gays civil unions - or even marriage - would debase the

institution. If

the state does have an interest in stable family life, it surely makes

sense to

allow committed gay couples to have the inheritance rights, tax breaks and

authority to make medical decisions.

Equality, of course, is still a long way off. Gays are being shoved out

of

the military. Anti-gay "defense of marriage" laws have been passed. Gov.

George

W. Bush is excoriated for even meeting with the gay Log Cabin

Republicans. But

this month's events show equality is not unattainable.

CORRECTION-DATE: April 29, 2000

CORRECTION:

The following editorial on gay rights should say that until 1978, black

men

could not become Mormon priests.

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: May 2, 2000

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

Time of Delivery: May 2, 2000 11:19 am EST

Email Number: 59:0:8977849

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jesse_M._Hartness (Jesse_M._Hartness@who.eop.gov [who])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-MAY-2000 20:58:17.00

SUBJECT: Another American: Asking and Telling

TO: Anthony R. Bernal (anthony r. bernal@ovp [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: arthur_coleman (arthur_coleman@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bernie.delia (bernie.delia@usdoj.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: chris_thomson (chris_thomson@ios.doi.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ckenngott (ckenngott@gipsa.usda.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cameron N. Cohen (CN=Cameron N. Cohen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Jason E. Rodriguez (CN=Jason E. Rodriguez/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Martin L. Yeung (CN=Martin L. Yeung/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul Oetken (CN=Paul Oetken/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Vicki Johnson (CN=Vicki Johnson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dlplumme (dlplumme@opm.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ekaplan (ekaplan@osc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth_E._Towne (elizabeth_e._towne@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: fred.hochberg (fred.hochberg@sba.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gail.shibley (gail.shibley@fhwa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: hcreel (hcreel@fmc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jean_veta (jean_veta@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John_Berry (john_berry@ios.doi.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: juan.lopez (juan.lopez@ssa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jwhite (jwhite@arc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: kate_seelman (kate_seelman@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: martinrouse (martinrouse@ios.ssa.os.dc [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MEHUNKER (mehunker@opm.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mercedes_m._marquez (mercedes_m._marquez@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Norma.Krayem (norma.krayem@ost.dot.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: paul.richard (paul.richard@eeoc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: philip g. dufour (philip g. dufour@ovp [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ppappas (ppappas@fcc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: roan.conrad (roan.conrad@hdq.noaa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: romulo.diaz (romulo.diaz@hq.doe.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rpereahenze (rpereahenze@doc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: summers_t (summers_t@al.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: tmiller (tmiller@cfo.usda.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: todd.dickinson (todd.dickinson@uspto.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: vbasile (vbasile@peacecorps.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Elizabeth J. Potter

04/28/2000 04:37:00 PM

Record Type: Record

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

cc:

Subject: Another American: Asking and Telling

A one person solo performance play by Marc Wolf and directed by Joe Mantello
will be playing at the Studio Theatre in WDC April 28 - May 14.

The playwright felt that if he could give a dramatic voice to people who

had been silenced, maybe he could add to the country's exploration of the Military's "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy. At the same time, he knew it would be important to find people who could persuasively argue the military's point of view.

He interviewed straight, gay, and lesbian military personnel, veterans from WWII to Desert Storm, civil rights lawyers, federal judges, politicians, activists, and professors of sociology, constitutional law and military history. The interviews have been tape recorded, transcribed, edited and then used as verbatim monologues to construct the text for a one-person, multi-character play.

Sounds Interesting. It has been playing in NY and has had positive reviews from New York Times, Variety, New York Post, Village Voice and Time Out.

Would anyone like to join a group on Wednesday May 4th?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jesse M. Hartness (CN=Jesse M. Hartness/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-MAY-2000 16:58:17.00

SUBJECT: Another American: Asking and Telling

TO: arthur_coleman (arthur_coleman@ed.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bernie.delia (bernie.delia@usdoj.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: cameron_n._cohen (cameron_n._cohen@who.eop.gov @ inet [who])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: chris_thomson (chris_thomson@ios.doi.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ckenngott (ckenngott@gipsa.usda.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anthony R. Bernal (CN=anthony r. bernal/O=ovp@ovp [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason E. Rodriguez (CN=Jason E. Rodriguez/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: philip g. dufour (CN=philip g. dufour/O=ovp@ovp [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: daniel_c._montoya (daniel_c._montoya@opd.eop.gov @ inet [opd])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dlplumme (dlplumme@opm.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ekaplan (ekaplan@osc.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth_e._towne (elizabeth_e._towne@hud.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: fred.hochberg (fred.hochberg@sba.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gail.shibley (gail.shibley@fhwa.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: hcreel (hcreel@fmc.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jean_veta (jean_veta@ed.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: john_berry (john_berry@ios.doi.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: juan.lopez (juan.lopez@ssa.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jwhite (jwhite@arc.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: karen_tramontano (karen_tramontano@who.eop.gov @ inet [who])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: kate_seelman (kate_seelman@ed.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: martinrouse (martinrouse@ios.ssa.os.dc @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mehunker (mehunker@opm.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: myeung (myeung@omb.eop.gov @ inet [omb])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: norma.krayem (norma.krayem@ost.dot.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: paul.richard (paul.richard@eeoc.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: paul_oetken (paul_oetken@who.eop.gov @ inet [who])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ppappas (ppappas@fcc.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: roan.conrad (roan.conrad@hdq.noaa.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: romulo.diaz (romulo.diaz@hq.doe.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rpereahenze (rpereahenze@doc.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: sean_p._maloney (sean_p._maloney@who.eop.gov @ inet [who])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: summers_t (summers_t@al.eop.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: tmiller (tmiller@cfo.usda.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: todd.dickinson (todd.dickinson@uspto.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: vbasile (vbasile@peacecorps.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: vicki_johnson (vicki_johnson@who.eop.gov @ inet [who])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Elizabeth J. Potter

04/28/2000 04:37:00 PM

Record Type: Record

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

cc:

Subject: Another American: Asking and Telling

A one person solo performance play by Marc Wolf and directed by Joe
Mantello will be playing at the Studio Theatre in WDC April 28 - May 14.

The playwright felt that if he could give a dramatic voice to people who
had been silenced, maybe he could add to the country's exploration of the
Military's "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy. At the same time, he knew it
would be important to find people who could persuasively argue the

military's point of view.

He interviewed straight, gay, and lesbian military personnel, veterans from WWII to Desert Storm, civil rights lawyers, federal judges, politicians, activists, and professors of sociology, constitutional law and military history. The interviews have been tape recorded, transcribed, edited and then used as verbatim monologues to construct the text for a one-person, multi-character play.

Sounds Interesting. It has been playing in NY and has had positive reviews from New York Times, Variety, New York Post, Village Voice and Time Out.

Would anyone like to join a group on Wednesday May 4th?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jesse_M._Hartness (Jesse_M._Hartness@who.eop.gov [who])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-MAY-2000 20:58:17.00

SUBJECT: Another American: Asking and Telling

TO: Anthony R. Bernal (anthony r. bernal@ovp [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: arthur_coleman (arthur_coleman@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bernie.delia (bernie.delia@usdoj.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: chris_thomson (chris_thomson@ios.doi.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ckenngott (ckenngott@gipsa.usda.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cameron N. Cohen (CN=Cameron N. Cohen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason E. Rodriguez (CN=Jason E. Rodriguez/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Martin L. Yeung (CN=Martin L. Yeung/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul Oetken (CN=Paul Oetken/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Vicki Johnson (CN=Vicki Johnson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dlplumme (dlplumme@opm.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ekaplan (ekaplan@osc.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth_E._Towne (elizabeth_e._towne@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: fred.hochberg (fred.hochberg@sba.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gail.shibley (gail.shibley@fhwa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: hcreel (hcreel@fmc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jean_veta (jean_veta@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John_Berry (john_berry@ios.doi.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: juan.lopez (juan.lopez@ssa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jwhite (jwhite@arc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: kate_seelman (kate_seelman@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: martinrouse (martinrouse@ios.ssa.os.dc [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MEHUNKER (mehunker@opm.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mercedes_m._marquez (mercedes_m._marquez@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Norma.Krayem (norma.krayem@ost.dot.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: paul.richard (paul.richard@eeoc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: philip g. dufour (philip g. dufour@ovp [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ppappas (ppappas@fcc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: roan.conrad (roan.conrad@hdq.noaa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: romulo.diaz (romulo.diaz@hq.doe.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rpereahenze (rpereahenze@doc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: summers_t (summers_t@al.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: tmiller (tmiller@cfo.usda.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: todd.dickinson (todd.dickinson@uspto.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: vbasile (vbasile@peacecorps.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Elizabeth J. Potter

04/28/2000 04:37:00 PM

Record Type: Record

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

cc:

Subject: Another American: Asking and Telling

A one person solo performance play by Marc Wolf and directed by Joe Mantello
will be playing at the Studio Theatre in WDC April 28 - May 14.

The playwright felt that if he could give a dramatic voice to people who

had been silenced, maybe he could add to the country's exploration of the Military's "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy. At the same time, he knew it would be important to find people who could persuasively argue the military's point of view.

He interviewed straight, gay, and lesbian military personnel, veterans from WWII to Desert Storm, civil rights lawyers, federal judges, politicians, activists, and professors of sociology, constitutional law and military history. The interviews have been tape recorded, transcribed, edited and then used as verbatim monologues to construct the text for a one-person, multi-character play.

Sounds Interesting. It has been playing in NY and has had positive reviews from New York Times, Variety, New York Post, Village Voice and Time Out.

Would anyone like to join a group on Wednesday May 4th?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Heather H. Howard (CN=Heather H. Howard/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-MAY-2000 15:03:42.00

SUBJECT: Guidance for Diane Rehm interview

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Heather H. Howard/OPD/EOP on

05/09/2000 03:03 PM -----

Eric J. Morse

05/09/2000 11:53:32 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Heather H. Howard/OPD/EOP@EOP

cc:

Subject: Guidance for Diane Rehm interview

----- Forwarded by Eric J. Morse/OMB/EOP on 05/09/2000

11:53 AM -----

Anna Richter

05/08/2000 04:23:50 PM

Record Type: Record

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

cc:

Subject: Guidance for Diane Rehm interview

As you can see, some topics to be discussed are noted specifically. So,
If your issue is noted, I will need guidance by 2:00 at the latest
tomorrow. Should a more comprehensive list come in around 1:00, which
includes new topics, I will push for a later, reasonable deadline with the
press office --

Thanks --

----- Forwarded by Anna Richter/OPD/EOP on 05/08/2000

04:17 PM -----

Megan C. Moloney

05/08/2000 04:04:48 PM

Record Type: Record

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

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

Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP, Dorinda A. Salcido/WHO/EOP@EOP

Subject: Guidance for Diane Rehm interview

The following is a list of topics from Diane Rehm's producers. They hope to have a more comprehensive list to me by 1 PM tomorrow.

The President is doing a 20 minute interview with Diane on WEDNESDAY, MAY 10 at 5:30 PM.

PLEASE HAVE ALL GUIDANCE AND/OR Q&A TO ME AND JASON SCHECHTER BY 3:00 PM ON TUESDAY, MAY 9. Also, please forward this to anyone that may be able to contribute that I have left off the list.

Thanks!

Domestic (Specific issues are in bold)

Past:

-- How do you view the success of your administration? In particular, do you claim credit for the 30 year low in unemployment, the 8 year decline in crime, etc?

Present:

-- Where do you see the United States' place in the economic structure of the world?

-- What has changed about the nature of the political process as you have been in office? In particular, discuss the approval rate of Judicial appointees and the political nature of that process. Also, discuss

fundraising and how that has changed.

-- Million Mom March and Gun control issues: Where are we now and what has to happen next?

-- There are a number of issues facing the gay community. What do you see as important steps we can take.

Future:

-- What is in your future?

-- What is the United States' role in the future?

Foreign Policy/National Security

-- Why is China PNTR important?

-- What has been the success of don't ask, don't tell and what is the future of the policy?

-- What are our country's greatest threats? In particular, does our military readiness pose a threat?

Message Sent

To: _____

Patrick M. Dorton/OPD/EOP@EOP

Anna Richter/OPD/EOP@EOP

Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OPD/EOP@EOP

James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP

Philip J. Crowley/NSC/EOP@EOP

David B. Stockwell/NSC/EOP@EOP

Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP

Message Sent

To: _____

Andrea Kane/OPD/EOP@EOP

J. Eric Gould/OPD/EOP@EOP

Eugenia Chough/OPD/EOP@EOP

Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OPD/EOP@EOP

Deanne E. Benos/OPD/EOP@EOP

Sarah C. Lucas/OPD/EOP@EOP

Andy Rotherham/OPD/EOP@EOP

Karin Kullman/OPD/EOP@EOP

Christopher C. Jennings/OPD/EOP@EOP

Devorah R. Adler/OPD/EOP@EOP

Irene Bueno/OPD/EOP@EOP

Ann O'Leary/OPD/EOP@EOP

Eric J. Morse/OMB/EOP@EOP

Kendra L. Brooks/OPD/EOP@EOP

Bethany Little/OPD/EOP@EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Megan C. Moloney (CN=Megan C. Moloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-MAY-2000 12:25:35.00

SUBJECT: REMINDER: Guidance for Diane Rehm interview

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James E. Kennedy (CN=James E. Kennedy/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leanne A. Shimabukuro (CN=Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: michael a. hammer (CN=Michael A. Hammer/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patrick M. Dorton (CN=Patrick M. Dorton/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Philip J. Crowley (CN=Philip J. Crowley/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Jennifer M. Palmieri (CN=Jennifer M. Palmieri/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I should have more specific issue areas this afternoon by 1:00 PM. I'll

get them to you as soon as I can... but if you see something on here,

please let me know whether you have something for us.

Thanks.

----- Forwarded by Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP on 05/09/2000

12:24 PM -----

Megan C. Moloney

05/08/2000 04:04:48 PM

Record Type: Record

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

cc: Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP, Jenni R.

Engebretsen/WHO/EOP@EOP, Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP, Dorinda A.

Salcido/WHO/EOP@EOP

Subject: Guidance for Diane Rehm interview

The following is a list of topics from Diane Rehm's producers. They hope to have a more comprehensive list to me by 1 PM tomorrow.

The President is doing a 20 minute interview with Diane on WEDNESDAY, MAY 10 at 5:30 PM.

PLEASE HAVE ALL GUIDANCE AND/OR Q&A TO ME AND JASON SCHECHTER BY 3:00 PM ON TUESDAY, MAY 9. Also, please forward this to anyone that may be able to contribute that I have left off the list.

Thanks!

Domestic (Specific issues are in bold)

Past:

-- How do you view the success of your administration? In particular, do you claim credit for the 30 year low in unemployment, the 8 year decline in crime, etc?

Present:

-- Where do you see the United States' place in the economic structure of the world?

-- What has changed about the nature of the political process as you have been in office? In particular, discuss the approval rate of Judicial appointees and the political nature of that process. Also, discuss fundraising and how that has changed.

-- Million Mom March and Gun control issues: Where are we now and what has to happen next?

-- There are a number of issues facing the gay community. What do you see as important steps we can take.

Future:

-- What is in your future?

-- What is the United States' role in the future?

Foreign Policy/National Security

- Why is China PNTR important?
- What has been the success of don't ask, don't tell and what is the future of the policy?
- What are our country's greatest threats? In particular, does our military readiness pose a threat?

Message Sent

To: _____

Patrick M. Dorton/OPD/EOP@EOP

Anna Richter/OPD/EOP@EOP

Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OPD/EOP@EOP

James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP

Philip J. Crowley/NSC/EOP@EOP

David B. Stockwell/NSC/EOP@EOP

Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-MAY-2000 12:33:53.00

SUBJECT: REMINDER: Guidance for Diane Rehm interview

TO: Deanne E. Benos (CN=Deanne E. Benos/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leanne A. Shimabukuro (CN=Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Will you be able to get something to me by 2:00?

----- Forwarded by Anna Richter/OPD/EOP on 05/09/2000

12:33 PM -----

Megan C. Moloney

05/09/2000 12:25:35 PM

Record Type: Record

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

cc: Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP, Jenni R.

Engebretsen/WHO/EOP@EOP, Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP, Dorinda A.

Salcido/WHO/EOP@EOP

Subject: REMINDER: Guidance for Diane Rehm interview

I should have more specific issue areas this afternoon by 1:00 PM. I'll

get them to you as soon as I can... but if you see something on here,
please let me know whether you have something for us.

Thanks.

----- Forwarded by Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP on 05/09/2000

12:24 PM -----

Megan C. Moloney

05/08/2000 04:04:48 PM

Record Type: Record

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

cc: Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP, Jenni R.

