

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Introduction
Reported by Tom Brokaw

TOM BROKAW, anchor:

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

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

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

a military attack?

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

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

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

BROKAW: Good evening.

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

TOM BROKAW, anchor:

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

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

TOM BROKAW, anchor:

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

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

TOM BROKAW, anchor:

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

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

CLAIRE SHIPMAN reporting:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TOM BROKAW, anchor:

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

Fred, what's the story there?

FRED FRANCIS reporting:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TOM BROKAW, anchor:

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

Jim, what do you have for us?

JIM MIKLASZEWSKI reporting:

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

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

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

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

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

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

immediate gratification. This is tough.

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

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

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

Reported by TOM BROKAW and ANDREA MITCHELL

TOM BROKAW, anchor:

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

ANDREA MITCHELL reporting:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-FEB-1998 10:43:54.00

SUBJECT: Re: Talking Points: Don't Ask, Don't Tell Report

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Yes -- send to Bacon, Tyrer and DeLoeon

Laura S. Marcus

02/19/98 10:39:07 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP

cc:

Subject: Re: Talking Points: Don't Ask, Don't Tell Report

I sent them to Anne Luzatto and Joe Brossard who works for Bob Bell early this morning. I have yet to hear anything.

Do I need to share these with DoD?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Laura S. Marcus (CN=Laura S. Marcus/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-FEB-1998 10:39:18.00

SUBJECT: Re: Talking Points: Don't Ask, Don't Tell Report

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I sent them to Anne Luzatto and Joe Brossard who works for Bob Bell early this morning. I have yet to hear anything.

Do I need to share these with DoD?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-FEB-1998 17:58:53.00

SUBJECT: NC6121: Gay harassment up in military

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marjorie Tarmey (CN=Marjorie Tarmey/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP on 02/19/98
05:58 PM -----

rwockner @ netcom.com

02/19/98 05:03:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Stuart D. Rosenstein, Richard Socarides

cc:

Subject: NC6121: Gay harassment up in military

* Reprint rights for this copyrighted news article must be obtained *

* ---> by you <--- from the originating news organization. *

Group Cites More Gay Harassment

.c The Associated Press

By SLOBODAN LEKIC

WASHINGTON (AP) - The number of gays facing harassment in the military has risen for the fourth consecutive year, despite the Clinton administration's pledge to prevent further discrimination of homosexuals in the armed services, according to a gay rights advocacy group.

The Servicemembers Legal Defense Network attributed the increase to "a climate in many commands where 'anything goes' in the pursuit of suspected gay personnel."

In its annual report, the group cited 563 "command violations" that servicemembers had reported to it, including instances where commands asked, pursued and harassed service members in direct violation of President Clinton's "don't ask, don't tell" policy, which sets limits on gay investigations.

In contrast, the number of violations reported in 1996 by members of all the services was 443, the group said.

Last year's report said a total of 850 people had been discharged from the military for homosexuality in 1996, a five-year high. No figures were given discharges of gays in 1997.

"The difference is that last year we received the number of discharges from the Pentagon, but, despite repeated efforts, we have not been able to get them this year," said Kevin Winston, a spokesman for the group. "We'd love to have the numbers, but we can't get them."

A Pentagon spokesman, Capt. Jim Knotts, declined to comment on the report, saying the Defense Department had not had a chance to review it

or analyze its contents.

``The reason underlying continued violations of (the administration's policy) is a lack of commitment from top military and civilian authorities," the document said.

It said the Navy was the worst service in anti-gay harassment and asking, with 193 violations.

The group's recommendations included placing strict limits on gay investigations, disciplining commanders who disobey them, and providing recourse to personnel involved in improper investigations.

``It is time for military leaders to obey the law," the report concluded.

AP-NY-02-19-98 0900EST

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

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879)
id <011TRSG2S1QO00JS4V@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Thu, 19 Feb 1998 17:11:00 -0500 (EST)

Received: from storm.eop.gov (storm.eop.gov)
by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879) id <011TRSFVBBQO00ORAL@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Thu,

19 Feb 1998 17:10:57 -0500 (EST)

Received: from netcom5.netcom.com ([192.100.81.113])
by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-7 #6879)
with ESMTP id <011TRSFY1F6002Z3D@STORM.EOP.GOV>; Thu,
19 Feb 1998 17:10:39 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from rwockner@localhost)
by netcom5.netcom.com (8.8.5-r-beta/8.8.5/(NETCOM v1.02)) id OAA13154; Thu,
19 Feb 1998 14:03:24 -0800 (PST)

===== END ATTACHMENT I =====

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-FEB-1998 17:59:59.00

SUBJECT: NC6120: Ask, Tell, Pursue, 563 times

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marjorie Tarmey (CN=Marjorie Tarmey/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP on 02/19/98

05:59 PM -----

rwockner @ netcom.com
02/19/98 05:02:00 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Stuart D. Rosenstein, Richard Socarides
cc:
Subject: NC6120: Ask, Tell, Pursue, 563 times

* Reprint rights for this copyrighted news article must be obtained *
* ---> by you <--- from the originating news organization. *

SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE, February 19, 1998
901 Mission St., San Francisco, CA, 94103
(Fax 415-896-1107)(E-MAIL:
chronletters@sfgate.com)(http://www.sfgate.com)

WASHINGTON -- 'Don't Ask' Policy Reportedly Ignored
Gays in the military list 563 cases of rule being violated

Louis Freedberg, Chronicle Washington Bureau Thursday, February 19,
1998

Military commanders routinely violate the Pentagon's "don't ask, don't tell" policy, according to a report to be released today, by aggressively investigating the private lives of military personnel suspected of being gay and failing to protect them from harassment.