Engebretsen/WHO/EOP@EOP, Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP, Dorinda A.

Salcido/WHO/EOP@EOP

Subject: Guidance for Diane Rehm interview

The following is a list of topics from Diane Rehm's producers. They hope
to have a more comprehensive list to me by 1 PM tomorrow.

The President is doing a 20 minute interview with Diane on WEDNESDAY, MAY
10 at 5:30 PM.

PLEASE HAVE ALL GUIDANCE AND/OR Q&A TO ME AND JASON SCHECHTER BY 3:00 PM
ON TUESDAY, MAY 9. Also, please forward this to anyone that may be able

to contribute that I have left off the list.

Thanks!

Domestic (Specific issues are in bold)

Past:

-- How do you view the success of your administration? In particular, do you claim credit for the 30 year low in unemployment, the 8 year decline in crime, etc?

Present:

-- Where do you see the United States' place in the economic structure of the world?

-- What has changed about the nature of the political process as you have been in office? In particular, discuss the approval rate of Judicial appointees and the political nature of that process. Also, discuss fundraising and how that has changed.

-- Million Mom March and Gun control issues: Where are we now and what has to happen next?

-- There are a number of issues facing the gay community. What do you see as important steps we can take.

Future:

-- What is in your future?

-- What is the United States' role in the future?

Foreign Policy/National Security

-- Why is China PNTR important?

-- What has been the success of don't ask, don't tell and what is the future of the policy?

-- What are our country's greatest threats? In particular, does our military readiness pose a threat?

Message Sent

To: _____

Patrick M. Dorton/OPD/EOP@EOP

Anna Richter/OPD/EOP@EOP

Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OPD/EOP@EOP

James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP

Philip J. Crowley/NSC/EOP@EOP

David B. Stockwell/NSC/EOP@EOP

Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP

Message Sent

To: _____

Patrick M. Dorton/OPD/EOP@EOP

Anna Richter/OPD/EOP@EOP

Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OPD/EOP@EOP

James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP

Philip J. Crowley/NSC/EOP@EOP

David B. Stockwell/NSC/EOP@EOP

Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Templeman, Lori ("Templeman, Lori" <Lori_Templeman@ed.gov> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:26-MAY-2000 14:36:47.00

SUBJECT: RE: FW: Statement of Administration Policy on S2549 National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001

TO: Bradley, Bridget ("Bradley, Bridget" <Bridget_Bradley@ed.gov> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James R. Kvaal (CN=James R. Kvaal/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

James--I just got your question. The answer is very complicated--here is

what we sent to OMB as the explanation for the SAP bullet and the issue

generally:

Explanation (and basis for possible letter):

Section 553(c) of S. 2549 would repeal, as "duplicative," section 8120 of P.L. 106-79, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000. However, section 8120 is not duplicative, and the Department of Education strongly opposes its repeal.

Section 8120 provides:

Sec. 8120. During the current fiscal year and hereafter, any Federal grant of funds to an institution of higher education to be available solely for student financial assistance or related administrative costs may be used for the purpose for which the grant is made without regard to any provision to the contrary in section 514 of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human

Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1997 (10 U.S.C. 503 note), or section 983 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 514 of the 1997 Labor-HHS-Education appropriations Act (enacted by section 101(e) of P.L. 104-208) was repealed when 10 U.S.C. 983 was extensively revised to consolidate, into a single codified provision, the various sanctions imposed on institutions of higher education that did not permit military recruiting or ROTC activities on campus. See P.L. 106-65, Section 549(a)(1); 113 Stat. 609-11. 10 U.S.C. 983(d)(1)(B) now applies these sanctions with respect to any funds made available in a Labor-HHS-Education appropriations Act. Thus, although the elimination of the cross-reference to the now-repealed section 514 would be a useful technical amendment, the exception for student financial assistance enacted in section 8120 is still applicable to 10 U.S.C. 983. That is, the effect of section 8120 is to permit otherwise eligible, financially needy students who are attending institutions of higher education that deny access for military recruiting or ROTC activities to continue to receive Federal student financial assistance. Repealing section 8120, as proposed in S. 2549, would result in a denial of several forms of Federal student financial assistance to an even larger number of students than the original sanctions in section 514, and consequently limit students' access to, and choices in, postsecondary education. For those students already enrolled in a sanctioned institution, this could result in the student having to drop out of school for financial reasons.

The Department's interpretation of section 514 (which would now apply to 10

U.S.C. 983) was that the only student assistance programs under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to which it applied were the three "campus-based" programs--the Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant, Federal Work-Study, and Federal Perkins Loan programs. A relatively small number of institutions (primarily law schools with nondiscrimination policies in conflict with the military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy) were affected by the original provision's sanctions, and all complied with the provision in order to avoid denying their students access to campus-based student aid. We continue to believe that it is inequitable to put assistance awarded to individual students at risk due to institutional conduct in circumstances such as this.

Moreover, because 10 U.S.C. 983 contains language imposing sanctions on an entire institution if one of its "subelements" (such as a law school that is part of a larger university) does not permit recruiters/ROTC, the sanctions to which these institutions would be exposed if section 8120 were repealed would actually be more far-reaching than under the repealed section 514. In addition to affecting the receipt of campus-based student aid by students attending "uncooperative" institutions, other Federal grants of funds to an institution of higher education to be available solely for student financial assistance or related administrative costs would be jeopardized, such as Javits Fellowships to graduate students. (Javits fellowships and similar forms of assistance were covered by the requirements of section 514, but, in

practice, these types of assistance were unaffected because there were no Javits Fellows at any of the institutional subelements that were originally out of compliance with section 514.)

We do not know whether the proposed repeal of section 8120 by S. 2549 is an intentionally subtle way of eliminating the exception for student financial assistance, or an unintentionally overbroad attempt at a technical correction. In either case, the result is unacceptable.

> -----Original Message-----

> From: James_R._Kvaal@opd.eop.gov [SMTP:James_R._Kvaal@opd.eop.gov]

> Sent: Friday, May 26, 2000 10:29 AM

> To: Templeman, Lori; Bradley, Bridget

> Subject: Re: FW: Statement of Administration Policy on S2549

National

> Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001

>

>

>

> lori, apparently i'm having email problems so i'm not sure if you got

this

> yesterday -- thanks.

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

> James R. Kvaal

> 05/25/2000 04:40:07 PM

>

> Record Type: Record

>

>

> To: lori_templeman@ed.gov @ inet

>

> cc: bridget_bradley@ed.gov @ inet

> Subject: FW: Statement of Administration Policy on S2549 National

Defense

> Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001

>

>

> lori -- can you explain to me what's going on here? the SAP seems to be

> taking about institutions of higher education, but section 553(c) on

> THOMAS

> only repeals an authority -- the section seems to only change the status

> of

> secondary schools. is that an old version of the bill and, if so, do you

> have the new language? or am i out to lunch?

>

> thanks.

>

> james.

>

>

>

> SEC. 553. ACCESS TO SECONDARY SCHOOLS FOR MILITARY RECRUITING PURPOSES.

>

> (a) REQUIREMENT FOR ACCESS- Section 503(c) of title 10, United

States

> Code, is amended to read as follows:

>

> `(c) ACCESS TO SECONDARY SCHOOLS- (1) Each local educational agency

> shall provide to the Department of Defense, **upon a request** made for

> military recruiting purposes, **the same access to secondary school**

> students, and to directory information concerning such students, as is

> provided generally to

> post-secondary educational institutions or to prospective employers

> of

> those students, except as provided in paragraph (5).

>

> `(2) If a local educational agency denies a request for recruiting

> access that must be granted under paragraph (1), the Secretary of the

> military department for

> which the request is made shall designate a general or flag officer

> of

> the armed force concerned or a senior executive of that military

> department to visit the

> local educational agency for the purpose of arranging for recruiting

> access. The designated officer or senior executive shall make the visit

> within 120 days after

> the date of the denial of the request.

>

> `(3) Upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense that, after

the

> actions under paragraph (2) have been taken with respect to a local

> educational agency,

> the agency continues to deny recruiting access, the Secretary shall

> transmit to the Chief Executive of the State in which the local

> educational

> agency is located

> a notification of the denial of access and a request for assistance

> in

> obtaining the requested access. The notification shall be transmitted

> within 60 days after the

> date of the determination. The Secretary shall provide copies of

> communications between the Secretary and a Chief Executive under this

> subparagraph to the

> Secretary of Education.

>

> `(4) If a local educational agency continues to deny recruiting

> access

> one year after the date of the transmittal of a notification regarding

> that agency under

> paragraph (3), the Secretary shall--

>

> “(A) determine whether the agency denies recruiting access to
at
> least two of the armed forces (other than the Coast Guard when it is not
> operating as a
> service in the Navy); and
>
> “(B) upon making an affirmative determination under
subparagraph
> (A), transmit a notification of the denial of recruiting access to--
>
> “(i) the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and
the
> House of Representatives;
>
> “(ii) the Senators of the State in which the local
> educational agency operates; and
>
> “(iii) the member of the House of Representatives who
> represents the district in which the local educational agency operates.
>
> “(5) The requirements of this subsection do not apply to a local
> educational agency with respect to access to secondary school students or
> access to directory
> information concerning such students during any period that there is
> in effect a policy of the agency, established by majority vote of the
> governing body of the
> agency, to deny access to the students or to the directory

> information, respectively, for military recruiting purposes.

>

> `(6) In this subsection:

>

> `(A) The term `local educational agency' includes a private

> secondary educational institution.

>

> `(B) The term `recruiting access' means access requested as

> described in paragraph (1).

>

> `(C) The term `senior executive' has the meaning given that

term

> in section 3132(a)(3) of title 5.

>

> `(D) The term `State' includes the District of Columbia,

> American

> Samoa, the Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, the Republic of the

> Marshall

> Islands, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the

> Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Republic of Palau, and the United States

> Virgin

> Islands.'.

>

> (b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS- Section 503 of title 10, United States

> Code,

> is amended--

>

> (1) in subsection (a), by inserting 'RECRUITING CAMPAIGNS- '

> after '(a)';

>

> (2) in subsection (b), by inserting 'COMPILATION OF DIRECTORY

> INFORMATION- ' after '(b)'; and

>

> (3) in subsection (c), by inserting 'ACCESS TO SECONDARY

> SCHOOLS-

> ' after '(c)'.
>

>

> (c) REPEAL OF DUPLICATIVE AUTHORITY REGARDING GRANTS AND CONTRACTS
TO

> UNCOOPERATIVE INSTITUTIONS OF

> HIGHER EDUCATION- Section 8120 of the Department of Defense

> Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106-79; 113 Stat. 1260; 10 U.S.C.

983

> note)

> is repealed.
>

>

> (d) EFFECTIVE DATES- (1) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall

> take effect on July 1, 2002.
>

>

> (2) The amendments made by subsections (b) and (c) shall take effect

> on the date of the enactment of this Act.
>

>

>

>

> ----- Forwarded by James R. Kvaal/OPD/EOP on 05/25/2000

> 04:25 PM -----

>

>

>

> (Embedded

> image moved "Bradley, Bridget" <Bridget_Bradley@ed.gov>

> to file: 05/25/2000 03:59:53 PM

> PIC13249.PCX)

>

>

>

>

> Record Type: Record

>

>

> To: James R. Kvaal/OPD/EOP

>

> cc:

> Subject: FW: Statement of Administration Policy on S2549 National

Defense

> Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001

>

>

>

>

> fyi...

> > -----Original Message-----

> > From: Ramirez, Heidi

> > Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2000 1:38 PM

> > To: Bradley, Bridget

> > Subject: FW: Statement of Administration Policy on S2549 National

> > Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001

> > Importance: High

> >

> >

> > FYI: Impact Aid and IDEA

> > -----Original Message-----

> > From: Templeman, Lori

> > Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2000 1:17 PM

> > To: Cohen, Mike; O'Neil, Brendan; Corwin, Thomas; Jones, Lonna;

> Ramirez,

> > Heidi; Rosenfelt, Phil; March, Greg; Cichowski, Carol; Hess, Jane;

> > Whitney, Miriam; Schagh, Catherine; McLaughlin, Maureen; Bergeron,

> David;

> > Jenkins, Harold; Kristy, Jack; Harris, Lee; Oberg, Jon; Fleming, Scott;

> > Kelley, Thomas; Graham, William; Baldinger, Alan; Warner, Delores;

> Link,

> > Phil; Rairdin, Kae; Gromek, Catherine; Lewis, Margie; Rogers, Diane;

> > McCullough, Carney

> > Cc: Riddle, Paul; Somerville, Leslie

> > Subject: FW: Statement of Administration Policy on S2549 National

> > Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001

> > Importance: High

>>

>> Attached for departmental review and clearance is the Draft SAP on S.

>> 2549. The Department's concern regarding the military recruiter/ROTC

>> provision affecting institutions of higher education is included in the

>> draft at page 4 (although not exactly our suggested wording). However,

>> our proposed objection to the \$20 million for LEAs with high-cost

>> federally connected children with disabilities didn't make the cut.

>>

>> Please review the attached draft and provide me with any comments you

> may

>> have by no later than 9:30 a.m. on Friday, May 26. Please forward this

>> e-mail to anyone else in ED that you think needs to review this.

> Thanks.

>>

>> <<S2549-sap-omb.doc>>

> << File: S2549-sap-omb.doc >> << File: PIC13249.PCX >>

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Klein, Richard M" <RKLEIN@OC.FDA.GOV> ("Klein, Richard M" <RKLEIN@OC.FDA.GOV> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-JUN-2000 17:15:54.00

SUBJECT: More June Events

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

TO: agambrell@hrsa.gov (agambrell@hrsa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: "Klein, Richard M" <RKLEIN@OC.FDA.GOV> ("Klein, Richard M" <RKLEIN@OC.FDA.GOV> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mgomez@osophs.dhhs.gov (mgomez@osophs.dhhs.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

From OPM - On June 14, 2000, the U.S. Office of Personnel Management and OPM

GLOBE will jointly sponsor a Gay Pride Month Event. The featured speaker will be Candace Gingrich. In addition, Potomac Fever, a men's singing ensemble from the Gay Men's Chorus of Washington, D.C., will perform. The event will be held in OPM's Auditorium at 1900 E Street, N.W. and will begin at 9:30 a.m.

And from Dept of the Interior -

Wednesday June 7th at 12:15 p.m., in the John Muir Room

Kathi Westcott, a staff attorney with the Service members' Legal Defense Network (SLDN) will attend a brown bag lunch to discuss the status of, and concerns regarding, the Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue policy, and her perspectives on the July 1999 murder of PFC Barry Winchell at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, and the subsequent military trial. SLDN is the sole national legal aid and watchdog organization that assists service members affected by the Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue policy. Ms. Westcott has extensive experience in this area, and will provide an insider's view on this important topic.

Friday June 9th at 12:00 noon, room TBA

Film: "After Stonewall" (1999) The sequel to the acclaimed film "Before Stonewall." This film explores the cultural changes and emerging

activism that has taken place since the 1969 riots at the Stonewall Inn which sparked the modern movement for gay civil rights. (88 min.)

Tuesday June 13th, 10:00 a.m., Rachel Carson Room
The Department will host its Pride celebration with featured speaker
Ms. Julian Potter, Director of Lesbian and Gay Outreach for the White House Office of Public Liaison.

Wednesday June 14th, 12:15 p.m., North Penthouse
Regular monthly GLOBE meeting.

Friday June 16th at 12:00 noon, room TBA
Film: "Out of the Past" (1998) This film focuses on gay and lesbian historical figures going back to the Renaissance, and links these figures to today's gay civil rights movement. (70 min.)

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Klein, Richard M" <RKLEIN@OC.FDA.GOV> ("Klein, Richard M" <RKLEIN@OC.FDA.GOV> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-JUN-2000 16:59:54.00

SUBJECT: More June Events

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

TO: agambrell@hrsa.gov (agambrell@hrsa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: "Klein, Richard M" <RKLEIN@OC.FDA.GOV> ("Klein, Richard M" <RKLEIN@OC.FDA.GOV> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mgomez@osophs.dhhs.gov (mgomez@osophs.dhhs.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

From OPM - On June 14, 2000, the U.S. Office of Personnel Management and OPM

GLOBE will jointly sponsor a Gay Pride Month Event. The featured speaker will be Candace Gingrich. In addition, Potomac Fever, a men's singing ensemble from the Gay Men's Chorus of Washington, D.C., will perform. The event will be held in OPM's Auditorium at 1900 E Street, N.W. and will begin at 9:30 a.m.

And from Dept of the Interior -

Wednesday June 7th at 12:15 p.m., in the John Muir Room

Kathi Westcott, a staff attorney with the Service members' Legal Defense Network (SLDN) will attend a brown bag lunch to discuss the status of, and concerns regarding, the Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue policy, and her perspectives on the July 1999 murder of PFC Barry Winchell at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, and the subsequent military trial. SLDN is the sole national legal aid and watchdog organization that assists service members affected by the Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue policy. Ms. Westcott has extensive experience in this area, and will provide an insider's view on this important topic.

Friday June 9th at 12:00 noon, room TBA

Film: "After Stonewall" (1999) The sequel to the acclaimed film "Before Stonewall." This film explores the cultural changes and emerging

activism that has taken place since the 1969 riots at the Stonewall Inn which sparked the modern movement for gay civil rights. (88 min.)

Tuesday June 13th, 10:00 a.m., Rachel Carson Room
The Department will host its Pride celebration with featured speaker
Ms. Julian Potter, Director of Lesbian and Gay Outreach for the White House Office of Public Liaison.

Wednesday June 14th, 12:15 p.m., North Penthouse
Regular monthly GLOBE meeting.

Friday June 16th at 12:00 noon, room TBA
Film: "Out of the Past" (1998) This film focuses on gay and lesbian historical figures going back to the Renaissance, and links these figures to today's gay civil rights movement. (70 min.)

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Eve Gerber to Jason Furman at 09:04:21.00. Subject: story. (5 pages)	06/22/2000	Personal Misfile

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[04/23/2000 - 07/10/2000]

2015-0017-F
ab1573

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: Richard Sorian <sorianr@georgetown.edu> (Richard Sorian <sorianr@georgetown.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-JUN-2000 15:51:18.00

SUBJECT: [Fwd: A washingtonpost.com article from a washingtonpost.com user]

TO: john stansell <JStansell@sfaisd.ucsf.edu> (john stansell <JStansell@sfaisd.ucsf.edu> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeff Levi <ihojxl@mail.gwumc.edu> (Jeff Levi <ihojxl@mail.gwumc.edu> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Donald Jones <jonesd3@georgetown.edu> (Donald Jones <jonesd3@georgetown.edu> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert A Imes <imesr@georgetown.edu> (Robert A Imes <imesr@georgetown.edu> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer Kates <jkates@kff.org> (Jennifer Kates <jkates@kff.org> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Frank Shane <Frank.Shane@8754bss.cina.cic.x400.gc.ca> (Frank Shane
<Frank.Shane@8754bss.cina.cic.x400.gc.ca> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Angel Burgos <aburgos@jhu.edu> (Angel Burgos <aburgos@jhu.edu> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Craig A Salman <salmanc@georgetown.edu> (Craig A Salman <salmanc@georgetown.edu> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Zoe Hudson <hudsonz@georgetown.edu> (Zoe Hudson <hudsonz@georgetown.edu> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Return-path: <register@washingtonpost.com>

Received: from mailhost.georgetown.edu ([141.161.1.103]) by
imap.georgetown.edu (Netscape Messaging Server 4.15) with ESMTP id
FWVQN400.1W2 for <sorianr>; Wed, 28 Jun 2000 15:40:16 -0400

Received: from georgetown.edu (postoffice.georgetown.edu [141.161.1.110])
by mailhost.georgetown.edu (8.10.0.Beta12/8.10.0.Beta12) with ESMTP id
e5SJJeGG19293 for <sorianr@mailhost.georgetown.edu>; Wed, 28 Jun 2000
15:40:16 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from nas1.washingtonpost.com (nas1.washingtonpost.com
[206.132.25.65]) by georgetown.edu (8.10.0.Beta12/8.10.0.Beta12) with
ESMTP id e5SJJe119750 for <sorianr@georgetown.edu>; Wed, 28 Jun 2000
15:40:14 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from nas1 (localhost [127.0.0.1]) by nas1.washingtonpost.com (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id PAA02819 for <sorianr@georgetown.edu>; Wed, 28 Jun 2000 15:39:03 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2000 15:39:03 -0400 (EDT)

From: <register@washingtonpost.com>

Subject: A washingtonpost.com article from a washingtonpost.com user

Message-id: <200006281939.PAA02819@nas1.washingtonpost.com>

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="Boundary_(ID_IMJMV/Yr2mO6RQ8tWIBmQg)"

You have been sent this message from a washingtonpost.com user as a courtesy of the Washington Post (<http://www.washingtonpost.com>).

To view the entire article, go to

<http://washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/politics/fedpage/supremecourt/19992000/A5596-2000Jun27.html>

Court Rules Boy Scouts Can Bar Gay Leaders

WASHINGTON — The Boy Scouts can bar homosexuals from serving as troop leaders, the Supreme Court ruled Wednesday, placing a limit on how far the courts should go to force open admissions upon private organizations.

The 5 to 4 decision said forcing the Scouts to accept gay troop leaders would violate the organization's rights of free expression and free association under the Constitution's First Amendment.

"The Boy Scouts asserts that homosexual conduct is inconsistent with the values it seeks to instill," Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist wrote for the court. Requiring them to accept a gay scoutmaster "would significantly burden the organization's right to oppose or disfavor homosexual conduct."

The ruling reversed a New Jersey Supreme Court holding that the Scouts wrongly ousted assistant scoutmaster James Dale when the organization learned he is gay. The state court had said the scouts' action violated a New Jersey law banning discrimination in public accommodation.

Dale, who was an Eagle Scout, had sued the Scouts under the New Jersey law. But the Supreme Court said Wednesday that law must yield to the Scout organization's right of "expressive association" under the Constitution's First Amendment.

Rehnquist's opinion was joined by Justices Sandra Day O'Connor, Antonin Scalia, Anthony M. Kennedy and Clarence Thomas.

Dissenting were Justices John Paul Stevens, David H. Souter, Ruth Bader

Ginsburg and Stephen G. Breyer.

Writing for the four, Stevens said the New Jersey law "does not impose any serious burdens" on the Boy Scouts' goals, "nor does it force (the Boy Scouts) to communicate any message that it does not wish to endorse. New Jersey's law, therefore, abridges no constitutional right of the Boy Scouts."

Dale was 19 and an assistant scoutmaster of a Matawan, N.J., troop when in 1990 he was identified in a newspaper article as co-president of a campus lesbian and gay student group at Rutgers University.

The Scouts' Monmouth Council revoked Dale's registration as an adult leader, telling him the organization does not allow openly gay members. Dale sued, contending the Scouts violated New Jersey's anti-discrimination law.

The New Jersey Supreme Court ruled in his favor, saying the expulsion of Dale was based "on little more than prejudice."

During oral arguments in April, the Scouts' lawyer, George Davidson, said the group had a right "to choose the moral leaders for the children in the program."

The Scouts relied on a 1995 Supreme Court decision in which the justices let the private sponsor of the Boston St. Patrick's Day Parade exclude a group of gays and lesbians, saying parades are a "form of expression."

Dale's lawyer, Evan Wolfson, said giving public accommodations the broad freedom to exclude people who do not match their message could swallow the civil rights laws.

Dale's attorneys cited Supreme Court decisions during the 1980s that let states force the Jaycees and Rotary International to admit women as full members. The court also let New York City bar large private clubs from discriminating against women and minorities.

Rehnquist's opinion said "it appears that homosexuality has gained greater societal acceptance" in recent times.

"But this is scarcely an argument for denying First Amendment protection to those who refuse to accept those views," the chief justice wrote. "The First Amendment protects expression, be it of the popular variety or not."

The Supreme Court has dealt with gay rights infrequently. In 1996, the justices struck down a Colorado measure that barred ordinances giving gays legal protection from discrimination, such as in housing or employment. But the court also has repeatedly turned away challenges to President Clinton's "don't ask, don't tell" policy on gays in the military.

Dale now lives in New York City and is advertising director for a magazine for people who are HIV-positive.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Edwards, Rob" <rob.edwards@enews.com> ("Edwards, Rob" <rob.edwards@enews.com> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 28-JUN-2000 14:48:31.00

SUBJECT: FW: Boy Scouts Of America v. Dale

TO: "Peter DeMartino (E-mail)" <pgdemart@midway.uchicago.edu> ("Peter DeMartino (E-mail)" <pgdemart@midway.uchicago.edu> [UNKNOWN])
READ: UNKNOWN

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

TO: "Rob Keyes (E-mail)" <robkeyes@mindspring.com> ("Rob Keyes (E-mail)" <robkeyes@mindspring.com> [UNKNOWN])
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: "Jack D Gocke (E-mail)" <Jack.D.Gocke@marshmc.com> ("Jack D Gocke (E-mail)" <Jack.D.Gocke@marshmc.com> [UNKNOWN])
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: "Paul Richard (E-mail)" <prichl@bellatlantic.net> ("Paul Richard (E-mail)" <prichl@bellatlantic.net> [UNKNOWN])
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:
fyi.....

-----Original Message-----

From: Dorothea Vafiadis [mailto:foundrygl@usa.net]
Sent: Wednesday, June 28, 2000 2:35 PM
To: dvafiadis@aol.com
Subject: Boy Scouts Of America v. Dale

Dear Friends:
Earlier today, the Supreme Court issued a 5-4 (delivered by CJ Rehnquist) decision in favor of the Boy Scouts of America. If you want to download the opinion, you can find it at:
"<http://supct.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/99-699.ZS.html>" or read the AP story below.
-- Dorothea Vafiadis

Court Says Boy Scouts Can Bar Gays
By Laurie Asseo
Associated Press Writer
Wednesday, June 28, 2000; 12:58 p.m. EDT

WASHINGTON -- The Boy Scouts can bar homosexuals from serving as troop leaders, the Supreme Court said Wednesday, a ruling that may also allow the Scouts to reject gay boys as members.

The 5-4 decision said forcing the Scouts to accept gay troop leaders would violate the organization's rights of free expression and free association under the Constitution's First Amendment.

The ruling did not specifically give the Scouts permission to bar homosexual boys from membership, but its language left room for that interpretation.

"I think it suggests that they can" keep gay youths out, said Evan Wolfson, attorney for James Dale, a New Jersey assistant scoutmaster ousted when the organization learned he is gay. "They won the right to declare themselves an anti-gay group."

"The Boy Scouts asserts that homosexual conduct is inconsistent with the values it seeks to instill," Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist wrote for the court. Requiring them to accept a gay scoutmaster "would significantly burden the organization's right to oppose or disfavor homosexual conduct."

The ruling reversed a New Jersey Supreme Court holding that the Scouts wrongly ousted Dale. The state court had said the scouts' action violated a New Jersey law banning discrimination in public accommodation.

Dale, who was an Eagle Scout, had sued the Scouts under the New Jersey law. But the Supreme Court said Wednesday that law must yield to the Scout organization's right of "expressive association" under the Constitution's First Amendment.

The American Center for Law and Justice, a conservative advocacy group that filed a friend-of-the-court brief supporting the Boy Scouts, said the ruling "will have a dramatic impact on all private organizations - including religious groups - to define their own mission and set their own criteria for leadership."

The Human Rights Campaign, a gay-rights organization, called the ruling a "travesty of justice that may allow large, open membership groups to be above the law and evade state and local nondiscrimination laws."

Rehnquist's opinion was joined by Justices Sandra Day O'Connor, Antonin Scalia, Anthony M. Kennedy and Clarence Thomas.

Dissenting were Justices John Paul Stevens, David H. Souter, Ruth Bader Ginsburg and Stephen G. Breyer.

Writing for the four, Stevens said the New Jersey law "does not impose any serious burdens" on the Boy Scouts' goals, "nor does it force (the Boy Scouts) to communicate any message that it does not wish to endorse. New Jersey's law, therefore, abridges no constitutional right of the Boy Scouts."

Dale was 19 and an assistant scoutmaster of a Matawan, N.J., troop when in 1990 he was identified in a newspaper article as co-president of a campus lesbian and gay student group at Rutgers University.

The Scouts' Monmouth Council revoked Dale's registration as an adult leader, telling him the organization does not allow openly gay members. Dale sued, contending the Scouts violated New Jersey's anti-discrimination law.

The New Jersey Supreme Court ruled in his favor, saying the expulsion of Dale was based "on little more than prejudice."

During oral arguments in April, the Scouts' lawyer, George Davidson, said the group had a right "to choose the moral leaders for the children in the program."

The Scouts relied on a 1995 Supreme Court decision in which the justices let the private sponsor of the Boston St. Patrick's Day Parade exclude a group of gays and lesbians, saying parades are a "form of expression."

Dale's lawyer, Evan Wolfson, said giving public accommodations the broad freedom to exclude people who do not match their message could swallow the civil rights laws.

Dale's attorneys cited Supreme Court decisions during the 1980s that let states force the Jaycees and Rotary International to admit women as full members. The court also let New York City bar large private clubs from discriminating against women and minorities.

Rehnquist's opinion said "it appears that homosexuality has gained greater societal acceptance" in recent times.

"But this is scarcely an argument for denying First Amendment protection to those who refuse to accept those views," the chief justice wrote. "The First Amendment protects expression, be it of the popular variety or not."

The Supreme Court has dealt with gay rights infrequently. In 1996, the justices struck down a Colorado measure that barred ordinances giving gays legal protection from discrimination, such as in housing or employment. But the court also has repeatedly turned away challenges to President Clinton's "don't ask, don't tell" policy on gays in the military.

Dale now lives in New York City and is advertising director for a magazine for people who are HIV-positive.

The case is *Boy Scouts of America v. Dale*, 99-699.

Get free email and a permanent address at <http://www.netaddress.com/?N=1>

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. email	TASwann to Mathew Murguia at 13:11:39.00. Subject: Ltr to John Perez on Gay Veteran Memorial. (4 pages)	07/05/2000	Personal Misfile

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[04/23/2000 - 07/10/2000]

2015-0017-F
ab1573

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: Richard L. Siewert (CN=Richard L. Siewert/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-JUL-2000 12:27:22.00

SUBJECT: the Klein interview

TO: Joseph N. Crisci (CN=Joseph N. Crisci/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP on
07/10/2000 12:01 PM -----

Margaret M. Suntum
07/08/2000 01:05:28 PM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: Internal transcript: Interview of the President by Joe
Klein

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

Internal Transcript July 5, 2000

INTERVIEW OF THE PRESIDENT
BY JOE KLEIN

New York, New York

5:00 P.M. EDT

Q Do you essentially agree with my sense that you had --
that the big issue has been moving from the Industrial Age to the
Information Age, and that -- I mean, the toughest thing --

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The short answer to that is yes.

Q -- to explain to people is, you take something like -- how can being in favor of affirmative action and being in favor of welfare reform be part of the same vision? How can being in favor of free trade and being in favor of universal health insurance be part of the same vision? There are people on the right or the left who would say, you can't do that. And yet, I think that they are part of the same vision.

But my first question is, how would you describe that vision?

THE PRESIDENT: I think my view -- I saw my presidency as a transformational period, and basically, America has gone through two before. Maybe it could start if we did it in historical times. There were basically -- I look at American history in the following -- we had the creation -- how we got started. And sort of filling out the elements of the national government and defining what it meant. And that basically went from the Declaration of Independence to the Constitution, Washington's presidency and the appointment of John Marshall as Chief Justice, which is a very important thing.

And then, ironically, through Jefferson's presidency, with the purchase of Louisiana and the Lewis and Clark expedition, and then the next big challenge was, how would we adapt that to our growing industrialization, and how did we get rid of slavery, which was inconsistent with our principles. So obviously, that's what Lincoln and the Civil War and the constitutional amendments and everything that happened on civil rights after that was about slavery.

But there was no single president that managed the process, if you will, or laid out a framework from the agricultural society to an industrial society, but that's part of what the railroads, the canals was all about, and it's part of what -- and Lincoln was a part of that with the Moral Land Grant Act, with the colleges.

Q This happened too slowly for --

THE PRESIDENT: But it happened over a long period of time. Then, there was the transformation from the -- you know, it happened over a long period of time as we slowly became a balanced society. But then, when we burst onto the world scene as a major national industrial power, that process was basically defined by Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson. And I sort of saw this period in parallel with that.

The rest of the 20th century was mostly about dealing with the rise of -- first, the Great Depression then the war and the need to defeat totalitarian systems, which was part of the war and the Cold War, and dealing with the specific challenges at home -- principally, civil rights, the women's movement and the growth of environmental movement in America.

So here, we are moving into basically from an industrial society -- an industrial economy to an information economy. And at the same time, moving into an ever more globalized economy, which also is more and more

of a global society and that we share common challenges and common interests that go beyond economics. And the globalization of the media has accelerated that.