The report charges that violations of the policy have become increasingly frequent each year since it was introduced by President Clinton in the face of considerable controversy in 1993.

The Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, which provides legal assistance to gay servicemembers, said the number of violations of the policy reported to the organization rose from 443 in 1996 to 563 in 1997. The worst offender was the Navy, with the Air Force close behind, it said.

"The violations we are seeing are very basic; they should not be occurring five years into the policy," said Michele Benecke, co-director of the group. "Don't ask means don't ask. The rule could not be more clear, but time and time again, investigating officers ask."

Benecke said the main problem is that military commanders don't know the rules, and their superiors have not informed them of the "letter or intent" of the policy. "Commanders are in the field without a road map," she said.

She identified one favorable development over the past year: For the first time, not a single servicemember was convicted and sent to prison for consensual gay sex.

The 80-page report was to be released at a press conference in Washington today. A Pentagon spokesman said he had not seen the report yet and could not comment on it.

The report describes what it calls "heavy handed and increasingly intrusive investigative tactics against suspected gays, including coercion and fishing expeditions." In addition, it said there is "no recourse or redress for service members asked, pursued or harassed" and that those who violate the policy are not held accountable for their actions.

Under the policy, commanders are allowed to begin an investigation if they receive "credible information" of homosexual conduct. But the report says investigations are often initiated based on nothing more than "belief or suspicion," rather than on "articulable facts."

These violations occur despite a promise last February by Secretary of Defense William Cohen to stop any "continued pursuits and prosecutions" under the policy.

One of the most egregious violations occurs when servicemen report that they are the target of anti-gay harassment, the report concluded.

The report described what it called a "most harrowing set of cases" on the aircraft carrier Eisenhower over a two-month period last year. One sailor was knocked unconscious by an assailant who addressed him with a homophobic epithet in an off-base assault, just days after his car tires had been slashed on his base. Another found a note tacked to his bunk on the carrier which read, "Leave or Die" plus an anti-gay slur. Another had a similar threat written in ketchup on his bunk.

But "the ship's command did little to attempt to track down the perpetrators, and instead investigated the private lives of the threatened sailors and questioned their veracity." All of the sailors who complained of harassment were discharged.

This response was, the report alleges, in direct violation of a memo sent out by the Pentagon last year that stated that "servicemembers should be able to report crimes free from fear of harm, reprisal or inappropriate or inadequate governmental response."

The report does cite some instances in which the military actively enforced the policy. In one incident, five Marines detonated a stolen military tear-gas canister in Remington's, a gay bar in Washington, D.C. More than a dozen customers suffered severe burning of the eyes and throat.

All five Marines were court-martialed. Four were sentenced to confinement of one to four months. Three of the four will receive bad-conduct discharges on completion of their sentences. The remaining Marine is awaiting punishment.

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879)

id <01ITRS87LBPS006FC8@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Thu, 19 Feb 1998 17:04:41 -0500 (EST)

Received: from storm.eop.gov (storm.eop.gov)

by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879) id <01ITRS84EX9S00MBIG@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Thu,

19 Feb 1998 17:04:36 -0500 (EST)

Received: from netcom5.netcom.com ([192.100.81.113])

by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-7 #6879)

with ESMTP id <01ITRS7C1TBS002ZPV@STORM.EOP.GOV>; Thu,

19 Feb 1998 17:03:57 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from rwockner@localhost)

by netcom5.netcom.com (8.8.5-r-beta/8.8.5/(NETCOM v1.02)) id OAA13108; Thu,

19 Feb 1998 14:02:45 -0800 (PST)

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-FEB-1998 10:58:12.00

SUBJECT: Re: Talking Points: Don't Ask, Don't Tell Report

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

the clock is ticking tick, tick, tick....

I'm in meetings from 11-1, so page me

Laura S. Marcus

02/19/98 10:54:12 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP

cc:

Subject: Re: Talking Points: Don't Ask, Don't Tell Report

I had sent to Rudy and asked him to disseminate.

don't worry - we'll hear from them!

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Glen M. Weiner (CN=Glen M. Weiner/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-FEB-1998 18:36:02.00

SUBJECT: REGO Criticism

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Thomas D. Janenda (CN=Thomas D. Janenda/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

In case you hadn't seen this yet...