So I saw my challenges trying to, first of all, maximize America's presence in the information economy. Second, to try to maximize our influence in the welfare of our country and like-minded people around the world in a globalized society. And then, the other -- and I'll get to your questions. And then the third big thing for me was trying to make people have a broader and deeper vision of the American community and how to handle diversity and how we would finally get a chance to see in ways we never had before what it meant to make one out of many, what our national motto meant.

And I think the -- and you ask me: Well, how can you reconcile those things? It seems to me that the two operational strategies we had to pursue those three great goals were: One, the Third Way political and social philosophy. If you believe in opportunity and responsibility and community, then it's perfectly clear why you would be for affirmative action and a global trading system -- you know, why you would be for health care for everybody and whatever else you said -- what was the other thing?

Q Free trade. No, I said that.

THE PRESIDENT: Welfare reform.

Q Welfare reform.

THE PRESIDENT: Welfare reform, because first of all, work is the best social program. Secondly, it is imperative to have a basic work ethic if you believe in individual responsibility and you believe it gives meaning and direction to life, and I do. But if you do, you also recognize that there is no society -- no society has succeeded in providing access to health care to everybody without some governmental action.

Q But there have been people all along, as you know -- I mean, you and I had this same conversation in 1991. People all along said, this is just an electoral strategy, it isn't a government strategy.

THE PRESIDENT: It was never just an electoral strategy to me.

Q Well, me, neither, as you know. And the question -- I guess my question is, do you feel that you were ever able to really communicate the depth and breadth of this to the public?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but only -- probably only at the State of the Union Addresses, because it's probably the only time I ever got to say it unfiltered. If I made an error in those, even though they always received very high public approval ratings, they said it always took me so much time to explain my specific ideas in education or whatever, I'm not sure I ever took full advantage of the opportunity to lay the coherent philosophy out. Because I do think at those points, that people got it.

But what I was going to tell you, if I could go back -- I think we had the transformation from the industrial economy to the information economy, from the idea of a national society to an idea of a more global society in which nation states matter. I think the nation state will matter more in some ways in the 21st century. We can talk about that some.

And, thirdly, the whole idea of defining America where our diversity was something to be cherished and celebrated because -- because our common humanity and common values were more important. And then, operationally, I think, the two things I think that mattered, I made some -- the whole Third Way political and social philosophy, one, and second is sort of a relentless focus on the future, making people always -- trying to force people to always think about not only what we're doing, how does it affect today, but what's it going to be like five years from now, ten years from now, 20 years from now. And I think that is often -- that hasn't often been the business of the government.

But if you go back to Roosevelt's focus on conservation or Wilson's struggle of -- failed attempt at the League of Nations, I think what made them both great presidents for the transformational period America was in is that they were not only successful in the moment, by and large, but they had this focus on the future; they kept trying to spark the public imagination with the future. And that's, I hope very much, that the announcement of this genome project, although I think it fills people with foreboding as well as hope, will tend to spark future orientation on the part of the voters.

So the issues that are plainly before us, but won't be felt for a few years will have more effect on the debate and also on people's voting rights.

Q But it's a difficult thing. Charlene Barshefsky said to me that there are times that you've really been concerned, that the expression you used was that you hadn't found your voice on trade, which is the equivalent of --

THE PRESIDENT: Well, one of the things -- she, of course, has to deal with it. But the two things in trade that have frustrated me most, although I think we've got a great record -- and you can go from NAFTA to the WTO, to the Africa CBI, to launching the free trade of the Americas to -- China.

Q The reason I raised it was because what just said about the genome reminded me -- I just read your remarks about NAFTA in October '93, and it was very similar, too.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. And then, of course, China, and then in between we had 270-odd agreements, and we had the Mexican financial crisis and the Asian financial crisis. But the thing that bothered me about trade -- the two things that have bothered me about trade, I think, are, one, I have so far not created a consensus within my own party, at least among the elected officials, for the view of trade which I hold; and, two,

and I think it's genuine -- that is, I don't think this is just politics. I think it's how people view the world.

The second thing, and closely related to that, is that -- I went to Geneva twice and I went to Davos once, and then I went out to Seattle to try to make the case that you can't have a global trading system apart from a global social conscience, anyway, where there is a legitimate place for the voices of those who care about the rights of workers, the condition of children in the workplace, the impact of economic development on the environment, both nationally and globally.

I haven't yet, at least, been able to convince people that there is a synthesizing vision here that has to drive not only a global trading system, but these other initiatives as well. And I suppose I shouldn't be surprised, because it's a fairly new debate. And one of the great things that always struck me is, if you look at the people who were demonstrating in Seattle, while I think they were all sincere, that is, they believed in what they were demonstrating against, their sense of solidarity was truly ironic, because they had completely conflicting positions.

Q What?

THE PRESIDENT: I mean, for example, a lot of the labor union people that demonstrated believe that even though -- for example, they think that even though this China deal is a short-term benefit to American industry because China drops their barriers, that they're so big that there will be so much investment there that they will develop a great deal of industrial capacity and that wage levels will be so low that it will cost the developed world, and particularly America because our markets are more open than the Europeans, a lot of our industrial base within a fairly short term, and that's what they really believe. I don't believe that, but that's what they believe.

And then you have the people that are demonstrating on behalf of the Third World, and they believe our concern for labor and the environment is a protectionist ruse to protect American high-wage jobs. But they're all out there in the streets in Seattle demonstrating together, because they're genuinely frustrated about the way the world is going and they kind of don't like this whole globalization thing. They think it's going to lead to further loss of control by ordinary people over the basic circumstances of their lives, and that bothers them.

Q I think that this is -- to kind of put a cap on the first question -- I mean, that's so much at the heart of what you've been trying to overcome. I was talked to Zoe Baird, who said that she always remembers the statistics that you used I think in around '95 that more jobs had been created by companies owned by women than had been lost by Fortune 500 companies. You always tried to make the future less frightened for folks.

And yet, I'm not sure you're convinced that you made the case.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think I made the case to the people that were open to it, but I believe that -- I think that it's hard --

everybody's for change in general, but normally against it in particular. You know, what's that Dick Riley used to say? Let's all change, you go first. (Laughter.) That's his sort of formulation of it. It shouldn't be surprising, but I still believe, first of all, I think that what I said to the American people is true and right. Secondly, I don't think there is any alternative to change. So I think the real question is, how do you bring your -- basically, values that don't change, how do you translate them into specific approaches and policies that have the greatest chance of enhancing those values in the world you're going to live in. That's the way I look at this.

And I think that for the United States to have essentially turned away from this world, I think, would have been a terrible mistake. And in fact, I think the only mistake we've made in this whole thing is not accelerating the integration of the free trade area of the Americas more -- more rapid.

Q Let me ask you some specific questions. Let's take a walk; start in '93. The First Lady said to me the other day that she believed that deficit reduction was a predicate for doing all the rest of the stuff.

THE PRESIDENT: Absolutely.

Q She compared it to education in Arkansas when you were reelected.

THE PRESIDENT: The '93 Economic Plan made all the rest of this possible.

Q There were a fair number of people on your staff that were saying -- you know, it would throw the economy into recession, and you were dealing -- it was a theory at that point that if you lowered the deficit, interest rates would come down and you would achieve the kind of growth that you have achieved. I mean, what made you think that --

THE PRESIDENT: First of all, let me back up a little bit. The people on the staff who favored somewhat -- there was nobody on my staff that was against vigorous deficit reduction. There were some who were afraid that to make the decisions we would have to make to get the \$500 billion, which is what Lloyd Bentsen and Bob Rubin felt was sort of the magic psychological threshold we had to cross to get the bond markets and the stock market to respond in an appropriate way, they were afraid that if we did that, we would have to shelve too much of our progressive commitments in the campaign.

Now, what finally happened was, we came up with a plan that raised income taxes only on the top 1.2 percent of the people, which I had, after all, promised to do in the '92 campaign. It wasn't like I didn't tell upper-income people who supported me I wouldn't try to raise their taxes. But we had to raise them at the very end. Bentsen came in with a plan that essentially lifted the income cap off the Medicare taxes, which closed the gap. And we stuck with the gas tax, which Charlie Stenholm and some of our conservatives who were big deficit hawks were worried about,

because they were afraid it would make our guys vulnerable, and I think it did -- it was the only thing that average people had to pay, except that there were, I think, 13 percent of the Social Security recipients paid more because we began to tax Social Security income more like regular pension income.

But it was the Republicans who believed that tax increases by definition were recessionary, and that -- so they unanimously opposed the plan. You asked me what convinced me. What convinced me finally was that I believe fundamentally, unless we got interest rates down and investment flowing, that we would never be able to see a decline in unemployment and growth in new businesses, particularly in this high-tech sector, which depended on vast flows of venture capital, confidence capital, if you will, that it seemed to me was just out there bursting, waiting to happen.

I think -- and maybe it was my experience as a governor that informed all this -- but I really did believe there was this huge, vast, pent-up potential in the American economy that had been artificially repressed ever since the deficit spending recovery at the end of President Reagan's first term. Basically, what happened at the end of the first Reagan term is, interest rates weren't too high because we had such a terrible recession and so much inflation and such high interest rates at the end of President Carter's term, so when the interest rates came down, then inflation -- naturally inflation around the world came down.

Those huge deficits brought us back a little bit. But the long-term potential of the American economy, I was convinced, could never be unleashed until we got rid of the deficit. So finally, I just decided that if I didn't get the economy going, nothing else would matter in the end, and I believe that the pent-up potential of the American economy was so great, that if we did get the interest rates down and we did get investment up, everything else would fall into place. And I thought that I ought to listen to Bentsen and Rubin because they knew a lot more about it than I did.

Q But you didn't listen to Bentsen on the EITC. That was one place where you absolutely didn't bend at all.

THE PRESIDENT: No, but we had promised that, and I believed in it. I thought -- and again, I'm confident that not only what I saw in the campaign, but my experience as governor of a state that was always in the bottom two or three in per capita income, had an impact on this. But I just believe that we had to use the tax system to dignify the work of low-wage workers, and to make it possible for them to raise their children more successfully. I didn't think I could go out there and argue for a tough welfare reform bill and a tough deficit reduction package, and say I was going to have to slow down my increases in education spending and some other -- social spending, housing and all these other things that I would otherwise like to do -- if we weren't prepared to give lower-income working people more income.

I also thought it was good economics, because they were going to spend it, they needed to spend it.

Q Did you ever think that -- was there any way that you could have gotten Republicans to go along with this?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know, and I'll tell you why. In retrospect, maybe there were some things I could have done.

Q What if you had invited Dole and Michel to that dinner in Little Rock?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Or invited them down even on their own, it might have worked. The real problem I see with it -- in retrospect, the reason I say I don't know, first of all I wish I had done that, because later on I started bending over backwards. I had Gingrich in and Armey in and I met with them exhaustively, and I tried. Often, it didn't work, but we did get some things done from time to time.

I think they had made a decision to oppose all tax increases because of the Gingrich position vis-a-vis President Bush. And he was pretty well in the ideological saddle, the political saddle in the House then. And I think because Senator Dole obviously hoped to run for president in '96, I think the Republicans in the Senate were going to be reluctant to break ranks once it was obvious that the House Republicans were going to oppose any kind of deficit reduction package that had any tax increases in it.

And I didn't believe -- if we hadn't gone for some upper income tax increases, then number one, we would have had to adopt cuts that the Democratic Majority in the House would not have supported, even under me, and number two, we could not have kept our commitments on the earned income tax credits on education, where we did have a substantial increase, or on the empowerment zones or a lot of the other things I did that I believed in.

Q Did the atmosphere surprise you -- the vitriol, the difficulty?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, it did. I think basically -- but I now know things I didn't know then.

Q What do you know now?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, they really believed -- first, I know now something I didn't know, which is that some of the people on the Republican side -- actually, I did know this, but I didn't believe it when I got a call from the White House early -- before I decided to run in the summer of 1990 -- from a guy I knew who worked there who was saying, you know, you shouldn't run. Bush was at like 80 percent then or something; I couldn't believe -- so I had this serious talk with him about how President Bush had used his popularity to try to deal with the economy.

And after about five minutes, the guy said, now, let's just cut the crap. We've looked at this crowd and we can beat them all. All the guys in Congress have votes; we can beat them all. And we think Governor Cuomo's too liberal, but you're different. You might beat us, and so if

you run we're going to take you out early.

Then, I realized that they somehow thought it was serious. Then, after I got up here and started dealing with them, what I realized is that they had been in for 12 years, but they basically had been in since President Nixon won, except for the Carter interregnum, which they thought was purely a function of Watergate, and therefore they saw it as an historical accident that they had quickly corrected, and that's the way they saw it. I actually think Jimmy Carter and before him Bobby Kennedy were the precursors of the sort of New Democrat, Third Way stuff I've tried to do here. And I think, therefore, it's not fair -- but that, exactly to diminish -- but that's the way they viewed it, anyway.

So I think they believed that there would never be another Democratic president; I really think a lot of them thought they could hold the White House forever until a third party came along to basically offer a competing vision. And so, they just never saw me as a legitimate person; they just thought I was, in President Bush's words, "the governor of a small southern state." And as I often crack on the trail, I was so naive that I actually thought that was a compliment. (Laughter.) And I still do.

So anyway, it did surprise me. I mean, I knew it was there, and I'd seen the Democrats do things -- in my view, I guess I've got a warped view, but I never thought it was nearly as bad as what they did to me. But from time to time, the Democrats did things I didn't approve of. I didn't like the nature of their arguments against John Tower or the fact that somebody checked out the movies that Bob Bork -- and I knew there was some of this up here.

But I never thought I would see it in the kind of systematic way that I saw it unfold. But when I got to know Newt Gingrich and actually had a lot of candid conversations with him, I realized that that's just the way they thought politics worked.

Q War without blood.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, that's what they thought.

Q That's what Newt called it.

THE PRESIDENT: I had a fascinating conversation with one Republican Senator in the middle of the D'Amato hearings when they were impugning Hillary. And I asked this guy who was pretty candid, I said, do you really think that my wife or I did anything wrong in this Whitewater thing? Not illegal, even wrong? And he just started laughing. He said, oh, you've got to be kidding, he said any fool who misread the record would know you didn't do anything wrong. He said, how could you do anything wrong? You didn't borrow any money from the S&L which failed; it was a very small S&L failure. And you lost \$40,000 or whatever you lost on the real estate deal. He said, of course, you didn't do anything wrong. He said, that's not the point of this; the point of this is to make people think you did something wrong.

But, so, it was funny. Yes, I was surprised by their vitriol, and yes, I was surprised, and I must say I was surprised that they believed -- and they had an electoral -- and they turned out to be right, but I made a mistake or two that helped them. They believed that they could win the Congress if they could just say no to everything. And they did. And I think it rested on basically three things. One is, we did the economy, the budget plan, which we had to do. And we had to expect some loss of midterm seats. And some of those seats we had for a long, long time were naturally Republican seats, anyway. So that was the first thing.

The second thing is, but the people hadn't felt the benefits of it. Then the second thing we did that cost us some seats, but I am absolutely convinced is the right thing to do, was the Brady Bill and the Crime Bill, which had the assault weapons ban. But there again, we got that done in 1994; had it happened in '93, I think it would not have hurt us so bad. But in '94, there wasn't enough time between the time that bill passed and the time people voted to convince the world people that voted against our congressmen on the Brady Bill and the assault weapons ban, that there wasn't anything going to happen to them and their hunting and sport shooting and all that.

By '96, the issue was working for us, because I could go to places like New Hampshire and say I want everybody that missed a day in the deer woods to vote against me; but if you didn't, they didn't tell you the truth and you ought to get even. That's what I said. And our wining margin in New Hampshire went from one point to 13 points or something.

But in '94, my party's members bore the brunt of that. Then the third problem we had, and this is where I think you were right, is I was trying so hard to keep all of my campaign commitments and the way I made them, I should have done welfare reform before health care; you were right about that.

Q I don't know that I took that position. In fact --

THE PRESIDENT: I thought you were saying that.

Q Well, I might have said it, but --

THE PRESIDENT: And it was right.

Q I'll tell you where I was wrong, is that when it came to doing welfare reform, I chickened out, and I wrote a column the week you signed it telling you not to sign it. I talked to Elwood last week, and he's turned around on it as well; we were both wrong.

THE PRESIDENT: But the reason is, I think, if you go back, there's one thing that nobody in the press has picked up and we ought to talk about this later -- is why I vetoed the first two bills and signed the third one -- we'll come back to that.

But if I hadn't done welfare reform first, that would have given the Democrats a chance to appeal to more conservative and moderate voters, and the system -- one thing I've learned is, since I've been there, is

actually the system is capable of great change, but it can only digest so much at once. So in '93, they did a big economic plan and NAFTA, and in '94 they did this big crime bill. And they might have been able to do welfare reform, but there's no way the system could digest the health care thing. Either that, or if we were going to do health care first, then the mistake I made was saying I would veto anything short of 100 percent coverage, because --

Q Why did you say that?

THE PRESIDENT: -- it was one of those decisions we made practicing for the State of the Union and I just shouldn't have done it. It was a mistake. I was trying to bring clarity to the debate, and I was afraid that they would try to run something bogus by.

Q You're saying that you think there is no way you could have gotten a health insurance deal in '94?

THE PRESIDENT: No.

Q You don't think so?

THE PRESIDENT: No.

Q What about --

THE PRESIDENT: Let me tell you what happened.

Q What if you had gone and just dumped your bill and gone over to Chafee's press conference and said "I'm with him"?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, maybe, but --

Q He had universality. He had a tax increase to pay for it, and he had Bob Dole.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, he sort of did, but let me tell you what happened. What happened was, I offered and Hillary offered not to submit a bill. We offered to do two different things. We offered to submit sort of a generic bill and let Congress fill in the blanks, and Rostenkowski asked us -- this is a little more detail, but -- then we offered not to submit our own bill at all, but instead to submit a joint bill with Dole, which I thought was good politics for him, because then he couldn't lose anything --

Q What was the time frame for this? When did you make that

--

THE PRESIDENT: Well, before we introduced a bill. I can't remember exactly when --

Q So this is while the task force was --

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, before we introduced the bill. And Dole said

to me -- I'll never forget this, because we were at a leadership meeting in the Cabinet Room and he said, no, he said that's not the way we should do it. He said, you introduce a bill, we'll introduce a bill, then we'll get together, we'll put them together, we'll compromise and pass them.

Then after that, Dole got the memo from Bill Kristol, I think, which said -- which basically took the Gingrich line. The way you guys are going to win in the Congress and weaken them is to have nothing happen. If anything happens, the Democrats will get credit for it, so you guys have to make sure nothing happens. After that, I don't think we really had a chance. Because Mitchell killed himself to try to figure out a way to get to Chafee, do something and -- maybe if I had gone to Chafee's press conference, maybe that would have worked.

Q Or if the First Lady had.

THE PRESIDENT: You know, I hadn't thought of that, but all I can tell you is that I really believed because Dole -- with that single exception, all my other dealings with Dole, whatever he said, was the way we did it. In other words, not the way we did it, but I mean, if I made a deal with him, it always was honest.

Q He was as good as his word.

THE PRESIDENT: Exactly. And in this case, I just think, you know, he saw a chance to win the majority, saw a chance to get elected president, Bill Kristol told them don't do it; they didn't do it. And that's what I think happened.

Q But this is the thing that people on the left point to, that would have been your big achievement, the big, new deal kind of achievement. And when you look back on it, do you regret the substance of what you did? Do you think that going with an employer mandate was the wrong thing? And also, do you regret the detail in which you did it, the fact that you did the 1,300 pages and --

THE PRESIDENT: I think politically it was bad politics. On the substance, I think basically it was a privately-financed plan that relied on managed care, but had a patients' bill of rights in it. And I think the two things that made it unpalatable to Republicans were the employer mandate and the patients bill of rights. I think the thing that made it unpalatable to Democrats, a few of them, was the employer mandate.

But if you're not going to have an employer mandate, then you have to have a subsidy where people buy into either Medicare or Medicaid. And probably, that would have been simpler.

Q That's what you're going to have eventually.

THE PRESIDENT: That's what you're going to have eventually. And if I could do it now, that's what I would offer. But the problem is, I couldn't do it in '94 with the deficits the way they were without a tax increase. And I didn't feel that I could ask the Congress to vote for another tax increase even if it was a dedicated thing after we had just

had that big one in '93.

Q Plus the reporting was way out of whack at that point, because you weren't getting credit for the savings, the managed care --

THE PRESIDENT: We were getting killed by the scoring. The scoring was all wrong, and we knew it was wrong. But I was stuck with the scoring. So if you look at it, the position I was in is, I was stuck with the scoring, I didn't want to ask for another tax increase; I didn't think that was right. So I had to try stay with the private insurance system. And I would have thought that the insurers would actually have liked that, because they were going to get a lot more customers.

But basically, they didn't like it because we couldn't just let them have all those mandated customers and have no patients' bill of rights and no restrictions on managed care, so they then developed this whole argument that it's a Rube Goldberg machine, it's a government takeover of health care and all this stuff, and that sort of stuck because they had all that money to put behind it.

But the truth is, in defense of what we offered, if you go back and look at all the early soundings from all the experts when we first laid it out there, everybody said this is a moderate plan, this is not too far left, they've tried to keep their private insurance system, they've certainly left the private health care delivery system intact, because nobody said it was some big government takeover until all the people spent whatever they spent, \$100 million, \$200 million, whatever they spent in their later to try to perform reverse plastic surgery on it.

But I think that in the context you ask the questions, to go back, I think that the combined impact of the economic plan with people not fully feeling the benefits in '94, the gun deal where people had their fears fully allayed, and the health care thing where the people that wanted it didn't get it and the people that didn't like it knew what they didn't like about it. That tended to depress the Democratic voters, and the three things together produced -- plus the fact that the Republicans had this Contract on America, and people didn't really know what it was, they just knew they had a plan, gave them the big win they got.

Q Just to stay with health insurance for a minute, do you regret structurally the way you went about doing it? If you had to do it all over again, would you give it to the First Lady? Was that a mistake?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think it was a mistake to give it to her; I think the mistake I made was, I either should have insisted on having her say, okay, here's all of our work, look at it. Here are the basic principles we want, you guys draft the bill. Or, I would have insisted that we had a joint bill. If we were going to draft the bill, I would have made the Republicans draft it with me. That was the mistake I made.

Neither one of those things was her doing. She gets a total bum rap on this. The plan she came up with, which was, she was told, we ain't going to have a tax increase, right, and therefore it's not going to be a total government program, but you have to try to get 100 percent coverage,

so there was no other way to do it except with an employer mandate. And she was also told that managed care is going to happen and we favor it, which she did favor it, but we've got to have some protections in there for people.

I don't know how many doctors I've had come up to me since then, tell me that we were right and that basically it was a good plan. So in a way, I think she really got a bum rap on that deal because she was operating within constraints that were -- we now know impossible. What I should have done is to let her do all the work, publish all the findings, say here are our principles, you guys write the bill.

Or, I should have said, if you want me to do a bill, I will only do it if we have a bipartisan agreement on the bill. That would have produced something less than 100 percent of coverage, but at least it would have produced something that would have passed and gotten us up to 90 or maybe above 90 percent. That was the mistake I made.

But it was my mistake, not hers. She, I think, has gotten a totally bum rap on this deal. All she did was what she was asked to do.

Q I asked Ira about it, and he pointed to his e-commerce protocols, and he said, what I did was, I decided to do everything the exact opposite of what we did with health insurance, and it worked.

THE PRESIDENT: But the interesting thing there was, it worked because number one, we didn't have to pass a big bill because of the Telecommunications Act, which was a great success, which we ought to talk about later, was a big part of the economic program, was operating on a parallel track. And all we had to do there was to basically invite them to help us make government policy that would maximize economic growth. It was a much simpler problem.

There was absolutely no way to get to 100 percent of coverage, to have universal health coverage -- unless you had an employer mandate or the government filled in the difference. If we were doing it today, we could do it. And the next administration could do it, because now we have the money to do it; but then, we didn't.

Q You're going to come down closer to get what you want in reconciliation if you move the CHIPS program to cover the parents, and only --

THE PRESIDENT: The CHIPS program -- the parents, and you let people between 55 and 65 buy into Medicare, then the only people that won't be able to get health insurance are young, single people who think they'll live forever and just don't want to do it, or very wealthy people who just would rather go ahead and just pay their doctor.

Q The reason why I was always for universal was because I thought those people had a moral responsibility to pay in to help the risk pools.

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know if I can get this CHIPS thing, but if

I can, it will make a huge difference.

Q I don't want to stick on the bad stuff in the first term too long, but -- things -- in retrospect, things seemed pretty much a mess in the White House for the first couple of years. And there were times -- several people have said to me that you came to them at various times and said, look, I'm in the wrong position; I'm to the left of where I should be, or things just don't feel right or things are out of control. And I guess two or three questions you could answer in a bunch.

How did that happen? I mean, how do you come out of the box doing gays in the military, for example, which I assume -- well, you believe in the policy -- it probably wasn't the best thing to come out of the box with -- why did you surround yourself with -- why were there so few --

(end of tape one, beginning of tape two -- no overlap)

Q At what point did you get a White House that you were really happy with the way it was working?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first of all, I think that in retrospect, I think if you compare the functioning of our White House, for example, with the Reagan White House in the first term, I think ours looks pretty good. And I think that the problems we had were fundamentally -- most of the mistakes we made were political, not substantive.

I mean, Bruce Reed was there, Sperling was there, McLarty was there, and Rubin was there. So I don't think -- I don't think it's fair to say -- and Laura Tyson agreed with us -- I don't think we had a bad -- I think we did have people who were philosophically and substantively and on policy terms, consistent with our New Democrat philosophy. And I think that budget from the empowerment zones to the charter schools we got in the beginning, to the Goals 2000 program to what we did on the student loan program, which was terrific -- it saved \$8 billion in student loan costs for kids -- to the overall economic plan, I think it was consistent.

I think the economic plan was consistent -- I mean the crime bill was completely New Democrat. I think family leave and the Brady Bill were. A lot of the most important things that were done that made possible all the stuff we've done in the last four years --

Q You left out NAFTA and reinventing government.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, we had NAFTA and we did RIGO and we did the WTO -- all that in the first two years.

Q But even given all that --

THE PRESIDENT: But what was wrong was that the political image was different from the reality. The substantive reality I think was quite good. I've heard Bob Rubin defend the White House repeatedly and talk about how the things that worked well later, especially the sense of

comradery and team work and joint decision-making, were all put in place in that first year and a half.

But let's just go through the problems, and you'll see. Part of it was I think none of us were sensitive to the way -- sufficiently sensitive to the way Washington works and to the way little things would look big to other people. Now, let's just start with the gays in the military. How did that happen? It is not true that we brought it up first.

Q Andrea Mitchell brought it up in a press conference on November 11th.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but why? What happened? Dole introduced legislation -- Dole deserves credit for this. The Republicans should give Dole credit for this. They always say he was too moderate and all that -- they should give Dole credit for this. And I give him credit for it. I've thought a lot of times about how I could have out-manuevered him on it. But I had two things going -- and the Joint Chiefs obviously agreed with him, which helped.

But what put this on the front burner early? Not me, it wasn't my decision. Dole introduced a bill in Congress which was going to fly through there, because Nunn agreed with him, to keep the present policy. That was like the first thing he did. And then the Joint Chiefs demanded a meeting with me. The President can't refuse to meet with the Joint Chiefs. So it was those two things that put this thing front and center. I did not want this --

Q The bill came in after you said -- after Andrea Mitchell asked the question and you responded the way you did. I always thought that was because she needed a vacation and hadn't taken it.

THE PRESIDENT: No, no, it was because -- but he was going to put that in anyway. We knew what he was doing. So what happened was between the Joint Chiefs and the Dole bill, we were forced to put it up. I was going -- what I intended to do was to get all the stuff, my basic stuff organized, lead with that, and figure out how to handle the gays in the military. And they basically forced me to deal with it from the beginning.

And then the thing that -- then I got a lot of heat, obviously, from the gay community for what I did. But everybody ignores what precipitated "don't ask, don't tell," which was a vote in the Senate essentially on the Dole position that passed 68-32, i.e. by a veto-proof margin. There was no vote in the House.

In retrospect, given the way Washington works, what I probably should have done is issued a clean executive order, let them overturn it and basically let them live with the consequences of it. And I might have actually gotten a better result in the end, more like the one I wanted.

But when General Powell came to see me about the "don't ask, don't tell" policy, the commitments that were made were very different from the

way that it worked out in practice later on. And so there was no question in my mind, given the way they laid out what their policy was going to be, that gay servicepeople would be better off under the new policy than they were under the old one. It didn't work out that way, but the commitments that I got and the descriptions that I gave when I announced it at the War College, there's no question that if that had been followed through, the gays in the military would have been better off than they were under the old policy.

And the thing that I didn't understand about the way things play out in public, because I really was inexperienced in the way Washington worked when I got there, is that sometimes you just need clarity. And even if you lose, it's better to lose with clarity than ambiguity. And what had not sunk in on I think even the press writing about this was that once the Senate voted 68-32, the jig was up, it was over, because everybody knew there were more than 300 votes in the House against the policy. So we had a veto-proof majority in both Houses in favor of legislating the present policy unless I could find some way to go forward. So that's what I tried to do.

But the reason it came up first was essentially because the Joint Chiefs and Dole were determined --

Q So it wasn't the Andrea Mitchell question on November 11th?

THE PRESIDENT: No.

Q It was up --

THE PRESIDENT: Because I had lots of options there. I mean, Harry Truman basically -- if you go back and look at what he did with integration of the military, he basically signed an order that said, integrate; come back within three years and tell me how you did it.

Q You could have signed an executive order.

THE PRESIDENT: I could have done that. And like I said, in retrospect, we would have had greater clarity. And since there had been so many problems with implementing the policy, I'm not sure that for the past six years it would have been better. Now I think Secretary Cohen has really taken hold of this thing and there have been some changes in the last six months that I think really will make the future better than the previous policy was.

Q But to go back to the original question, I have a strong sense that during that first year, year and a half, you weren't satisfied with the way the White House was working --

THE PRESIDENT: No, because I thought we were often -- first of all, we had to do some stuff that was tough, that was going to get us out of position. Our foreign policy team I think was working very well, and except for it took us too long to build an international consensus in Bosnia, but we eventually did it and did the right thing there. We were

doing well in the Middle East. We took a big, bold step away from the traditional American position to get involved in the Irish peace process. And on balance, I was pleased with that.

And actually, a lot of people have forgotten this, but when I came back from Jordan from the signing of the peace agreement in the Wadi Araba in Jordan in late '94, right before the election, we were still in reasonably good shape because my numbers went back up and that helped the Democrats.

But I still believe that the underlying problems were the reasons for the election results. But the political problems of gays in the military hurt. I think that we had a lot of -- I was more frustrated by operational things, like leaks on Supreme Court appointments that weren't even accurate, and I thought that the White House was not operating politically in a way that I thought was effective.

I thought, policy-wise, we weren't out of position on anything except the retrospective on health care. And I've already said what I thought the political mistake was there, about how I should have handled it, given the fact --

Q If you had to do it over again, you would have done welfare reform in '94 and the crime bill?

THE PRESIDENT: If I had to do it over again, I would have tried to do the welfare reform and the crime bill in '94, together, and started a bipartisan process on health care. I would have had Hillary up and meeting, issue the report with basic principles -- that whole 600-page, however long it was, the stuff we did -- I would have given it all to the Congress and said, either you write a bill or we write a bill together.

Q Let me give you another, I think a tough "if you had to do it all over again." When I look back on this period, you were rolling at the end of '93. You did NAFTA, you gave the speech in Memphis. I mean, even I was writing positive stuff about you at that point. And then came the wave of stupid scandal stories -- the Troopergate story, the Whitewater stuff. That December, the Washington Post asked for all the documents. And there was a meeting that you had, maybe the only time in recorded history that George and David Gergen agreed and said you should turn over all the data, everything.

And you didn't do it. Do you regret that? Do you think that that changed things?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't believe, given the subsequent coverage of the Whitewater thing, it would have made any difference. What I regret is asking for the special counsel, because under the law that existed before and the law that existed after, under neither law could a special counsel be called. They had one --

Q Why did you do it? I was there the night you did it. You were in Ukraine -- Kiev.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I did it because I was exhausted, because I just buried my mother and I had poor judgment. And I had people in the White House who couldn't stand the heat of the bad stories and they suggested that I do it, and that I'd have to do it. And I knew that there was nothing there. I knew it was just one guy lying. And I had Bernie Nussbaum and Bruce and a few other people screaming at me not to do it. They said, you don't understand.

I knew that Janet Reno would appoint a Republican, even though all other Presidents had been investigated by people who had basically supported them. Lawrence Walsh supported Reagan; Sirica -- no, what's his name?

Q Sirica.

THE PRESIDENT: No, Sirica was the judge. Jaworski (sp) supported Nixon. I knew Reno wouldn't do that. I knew Reno would appoint a Republican, but I knew that there was nothing there. I knew she'd appoint an honest, professional prosecutor. So I just did it. But it was wrong. Because the decision to appoint a special counsel is a decision to bankrupt anybody who's not rich. I mean, by definition, there's a penalty associated with it. But if Fiske had been allowed to do his job, this whole thing would have been over in '95 or '96, and, of course, that's why he was replaced, because he was going to do his job.

Q Just staying on this for a minute --

THE PRESIDENT: But do I think so? No, because I think -- I mean, I don't want to get into this. I shouldn't talk about this much until I'm out of office. But I believe that the desire, the almost hysterical desire to have something to investigate was so great that it wouldn't have made any difference.

Because, look, what did this thing hang on? There was nothing in those private papers that we -- we gave it all to the Justice Department -- there was nothing in there that did anything other than support what the report said, which was that we lost money on a real estate investment. And if you noticed, when Starr got a hold of this, he immediately abandoned that and just went on to other stuff. There was never anything to it.

And I do not believe -- I have no reason to believe, given the coverage of the events of Whitewater, that it would have made any difference. I think they would have found some way to say, oh, there are questions here, let's have a special counsel. But do I wish I had done it? I mean, I don't know.

Q Last week you talked about the clanging tea kettle, and you know I've written this continuum -- I've wrote that this era is going to be remembered more for the severity -- for the ferocity of its prosecutions than for the severity of the crimes. And there's never been anything proven. And yet, the hatred and the vitriol has been relentless.

What do you think it is about you? Do you think it's you? Do you

think it's us, our generation? And what about the Steve Skeronick (sp) theory, the Yale professor who talked about third way Presidents like you, like Wilson, substantively like Nixon, people who take the best of the opposition's agenda, sand off the rough edges, implement it, and are therefore, distrusted by their own party and hated by the opposition?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think that that -- I read his book and it's a very good book. But I think, in this case that's not accurate, for the following reasons. Number one, if you go back to '93 and '94, the Democrats in Congress supported me more strongly than they had supported -- a higher percentage of Democrats voted for my programs than voted for Kennedy, Johnson or Carter. It was that the Republican opposition was more unanimous.

Number two, the Republicans never owned crime and welfare. They owned them rhetorically, but they didn't do much about it. And at least in the tradition that I came out of as a governor, we thought we were supposed to act on crime and welfare. Nobody -- when you check into the morgue, they don't ask for your party registration. And I never knew that anybody had a vested interest in poor people being out of work.

And so I just never accepted that. And I found that there were a lot of Democrats in the Congress that were eager to deal with those issues. And if you look at it, we had -- I don't know -- more than two-thirds of the Democrats in the House and more than 75 percent of the Democrats in the Senate voted for welfare reform. And we had a higher percentage of Democrats than Republicans in the Senate voting for it, and slightly higher percentage of Republicans than Democrats voting for it in the House, but not huge.

So I think that maybe transformational figures generally inspire that, because most times people like to deal with folks they can put in a box. Maybe it's just -- maybe it's something about me that made them mad. You know my favorite joke about the guy that's walking along the edge of Grand Canyon and falls off -- so this guy is hurdling down hundreds of feet to certain death, and he looks out and he grabs this twig and it breaks his fall. He heaves a sigh of relief. Then all of a sudden he sees the roots coming loose. He looks up in the sky and says, "God, why me? I'm a good person. I've taken care of my family, I've paid my taxes, I've worked all my life. Why me?" And this thunderous voice says, "Son, there's just something about you I don't like." (Laughter.)

I don't know. I don't think --

Q The folks like you. They never cared about this stuff.

THE PRESIDENT: But I believe the Republicans thought -- I told you -- I think that they thought --

Q It wasn't just them, it was us, too.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The press I think -- I wasn't part of the Washington establishment, and I think that the press didn't know what to make of me. I think this travel office deal, it was largely a press

deal. I mean, I didn't know that they thought they owned the travel office. It was a weird deal. And, of course, all I ever heard was one guy in the press who happened to be the head of the White House Correspondents at the time said, I wish you'd have somebody look into this because the costs are going up and it's not working well. I didn't realize that everybody else didn't care what happened. It was a strange thing.

But I think that -- all I can tell you is that the same guy that told me -- the same senator that told me that it was about making people think I'd done something wrong in Whitewater also said that the Republicans had learned a lot from my presidency. He said, before that they thought there was a liberal press, and he said, now we have a different view, we think that they are liberal and that they vote like you, but they think like us and that's more important.

And I said, what do you mean? And he said, well, we just don't believe in government very much, but we love power. And he says, you know, the press wants to be powerful and we both get it the same way, by hurting you. There could be something to that.

But I'm sure -- maybe there were times when I didn't handle it all that well in the early going. But all I can tell you is, if you look back over it, the Whitewater thing was a total fraud. Now, I've got a friend named Brandy Ayres who is the editor of a little newspaper in Addison, Alabama -- do you know who he is?

Q I've met him, yes.

THE PRESIDENT: He wrote an editorial that said, this is what always happens when Republicans get in the majority. They did it when they got in the majority after World War II, they tried to convince us Harry Truman and Dean Acheson were communists. And then the second time, they gave us McCarthy and now they gave us this.

I don't know. I think part of it is how you view power. But for whatever reason, there is something about me that they didn't like very much. But it all worked out all right. Like I said, I'm sure that my not being familiar with Washington mores may have had something to do with the way I didn't handle the press right. Maybe I didn't --

Q Yes, you know -- I mean, I've said this in print, so I can say it to your face -- you're the most talented politician I've ever come across. And you're not a slow study. That's the other thing we know about you.

THE PRESIDENT: But I think in the beginning, for the first two years I thought I was pushing a lot of rocks up the hill. I was obsessed.

Thomas Patterson, who has written books about the presidency and the media and all that, he said in '95 that I'd already kept a higher percentage of my campaign promises than the previous five Presidents, which I felt really good about. We had just lost the Congress, I needed

something to feel good about.

But I do believe in '95 I was -- and '93 and '94, I was just fixated on trying to get as much done as quickly as I could, and also on trying to learn the job, get the White House functioning, all that kind of stuff. And I think that I did not spend enough time probably at least working with the media, letting them ask me questions, at least trying to get the whole -- letting them get something in perspective. And I think maybe I was just the last gasp of 25 years of scandal mania. We may be swinging the other way on the pendulum now.

Q I think after '98 maybe we've learned -- I think we're doing a little bit better this year. You might see that in a different way.

Let's talk about '95 for a second. To my mind, the period of this presidency that is most touching to me, I think, are the weeks after -- well, the two days, April 18, 1995 --

THE PRESIDENT: Oklahoma City?

Q No, the press conference the night before Oklahoma City when you said the President is still relevant here. I thought, oh, my God, that must be the rock bottom for him.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, actually, it wasn't -- I didn't have the same reaction to it than maybe -- you know, we often don't perceive ourselves as others see us. But that question, I learned something from that, which is, if someone asks you a question that you want to answer directly, but there's a word in it that's dynamite, you should answer it without using the word. Because actually, what I was doing in April of '95 in my own mind was prefiguring the fight which occurred at the end of '95 and the end of '96.

That is, I honestly didn't feel pathetic or irrelevant or anything. I knew that in the end, if a veto-proof minority of my party would stay with me, after the terrible licking they'd taken in '94, if they would stay with me, I believed in the end we'd have our chance to make our case to the American people. In other words, I believed it would turn out the way it did turn out at the end of '95 and the beginning of '96.

So, actually, to me, it wasn't the worst point of the presidency. When they asked me that question, a light went on in my head. I actually felt good about it. But because I used the word, it came out -- people perceived it differently than I did. I didn't feel that about it.

Q But then, a week later, you said -- at Michigan State, you said, you can't love your country and despise its government. And that's when a light went off in my mind, he's figured out how he's going to go up against these folks.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, that's what I believed. I think the Oklahoma City thing was awful, it was awful. But I think it began a kind of

reassessment, a kind of breaking of the ice. And I don't mean that -- God knows --

Q Someone told me that you said, you told them that you wouldn't use the word "bureaucrat" again in a speech after that.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I did. It affected even me. I realized that I had played on the resentments people feel about government, and I thought that when government did something stupid or indefensible, they ought to be taken on. But I realized that even when you do that, you have to be careful what word you use. And I did say that. I said, how many times have I used the word "bureaucrat," and there are people there. And I didn't mean to say that I or even Newt Gingrich was responsible for Timothy McVeigh. I don't want to get -- that's what he did. Are the liberals responsible for Susan Smith -- the one throwing her kid out the window? I didn't want to get into that. But Oklahoma City had a profound impact on me, too.

I went down there and I was sitting there with the relatives, and one of the people that was killed had been in my inaugural and I was talking to his kinfolk. And I said, you know -- I just made up my mind I would try never again to discuss the government, even people's frustrations with it, in a way that could be directed against categories of people. It really had a big impact on me. And I think it did on the country.

Q Would it be fair to say that by the time you gave that speech at Michigan State, you were ready for battle?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Yes.

Q Now, this is a really interesting part of your presidency to me. You had at that point a brilliant strategy in place to screw them. It was, smoke them out. You could have just sat there and said, well, what's your plan? You could have done to them what they did to you in '94. And yet, you insisted, ultimately, against, from what I can gather, your entire staff, including people like Bob Rubin, you insisted on coming out with your own budget, your own balanced budget that June. Why did you do that? I mean you didn't have to politically, right?

THE PRESIDENT: No, probably not. In other words, I could have done to them what they did to me. And that was the argument, that we'd just say no to them like they just said no to us. But governing is important to me. And I thought that in the end we would all be judged by how we had performed, and by whether we had performed. And this may sound naive, but I believed that in the end we could change the politics of Washington.

See, one of the reasons I ran for President is I didn't just want to prove that I could play the game they'd all been playing with each other -- "I got an idea, you got an idea, let's fight and maybe we can both get our 15 seconds on the evening news." That's basically the operative mode. I didn't want to do that. I came here to do things. I wanted to be President to do things, to change the country, to be

relevant. And I thought that the Democrats -- I didn't think the Republicans would take us up on it initially, because Gingrich had basically made it clear that he wanted to basically be prime minister of the country and turn me into a ceremonial and foreign policy President. We'd have the French system, in effect.

Q Not only that, he told me on the phone one night he was personally going to lead a Wesleyan revolution that year.

THE PRESIDENT: So that's basically what he wanted to do. But I just felt that the Democrats could not sacrifice -- what I was trying to do was to build the Democrats as a party of fiscal responsibility. I wanted to prove that you could be socially progressive and fiscally responsible. And for us -- and I went out there saying, look, our credo is opportunity, responsibility, community. I just didn't see that I could stand there and say, what do you expect of me, I'm just the President, they're in the majority. That's just not my way. I believe that you have to do things if you can. And my own view of politics is that there's always plenty that the parties are honestly divided about at election time, no matter how much you get done.

Furthermore, I really did believe that the Democrat Party, in the end, would be successful by developing what is now known as the Third Way, but which I really saw as basically an information age version of what we'd always been for.

Q What was your fantasy for a second term? If you'd had everything you wanted the day after you were reelected, what would it have been?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the validation of the economic strategy has been a part of it. I would have finished the job in health care and enacted my entire education budget. And the rest of it is still sort of pending. The Irish peace process worked out the way I'd hoped. I'm still hoping that we'll get more done in the Middle East. It's very difficult, but I'm hoping we will. And then, on the foreign policy front, it's going to pretty much work out the way I'd hoped it would I think.

Q When I look back at your speeches, if there were a couple of paragraphs where you best describe your political philosophy, the Third Way, they were in the 1998 State of the Union address, and nobody paid any attention. And you know why?

THE PRESIDENT: Because I was standing -- what I got credit for there was just getting up, standing up. (Laughter.)

Q What was the opportunity cost of that scandal? what did it cost you?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know yet, because actually we did -- in '98 we won seats in the House of Representatives, the first time a President's party has done that since --

Q I mean, substantively.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I don't know. Because I don't know whether the Congress, the Republicans would have been more willing to work with me, or not.

Q What about things like Social Security reform -- could you have made a --

THE PRESIDENT: Maybe. What I wanted to do with Social Security -- I am disappointed there. We still may get some Medicare restructuring reform out of this. And in any case, Medicare is going to be okay for 30 years, which is the longest it's been okay for in forever and ever. And I think --

Q Yes, but that's a problem, for god sakes. I mean, the generational transfer issue I think is something that you're really concerned about.

THE PRESIDENT: I am concerned about it. But --

Q You can't keep a fee-for-service --

THE PRESIDENT: But, but, but both Medicare taxes and Social Security taxes, in fairness, since 1983 have been paying for everything else. So we've had a little of that in reverse.

Q That's very good.

THE PRESIDENT: Everybody has forgotten that. We've been dumping all these Social Security and Medicare taxes into the general economy all this time. I personally believe, though, that -- I regret we didn't get to do Social Security because I would have -- what happened was I think maybe we could have gotten it if we hadn't had that whole impeachment thing. But there was more resistance in both parties to do anything than I had imagined there was.

They'll have to come to terms with this. It will have to be done. And I think you've either got to raise taxes, cut benefits, or increase the rate of return. What I proposed in '98 on Social Security I think was a very good beginning, and I really thought we'd get something. Was that '98 or '99?

Q That was '98. And there was also the Breaux-Thomas, later Breaux-Frisk commission on Medicare. You could have, with your abilities, you could have gotten some kind of deal if you'd been able to at that point.

THE PRESIDENT: Maybe. But they --

Q Breaux was your guy, right?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I don't agree with what he wanted to do there. And he knows that. I mean, I thought -- I agree with some of what they proposed, but some of what they proposed I think would not be good for Medicare. On policy grounds, he and I have had long discussions about it. I think there are a couple of things in that report that I just

simply didn't agree with.

Q In general, when you talk about an information age safety net, what would it be and what would be the guiding principles? I don't think that you can have the kind of centralized, top-down sort of programs that Social Security and Medicare --

THE PRESIDENT: I think if you had -- yes, but there's a great article -- let me just say this -- there's a great article in the New York Times Sunday Magazine the day before yesterday --

Q The Sarah Moseley article?

THE PRESIDENT: About volunteerism. And I don't believe -- I think you have to have some sort of -- if you believe there should be a safety net, there has to be some sort of safety net. Now, there's all kinds of options to get it done, and I think there should be more -- you can have some more room for private initiative, but if you had a safety net that worked, you'd have something for the poor and the disabled, the people who through no fault of their own were in trouble. You would have genuinely world-class education for everybody who needed it, which is everybody. You would have access to health care at an affordable rate, and decent housing, and you'd have to have a lifetime learning system.

And then I think you'd have to have some more generous version of the New Markets Initiative I proposed, because there will always be unevenness in the growth of the market economy. That's part of its genius because you have to have opportunity for new things to branch out. But in my view, this New Markets thing has been under-appreciated.

Q I was out there a year ago watching Al From and Jesse Jackson cavort along beside you.

THE PRESIDENT: And it may be one of the great opportunities for bipartisan achievement in this session. It may be one of the great opportunities because Hastert is completely committed to it, he's been as good as his word on everything. And I think Lott knows it's the right thing to do. I've talked to them both a lot. We do have a good working relationship now, even though we have our differences. I think the Senate has been far too grudging on the judges, particularly since I appointed basically mainstream judges, but they want more ideologues, and they hope they can get them next year. And I hope they can't, and we'll see what happens.

But anyway, I think a part of the safety net ought to be viewed as a willingness of the government to make continuing extraordinary efforts including big tax incentives to keep the people in places that are left behind in the emerging global economy, keep giving them a chance to catch up.

And I think this whole digital divide is a -- I prefer to think of it as a digital bridge. I think if you think about what this means, basically, this information economy can collapse distances in a way that telephones and railroads and electrical -- I mean, I think about it in

terms of Arkansas. When they brought us REA and the interstate highway system, and I put all these little airports up in remote towns and all that -- it all helped to bring, like, small-scale manufacturing to places that had been left behind. But there was always the factor of distance.

And then I got to a place like the Ship Rock Navaho Reservation where they make really beautiful jewelry, for example, where the unemployment rate is 58 percent and only 30 percent of the people have telephones. And you realize that if they really were part of an information age economy, there are ways in which they could do -- I remember when I became President there were a lot of banks in New York shipping their data processing to Northern Ireland every day -- every day. And then bringing it back. There are all kinds of opportunities that we never had before. And I think people ought to start thinking about that as a part of the safety net.

Q You know, this raises an interesting point about you, personally. Shalala said to me that she thought that just as you were obsessed and voracious about social policy when you were government in the '80s -- that's one of the things I first noticed about you, is that you knew everything. I mean, you knew about the schools up here in East Harlem, more than Cuomo did, in fact. But as you were to social policy in the '80s you've been hungry in the same way for knowledge about science and technology in the '90s.

And I talked to Herald Farmus (sp) about it, and other people have said the same thing. Is that true? And in that regard, talk to me a little bit about the policy that you pursued in high-tech and information age things that I don't understand that well, like telecommunications and --

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let's talk about that. The one thing in our mantra about our economic policy which we always repeat, fiscal responsibility, expanded trade, and investing in people -- those three things really were the sort of three stools of our economic policy. But one thing I think that tends to understate is the role that technology, particularly information technology has played in this remarkable growth, and the productivity growth and the long economic expansion.

And I think our major contribution to that, apart from getting interest rates down so capital can flow to that sector, was in the Telecommunications Act of '96. And there were -- our major contributions to that act, I might say, Al Gore deserves a lot of credit for because he was our front guy on it -- were two. One is we insisted that the Telecom Act would be very much pro-competition, which required us to get into a very difficult political fight principally with the RBOCs, -- operating companies -- many of whom I've had very good relationships with because they do great stuff. They've helped us on all of our digital divide stuff, a lot of the New Market stuff. But I just thought that we had to bend over backwards to maximize the opportunity for people with ideas to start new companies and get in and compete.

And we fought that through, and it delayed the passage of the Telecom Act, but eventually we got what we wanted. And as I remember,

while there were more Democrats than Republicans for our position, there were actually people on both sides of both parties. But we very much wanted to have a pro-competition bias.

The other night, interestingly enough, I was at dinner in New York with a friend of mine who was in the telecom business and then got in the venture capital business with telecom. He had a dinner for me and I had dinner with like 40 people, all of whom headed companies that didn't exist in 1996. I went out to UUP, which is an Internet connection company, which had 40 or 80 employees, something like that, in 1993, when I became President, and they have 8,000 now. I mean, it's amazing.

So that was good. And the second thing we did was to fight for the e-rate, which democratized the Internet and democratized the telecommunications revolution. We've got 95 percent of our schools have at least one Internet connection, and 90 percent of the poorest schools have an Internet connection.

So I think that those are the two things that happened. And then I also continued to push relentlessly these last eight years for greater investment in science and technology.

It was interesting, I've had an interesting relationship with the Congress since the Republicans won the majority because they look around for things that they can spend more money on than me.

Q NIH.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. And it's been very interesting. They knew they would always be -- whatever defense number I proposed, they'd always be for more. And they liked to -- I'm always for a balance between mass transit and highways, and they're always a little more on the highways side. But the big area was NIH. And Herald Farmus (sp) did a brilliant job -- when the Republicans won the Congress, he brought all these freshmen congressman out, showed them the NIH, showed them what they were doing, explained the genome project to them. And I think John Porter was the head of the subcommittee in the House that had this. He's a good man. He's smart and he wanted to do the right thing. And so, anyway, I figured out after the first go-round that whatever I proposed, they propose more, which suited me fine because I basically don't think you can spend too much on those things.

But the problem I had early on, and the problem I still have is, notwithstanding how much money we have, the Republicans do not, in my view, spend enough money on non-NIH research. For example, they just took out all the money that I proposed for nanotechnology, this highly microscopic technology which could increase the power of computer generation by unfathomable amounts.

Now, why is that a mistake? Because as -- one night Hillary had -- we had all these millennial evenings at the White House and then we had one the other day on outer space and the deep oceans. We did it in the afternoon. But we had one on the Human Genome Project, and we had Eric Ladner from Harvard, who is a biological scientist, and we had Ben Cerf,

who was one of the developers of the Internet.

He actually sent the first e-mail ever sent, 18 years ago -- or 19 years ago now -- to his then profoundly deaf wife, who now can hear because she's got a microdigital chip that's been planted deep in her ear. She heard at 50 -- she said she's sure she's the only person who's ever heard James Taylor sing "Fire And Rain" at the age of 50 for the first time. She came and sort of stood up and was exhibit A.

But the point they were making is that the biomedical advances that would flow out of the Human Genome Project, which the Republican majority will support lavishly, depended upon the development of the computer technology. And that without the development of the computer technology, you could never parse something as small as the human genome, and get into all these genes and understand all the permutations.

For example, there was a fascinating article the other day about one of the implications of the human genome, saying that -- talking about these two women who had a form of cancer, and that basically, if you look at the historical studies of all women in this category with this kind of cancer, diagnosed at this point in their illness, that you would say they had a 45-percent chance of survival. But now they can do genetic testing showing that they actually have very different conditions, and that one of them had a 20-percent chance of survival, the other had an 80-percent chance of survival.

Now, the reason they can do that is because not only of the biological advances, but the non-biological advances that make it possible to measure the biological differences. And I could give you lots of other examples.

And, again, I owe a lot of this to Al Gore. He convinced me in 1993 that climate change was real. And he wrote that book in '88 and they're still making fun of his book, and I remember as late as last year we had a House subcommittee that treated climate change like a conspiracy to destroy the economy of the United States. But now you've got all the major oil companies admitting that it's real, that the climate really is warming at an unsustainable rate. And that's why we pushed the Kyoto Protocol and why I want to spend a lot more money, and also have tax incentives, for people to keep making advances in energy technologies and environmental conservation technologies.

So my frustration about where we are now is that I'm really grateful that the Republican majority has embraced NIH, because it's been good and it's enabled me to present budgets under the old budget caps that I knew they would break, so I could get adequate funding for education, for example, and still know we're going to do a really good job on NIH. But I think we need a much broader commitment in the Congress to research in other areas of science and technology, going beyond the biological sciences.

(end of tape 2, beginning of tape 3 -- no overlap)

Q -- when it became clear to you -- I mean, I know this is

prompting you to sound braggart, but so be it. There must have come a time when you realized, hey, our economic policy worked, this whole thing is taking off, and my larger sense of us moving from the Industrial Age to the Information Age is really true, and all of a sudden we have these surpluses. Was there a moment when the bolt of lightning hit and knocked you off the donkey on the way to the West Wing? Was there a day when you realized that --

THE PRESIDENT: I spent a lot of '98 trying to dodge bolts of lightning. (Laughter.)

Q Well, that's the irony of this, I think, is that that was probably going to be the moment that the press was going to realize that there had been a coherence to this whole project all along, and we managed to work our way out of that.

THE PRESIDENT: In '98, I spent a lot of '98 --

Q Is it fair to say '98 was the time that this --

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, yes. And I spent a lot of '98 sort of¹ wrestling with three overwhelming feelings. One is, obviously there was a lot of pain involved because I had made a terrible personal mistake, which I did try to correct, which then a year later got outed on -- or almost a year later -- and had to live with. And it caused an enormous amount of pain to my family and my administration and to the country at large, and I felt awful about it. And I had to deal with the aftermath of it.

And then, I had to deal with what the Republicans were trying to do with it. But I had a totally different take on it than most people. I really believed then and I believe now I was defending the Constitution. And while I was responsible for what I did, I was not responsible for what they did with what I did -- that was their decision -- and that I had to defend the Constitution.

And so I felt that -- I still believe historically two of the great achievements of my administration were facing down the government shutdown in '95 and '96, and then facing this back; and that those two things together, essentially, ended the most overt and extreme manifestations of the Gingrich revolution.

And then the third thing I felt was this "gosh, it is all working and it's coming together and all these things will be possible." And I still believe if we can get one or two things straight for the future, that a lot of the good stuff is still ahead.

Q I'm not going to let you off that so easily. Were there days, were there moments that you remember where you saw, hey, this is happening?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, I was really happy. I just was happy because I thought -- to be fair, I don't think any of us thought in '93 -- if you asked me in '93, what level of confidence do you have this economic plan is going to work, I would say, very, very high. And if you asked me, what do you mean by "working," when I started in '93, I would say we'd probably

have between 16 million and 18 million new jobs. I never would have guessed 22.5 million, and maybe more.

I would have said -- I was fairly sure that we'd get rid of the deficit by the time I left office. I didn't know in '93 that we'd be paying off nearly \$400 billion of the national debt when I left office, and we'd be looking at taking America out of debt, which is a goal I hope will be ratified by this election and I hope the American people will embrace that, because I think that's quite important.

So in '98 I began to imagine just how far we could go, you know, and to think about that.

Q There's another aspect to this that we haven't talked about that I think has really been central. In '93 would you have predicted that the state of race relations would have gotten to the point that it's gotten to now? I mean, I don't know whether you can sense -- I sensed it out on the trail this year. Bob Dole went to Bob Jones in '96 and didn't pay any price at all, did he? This year you couldn't do it, and everywhere you go in this country, people of different races are having lunch together and holding hands.

THE PRESIDENT: I confess, you know, I like Senator Dole very much, but I would have made him pay a price if I had known he went to Bob Jones University. I just didn't know.

Q You didn't know about the dating policy?

THE PRESIDENT: No, I didn't know he went to Bob Jones University. I didn't know about the dating policy, but I knew about Bob Jones because I'm a white southerner. And I think the Bob Jones thing -- I think Governor Bush going there mattered more maybe to white southerners my age who supported civil rights than maybe to even other Americans, because it has a whole -- because of the history there. It was a big deal to me. I just didn't know.

But I do believe we have come a long way. And I think -- I hope I made some contribution to that, because I think it's really important. I've tried to get Americans to understand that how we handle this -- I still believe how we handle this is in a way the most important thing, because we're a great country and we're full of smart people, and we nearly always get it right, unless we get in our own way. And it's just like me -- nations are like people, individuals, in the sense that very often all their greatest wounds are self-inflicted. And this whole state of racism, it's a self-inflicted wound.

Q This was where I was wrong on affirmative action, I think, in the end, when I kicked you around on that.

THE PRESIDENT: I never wanted it to last forever, and I think that we had to clean up some of the contracting policies and some of the other things. But we --

Q Have those been done?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we made some changes, and I hear a lot of complaining about it from people that have been affected by them. But I still believe that -- and to be fair to my critics or skeptics, it's a lot easier to sell and affirmative action in good economic times than in tough economic times. I believe what launched the assault on affirmative action in the beginning was that, number one, it did seem to be that nobody was ever reexamining it, its premises.

But secondly, the big start was in California because California was suffering so much from a recession in the late '80s and early '90s, and people felt that they were being disenfranchised, and they felt that the circumstances were squeezing in on them anyway and they didn't want any other burdens that they lost just because they happened to be in the majority. So I think maybe the acid test of whether I was right or not won't come until there's another period of economic difficulty.

Q People argue the same on welfare reform, as well, although --

THE PRESIDENT: But I think there's enough evidence in on that. I think if there are adversities coming out of welfare reform in the next economic downturn, or as far as there are now, it may be because -- it's largely because of decisions states have made about how to spend or not to spend properly the big extra money they got because we grandfathered them in at the amount of money they were getting when welfare rolls were at their height in February of '94. I think that's when we did that. Maybe it was '96, but I think it was '94. I think we grandfathered them -- anyway, whatever month it was, we grandfathered their cash flow in when welfare rolls were high, on the theory that we wanted them to spend this money on education, on transportation, on housing assistance, on training people to not just take jobs, but to be able to keep jobs, or find new jobs if they lost them. And there are some stories coming in which are troubling, but which have more to do with decisions that were made at the state level.

The thing that some of the people who criticized me on the left for welfare reform never understood, I don't think -- they said, oh, gosh, he's ending this national benefit. But that was a joke, because for more than 20 years, by 1996, states had been able to set their own rate. So you had the family support, monthly support for a family of three on welfare varied anywhere from a low of \$187 a month to a high of \$665 a month -- on the day I signed the welfare reform bill.

So to pretend that there was somehow some national income safety net was a joke. Nobody was going to go below \$187 a month. And if there was a political consensus for a higher level, they weren't going to go out and gut people. And the idea of spending this money to empower people to go into the workplace, and then require people who could do so to try to get their personal act together and access the benefits and go in there, and then letting them keep their medical coverage for a while, is very, very important.

The only thing I didn't like about the welfare reform bill was not

that, it was the immigrant thing. But the two I vetoed -- everybody acted at the time -- the only thing that really disturbed me, and I realized I had not succeeded in getting people into the intricacies of welfare policy was that I had people, both liberals and conservatives, who said, well, he vetoed two of them, but he signed the third one because it's getting close to the election and he wants credit for that. That's not true.

The thing we were fighting about was whether or not, if you required people on welfare to go to work and they refused to meet the requirement -- that is, they acted in a way that violated the responsibility portions of the law -- how do you minimize the impact on their kids. And what I was unwilling to do, because there was a uniform national benefit there, was to scrap the food stamps or the Medicaid coverage for the children, where we did have a uniform national standard. And nowhere near the variations that already existed in the monthly cash payment.

So I thought that finally when they agreed to put those back in, I believed, given the way the budget fights were unfolding -- and by then I was in my second one, in '96 -- that within a couple of years I would be able to restore most of the immigrant cuts. And sure enough, we did.

So I still think that some of them are not right and that we haven't restored, but I think, on balance, the welfare reform bill was a big net advance in American social policy and the right thing to do.

Q That's an interesting phrase, "given the way the budget fights were unfolding." There seems to have been a pattern since '95, and I think that that may be part of the reason why people might not see the whole of what has gone on here -- is that a lot of the stuff you've gotten since '95 has come in budget reconciliations at the end of the year --

THE PRESIDENT: Huge. And I've got to give a lot of credit to Panetta and Bowles, who was brilliant at it, and John Podesta and Ricchetti, and all these people that worked the Congress, because they -- and the congressional leadership in our party -- keep in mind, any time that our support among the Democratic minority drops below a third plus one, I have no power in the budget process. So I think that -- but we have gotten enormous amounts done for poor people, for the cause of education -- we've gone from a million dollars a year in three years to \$445 million a year, something like that, in programs for after-school. And my budget this year, if we get that, we'll really be able to put an after-school program in every failing school in America -- if we get what I asked for this year. Amazing stuff.

I think that's one of the reasons that a lot of what we did in education has not been fully appreciated.

Q Ten million people taking advantage of HOPE Scholarships and Lifelong Learning credits this year, according to Gene.

THE PRESIDENT: That's right.

Q I mean, are you frustrated that this kind of stuff isn't

more known?

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, a little bit. But the main thing for me now is that it's happening. And the other thing that I think is really important I'd just like to mention, that I think almost no one knows, that I think is, over the long run, particularly if we can get -- it's interesting, the Republicans say they're for accountability, but they won't adopt my education accountability act, which would require more explicit standards, more explicit -- turn around failing schools or shut them down, and voluntary national tests, which they're against, but we're working on it still.

But just what we did in '94 -- in '94, in a little-known provision of our reenactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, we required states to identify -- getting Title I money -- to identify failing schools and to develop strategies to turn them around. States like Kentucky the have taken it seriously have had a breath-taking result.

I was down at that little school in Kentucky, in eastern Kentucky, the other day. And it was a failing school, one of the worst in Kentucky, over half the kids on school lunches, now ranked in the top 20 elementary schools in Kentucky -- in three years.

Q What did they do.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let me tell you the results they got. In three years, here's what happened -- they went from 12 percent of the kids reading at or above grade level to 57 percent. They went from 5 percent of the kids doing math at or above grade level to 70 percent. They went from zero percent of the kids doing at or above grade level in science to 63 percent. In three years. And they ranked 18th in the performance of elementary schools in Kentucky.

Well, smaller classes, good school leadership, heavy involvement by the parents, and basically measuring their performance. It's stunning. I mean, it's just amazing.

I was in a school the other day in Spanish Harlem that in two years went from 80 percent of the kids doing reading and math at or below grade level to 74 percent of the kids doing reading and math at or above grade level. Below grade level, 80 percent below, to 74 percent at or above grade level. In two years. And I know what they did there because I spent a lot of time there. They got a new principal and they basically -- they went to a school uniform policy, one of my little ideas that was falsely maligned, had a huge impact -- and they basically went to -- they established goals and results, and you either met them or you didn't. It's amazing. And these children, the pride these children felt was breath-taking.

So one of the things -- I mean, I think one of the most important accomplishments of the administration was basically opening the doors of college to everybody with the HOPE Scholarships and the direct loans. And if we could just get this tuition tax deductibility then -- we haven't made it possible for every person making \$40,000 to send all their kids to

Yale, but we made it possible for everybody to send all their kids somewhere.

Q That's not refundable, is it?

THE PRESIDENT: Not refundable, but it is deductible at the 28-percent level for people that are in the 15-percent income tax bracket.

Q Oh, I see. So it's a kind of semi-deduction.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, well, in our proposal you get to deduct up to \$10,000 at the 28-percent level even if you're in the 15-percent income tax bracket. So it's not refundable, but for the people that need refundability, they have access to the Pell Grants and to loans they can pay back now as a percentage of their income under the Direct Loan Program.

Q You're getting restless. Let me ask you one last -- well, I'm not going to guarantee this is one last, I might want to ask you -- if I have a few more over time, is there some way I can get in touch with you?

THE PRESIDENT: Sure. You've interviewed 50 people, you've taken this seriously, so I want to try to --

Q Well, it's the last eight years of my life, too, you know. (Laughter.) And I haven't even asked you about foreign policy, for god sakes. We'll do two things. Let me ask you about foreign policy. It seems to me that if you look at what you did, there are two big things you did in foreign policy. One was raise economic issues to the same level as strategic issues, which was crucial, and the other was to demonstrate over time that America was going to be involved and use force when necessary in the rest of the world.

The second one is, obviously, more messy and dicey than the first. The third thing you did was essentially not do anything wrong and do really right things when it came to the big things like Middle East, Russia, China.

The messy part of it is the dustups in places like Bosnia, Kosovo. People have told me that you really feel awful that you didn't do more in Rwanda. Is that true?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I don't know that I could have. Let me back up and say, I had a -- when I came here, came to the White House, I sat down, basically, and made my own list of what I wanted to accomplish in foreign policy. I wanted to maximize the chance that Russia would take the right course. I wanted to maximize the chance that China would take the right course. I wanted to do what I could to minimize these ethnic slaughters, which basically the end of the Cold War ripped the lid off -- it's not that they didn't occur before, but now they became the main problem with the world.

I wanted to try to create a unified Europe which included an

expanded NATO, supporting European unification and dealing with all the countries around. I wanted to try to get Turkey into Europe as a bulwark against fundamentalist terrorism. That required some progress between Greece and Turkey, and we made some, not enough to suit me.

I wanted to try to minimize the turbulence -- the possibility of war and nuclear war between India and Pakistan, which is something that was not right for my involvement until rather late in my term. But one of the things that -- and I wanted to try to -- and I'll leave this until last -- I wanted to try to broaden the notion in America of what foreign policy and national security was, to include health issues, to include -- like we made AIDS a national security threat -- to include climate change; to include the globalized society, all these issues we started talking about.

So the one thing I would say to you is that I think this has all occurred kind of under the radar screen -- I'll come back to Rwanda -- but one of the things I think should be mentioned is we have spent an enormous amount of money and time and effort focusing America on how to minimize the threats of biological warfare, of chemical warfare. What are we going to do -- will the miniaturization of the information revolution lead to small-scale chemical, biological, even, God forbid, nuclear weapons; how are we going to deal with that. So we've done a lot of work on that.

And to come back to Rwanda, one of the things I've tried to do with Africa is to -- and Sierra Leone is giving us a good test case here -- is to increase the capacity of the African nations to deal with their own problems, to support the regional operations like ECOWAS or OAU. And I developed something called the African Crisis Response Initiative, where we would go in and train African militaries. When I was in Senegal, for example, I went out to the community -- to the training site there on our trip to Africa, and saw the American soldiers training with the Senegalese to dramatically increase their capacity.

What happened basically with Rwanda is we were obsessed with Bosnia and all the other stuff, and it was over in 90 days. I mean, they basically killed hundreds of thousands of people in 90 days. And I just don't think we were -- any of us focused on it and whether we could have done something. But I made up my mind that we would certainly try to increase the capacity of Africans to deal with it and we would move in as quickly as we could. And like I said, what happens in Sierra Leone is going to be a little test of that.

Q Do you think you were prepared for being a foreign policy leader when you came in? What are the things that you've learned in terms of --

THE PRESIDENT: I would say, yes and no. I think --

Q You had it in principle.

THE PRESIDENT: I think I had a very -- because I'd been interested in it since I was a student in college, and I'd always been fascinated by world affairs. So the fact that I had not been a senator or

served in a previous administration I don't think was a particular disadvantage. I think all the economic stuff I think I had right, and the fact that there was a lot more in economics involved and it was about democracy, it was about minimizing war, it was about lifting people's sights so they had something better to do than killing their neighbors because they were of a different religion or ethnic group. I think we had that right.

I think we basically had the nuclear issues right, and the big power issues right with Russia, with China, what we tried to do in the Korean Peninsula.

Where I felt -- I think where I felt some frustration is maybe where even a President with a lot of experience would have felt frustration, a lot of experience in this, which is building the post-Cold War alliances, which proved to be very frustrating. I mean, we had a lot of frustrations -- and we got panned a lot, and maybe we deserved some of it and maybe we didn't -- in '93 and '94, trying to put together some kind of coalition of our European allies to move in Bosnia.

In Kosovo, having had the Bosnia experience, even though there were differences in the alliance, I have nothing but compliments for my allies. They were basically -- we had our arguments; we should have. Nobody has got a monopoly on truth. But basically, we got together, we moved quickly, we did the right things.

And I think that the idea of how we might even go about mechanically, operationally, dealing with something like Rwanda just wasn't there. The French and others that had been more active in that part of Africa, I think they may have had a better sense of it, although they went in late.

Q But you were acting with more confidence, too. You weren't asking, you were telling.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, well, it happens once you've been around and you know people, you know what it was. But it was -- I think that some of that, when you've got to have some support from other countries, and you can have an uncertain result, but you think you have to try, it just takes a while until you get your sea legs and you get everything worked out, particularly when there aren't sort of institutional structures and policies and rules of the road there. And so I think we did get it right.

If you take another sort of sad moment of the administration, when we lost our soldiers in Somalia --

Q Almost at the same time as the ship turned around in the harbor in Port-au-Prince.

THE PRESIDENT: When we lost our soldiers in Somalia, it was a very sad thing. But that happened I think -- and I hope the Congress will never decline to put people in peacekeeping missions because of it, because basically our guys did a terrific job there. But there was an operational, I think, decision made there, which, if I had to do it again,

I might do what we did then, but I would do it in a different way.

I remember General Powell coming to me and saying, Aideed has killed all these Pakistanis and they're our allies. Somebody needs to try to arrest him, and we're the only people with the capacity to do it. And he said, we've got a 50-percent chance of getting him, and a 25-percent chance of getting him alive. And so, he said, I think you ought to do it. And I said, okay.

But today, with that number of people there -- and then he retired, he left like the next week -- I'm not blaming him, I'm just saying that he was gone. So what happened was, we had this huge battle in broad daylight where hundreds and hundreds of Somalis were killed and we lost 18 soldiers, in what was a U.N. action that basically, if I were going to do it again, I would treat it just like -- if we were going to do that, I'd say, okay, I need to know what's involved here, and let's do this the way we planned out the military action we took against Saddam Hussein, for example -- or the military action I took to try to get Usama bin Laden's training camps, or anything else.

It doesn't mean America shouldn't be involved in peacekeeping, but it means if you go beyond the normal parameters that you decide on the front end, then the United States has to operate in a very different way.

Q There doesn't seem to be a uniform set of ground rules yet in place.

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think there is, but we're getting there.

Q Should there be? Could there be?

THE PRESIDENT: I think it's pretty hard, but I think you -- anyway, I will always regret that. I don't know if I could have saved those lives, or not, because I think what we were trying to do was the right thing to do, and the people who were there on the ground did the best they could. But I would have handled it in a different way if I had more experience, I think. I know I would have.

The only other thing I was going to say about this is that -- we talked about earlier how I hope in the future that the Congress will give more support to science and technology, beyond NIH. I hope in the future the Congress will give more support to our national security budget beyond the defense budget. As well-off as we are, one real big problem, we should be spending much more than we're spending, in my judgment, to fight global disease, to promote global development, to facilitate global peace-making and peacekeeping.

I think that we need to succeed in getting the bipartisan majority in Congress with a much broader view, because people look at us -- and they know how much money we've got and they know what our surplus is, and all these other countries are struggling, and we shouldn't be so begrudging -- I fight with the Congress all the time -- in our contributions to peacekeeping and to creating the conditions in which democracy and peace will flourish.

I'm encouraged by how Congress voted in this Colombia package because it's a balanced package and it has a lot of non-military, non-police stuff in it. And I'm hopeful that we'll have a more -- I saw Ben Gilman had a very good article -- somebody else, he and a Democrat, I can't remember who it was -- wrote an article in the L.A. Times yesterday, talking about the importance of the United States taking the lead in the international fight against global disease. That's one thing that I hope, after I'm gone, I hope that the next President will be more successful at than I was.

Q Let me ask you -- this is it -- after you're gone, you're going to be the youngest ex-President since Teddy Roosevelt. If there was one thing that Teddy Roosevelt did absolutely awful, it was be an ex-President. I mean, he was really terrible at it because he was so engaged, so involved, and he couldn't quit kibitzing.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, he felt, to be fair to him, that the Republicans had abandoned his philosophy. He felt Taft had kind of let him down.

Q You also have a restraining amendment in the Constitution that he didn't. But do you worry about that?

THE PRESIDENT: No. Well, I do, because -- (laughter) -- but not in the way you think. I don't think that the next President, whoever it is, will have problems with me acting like I wish I were still President. I mean, I think I know how to behave, and I've been here, and I want my country to succeed, and for my country to succeed, the presidency has to function. And I don't want to complicate that.

So the challenge I have is to figure out how to have a meaningful life, how to use all this phenomenal experience I've got and what I know and the ideas I have in a way that helps my country and helps the things I believe in around the world, and doesn't get in the way of the next President. And that's what I have to do. I've got to figure out how to do it.

Q Any thoughts?

THE PRESIDENT: I've thought about it, but I'm not ready to talk about it yet. But the one thing that I -- (laughter) --

Q You've talked about everything else today. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but the one thing that I -- the reason I wanted to spend so much time with this interview -- if you want to talk to me anymore, just call and we'll talk more on the phone -- is that you always knew -- and even when you got mad at me it was because you thought I'd stopped it -- that I would take this job seriously. I mean, the basic thing that I can tell you about this is I will leave Washington, believe it or not, after all I've been through, more idealistic than I showed up here as, because I believe that if you have a serious presidency, if you have ideas and you're willing to work, and you're not so pig-headed that

you think you've got the total truth, and you work with other people, and you just keep working at it, and you're willing to win in inches as well as feet, that a phenomenal amount of positive things can happen.

And you always thought that I was trying to have a serious presidency. That's all I ever wanted.

Q I got pretty pissed off at times.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, that was all right. But at least -- but when you were mad, it was because you thought I was abandoning something I said I would do, that I was trying to do. I never had any -- my frustration was with the people in your line of work that I thought didn't take all this seriously, that thought it didn't matter one way or the other, that thought it was some game or who was up or who was down, or where was the power equation, or something.

Because it really does matter. There are consequences to the ideas people have. One of the worries I have about this election is all these people writing as if there is no differences and there are no consequences. The American people should make a judgment knowing that there are differences and there are consequences and it matters what you do.

The thing that I think the last several years has shown is that a lot of these problems yield to effort. And if you're willing to just put in a few years of effort, you can push a lot of rocks up a lot of hills. People should feel really good about that.

One of the things that I hope when I leave office that people will say is, I hope that there will be a greater sense of self-confidence about what America can achieve. But it requires you -- everybody has got to play politics, and I understand all that. I don't want to get sanctimonious about that just because I'm not running for office for the first time in 26 years. That's part of the political system. And everybody will take their shots and do this. But in the end, the presidency should be informed by a set not just of core principles and core values, but ideas -- that there ought to be an agenda here; people ought to always be trying to get something done. And you shouldn't be deterred by people saying it's not big enough, or it's too big, or all that. There ought to be a broad-based view of where the world should go and what the role of the presidency is in taking America where it should go.

And as long as there is, I think our country is going to do pretty well. In that sense, I will leave office phenomenally optimistic. And everything I ever believed about the American people has been confirmed by my experience here. If they have enough time and enough information, no matter how it's thrown at them, in how many pieces and how slanted it is, or whether it's inflammatory or whether it's designed to produce sedation, no matter what happens, they nearly always get it right. That's the only reason we're around here after -- the Founding Fathers were right; democracy, if given a chance to work, really does. If there's enough time and enough information, the American people nearly always get it right.

So, in that sense, I just -- I'm grateful I've had the chance to serve. I've had the time of my life. I've loved it. Probably good we've got a 22nd Amendment; if we didn't, I'd probably try to do it for four more years. (Laughter.)

Q Well, I'll tell you something -- turning this off. Two things. One is, every last campaign I've covered since '92 I found myself judging against that one, in just big ways and little ways. And the other thing I promised my son I'd tell you -- he's just finishing up his first tour as a foreign service officer in Turkmenistan, and he said his proudest possession is his commission document with your signature on it.

THE PRESIDENT: Wow. Well, if you go back to that '92 campaign, it just shows you, though -- the only other thing I would say is I think I was so advantaged by having been a governor for 10 years when I started running, or however long I'd been serving, and having had the opportunity to develop these ideas over time, and then to measure them against the experience I've had.

I still think ideas and organized, concentrated effort mattered. No President with an ambitious agenda will fail to make errors. Things happen in other people's lives. Maybe something will happen to the next President -- God knows they won't go through what I did, but maybe their kids will get sick. Things happen in people's lives and mistakes get made. And sometimes you just make a wrong call. But if you've got -- if you're serious and you've got a good agenda, and you have good people and you work at it in a steady way, you get results.

It really is a job like other jobs. That's another thing -- I think it's important -- you said something in your letter to me, which I think is true, that maybe we had removed all the mystery around the President --

Q I didn't even get a chance to ask that question.

THE PRESIDENT: -- and maybe that's not good. And maybe that's not good, but I do believe that we need to demystify the job. It is a job. And if you love your country and you've got something you want to do, and you've thought it through and you've put together a good team, and you're willing to be relentless and to exhaust yourself in the effort, results will come.

That's what I would like the American people to know. They should be very optimistic about this.

Q You know, they are. They're in such great shape right now. I noticed it traveling around this year. It's not just everybody is getting along, but they appreciate the thing that you always said way back when, which is that diversity is a strength.

Sandy was telling me about your first G-7 conference, which I don't expect you to talk about on the record, but he was telling me about how the Japanese were lecturing you about how to run an economy. And when

you took office most people believed that we were going to get taken to the cleaners by the Japanese and the Germans, because they were homogenous and we were mongrels. And now most people -- you know, most of those Archie Bunkers out in Queens have a niece or a nephew who is dating a Puerto Rican at this point. And most people --

THE PRESIDENT: Or an Indian or a Pakistani. I went to a school in Queens the other day, and I mean I thought I was -- there was one guy there I could swear the kid was from Mongolia. There were a lot of East Asians; there were a lot of South Asians; there were all the Puerto Ricans; there were all the other Latins, you know.

But the test that -- that's not over, but I think people are beginning to feel good about it.

Q Well, I mean, kids my kids' age, your kid's age, think it's a positive value --

THE PRESIDENT: It is a positive value. It makes life more interesting. I keep telling everybody, the trick is to figure out how to respect all these people's -- other people's traditions, religions, the whole thing, cherish your own, and then -- but the only way to make it work -- which is why I keep citing this human genome finding that we're 99.9 percent the same -- is to realize that the differences make life interesting, but the similarities are fundamental.

If you can get people to think that -- what we have in common is fundamental, but the differences make life more interesting -- then I think we'll be okay. And I still think that's still the most important thing of all. It's even more important than the right economic policy -- because, eventually, we'll get all that stuff. We'll make mistakes, we'll correct it. But if your whole heart and mind and spirit is wrongly turned, then you can do everything else right and you still come a cropper. You'll have problems.

So I really -- I think this advance in race relations is profoundly important. I'll give you one -- exhibit A was old Gordon Smith's speech for the hate crimes bill. Did you see that?

END 7:10 P.M. EDT

Message Sent

To:

Betty W. Currie/WHO/EOP@EOP

Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP@EOP

Nancy V. Hernreich/WHO/EOP@EOP

Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP@EOP

Ellen E. Olcott/WHO/EOP@EOP

Margaret M. Suntum/WHO/EOP@EOP

Natalie S. Wozniak/NSC/EOP@EOP

Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP

Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP@EOP

Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jenni R. Engebretsen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Christine L. Anderson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Terry Edmonds/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah E. Gegenheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joel Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Pamela P. Carpenter/WHO/EOP@EOP
James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP
Alexander N. Gertsen/WHO/EOP@EOP