It's from the March 9, 1988 Insight Magazine which is on their web page:

<http://www.insightmag.com/articles/story1.html>

Rating the 'Reinvention'

By Sean Paige and Timothy W. Maier

from Five years ago Al Gore pledged to save Americans
the gaping jaws of big government, and his National
Performance Review was born. What happened?
to July 4, f the making of the U.S. government can be dated
according 1776, its remaking occurred on March 3, 1993,
that day, the to Clinton administration legend-spinners. On
of the president asked Vice President Al Gore -- a denizen
"reinvent" the capital from the time he could toddle -- to
the Founding bloated, bullying and blundering progeny of what
Fathers had conceived.
shoulder to this Nearly five years after he put his mighty
effort is living up labor of Sisyphus, it is far from certain that the
inconceivable to the promises made by the White House -- and
anything near the that the second date will be as revered with
respect afforded the first.
. . . . The Gore effort sprang quickly enough from

the starting
consultations
"stakeholders,"
reform
Commission and
and set about
National
Tape
"works better
Clinton. Start
been
Add a
savings during
budget-cutters
Sweeten the
federal-employee
process. And,
mantra of
incantation,"Total
and you
as the NPR.
judging from the
administration enjoyed in
any institution
trumpeted as

blocks, however. After six months of whirlwind
with management gurus, federal labor unions, favored
Democratic constituencies and other so-called
and borrowing ideas from such thwarted government
efforts of the past as Eisenhower's Hoover
Ronald Reagan's Grace Commission, the vice president
declared that he clearly saw what had to be done
doing it. His reinvention project was called the
Performance Review, or NPR. Its motto was "From Red
to Results," and it promised a government that
and costs less."
. . . . The recipe for reinvention was typical
hash of commonsense reforms of the kind that have
collecting mold in Washington's basement for years.
pinch of parsimony by promising \$108 billion in
a five-year period. Throw in some red meat for
by promising to downsize the federal workforce.
pot for doggedly supportive but skittish
unions by making them equal partners in the
finally, awe the natives with techno-talk and a
managerial mumbo jumbo. Repeat the
Quality Management (TQM), Management by Objectives
(MBO) and Business Process Reengineering (BPR),"

have a politically palatable goulash to be served
. . . . It was a dish the public was hungry for,
bump in approval ratings the fledgling
the afterglow -- even if critics were unkind. "In
other than the federal government, the changes
reinventions would not even be announced except

perhaps on the bulletin board in the hallways," management expert Peter Drucker wrote in the Atlantic, arguing that many NPR recommendations were the kinds of things that other organizations expected their workers to do as a matter of course "without getting much praise, let alone extra rewards." But NPR's September 1993 roll out was a political masterstroke for Clinton who, after a rocky start wading into hornets' nests -- such as gays in the military -- badly needed to reestablish his "New Democrat" bona fides. And it was a windfall for Gore, who was delighted to be given a substantive role in addition to saving the planet. . . . Few in Washington were impolite enough to question Gore's fitness for the job of reinventing the government given us by Alexander Hamilton, James Madison and others. Especially given his bottom-of-the-barrel legislative rating from Citizens Against Government Waste, or CAGW, the antiwaste watchdog group which evolved out of the Grace Commission. While in Congress, "Al Gore never led any battle that I can recall to eliminate a single wasteful program," says CAGW President Thomas A. Schatz. . . . But if perceived as successful, administration strategists realized, NPR might rehabilitate the battered image of big government -- something very much in the interest of an administration then proposing a massive expansion into health care. They also would snatch a winning issue away from Republicans, who held the patent rights on government-bashing after Ronald Reagan, but since had allowed them to expire through benign neglect. . . . The spectacle of Clinton and Gore taking on big, wasteful government was akin to seeing Richard Nixon, a

longtime
political
parties could get
aide who
parallel may
think it's true,
didn't hate
mistrust on
Congress, toward
to go very
came in
definitely
[Clinton/Gore]
calculus,
to the
government look
couldn't convince
That's
Clinton agenda
impressive-sounding list of
deserve
operations of
by Insight.
the slipperiness

anti-Communist, going to China -- both were
maneuvers that nobody else in their respective
away with, says Elaine Kamarck, the longtime Gore
ran NPR from 1993 to 1997 and is now at Harvard
University's Kennedy School of Government. The
be "hackneyed," she says, "but in this instance I
because I think that only a political party that
government could reform it.
. . . . "There was too much suspicion and too much
the part of the bureaucracy, and of course in
the Reagan/Bush efforts [at reform] to allow them
far," Kamarck tells Insight. "Whereas, when Clinton
and you had Democrats who were both respectful of
government, as Clinton and Gore certainly are, and
respectful of the people in government -- which the
Republicans weren't always -- I think it allowed
to accomplish a lot more of their program."
. . . . And NPR was part of a broader political
Kamarck remembers. "It was clearly very important
whole Democratic agenda that until we made
efficient and respectful of taxpayer dollars we
taxpayers to spend any more dollars on government.
why the politics of this were so important to the
and remain so today."
. . . . NPR's cheerleaders tick off an
accomplishments after five years and undoubtedly
credit for marginal changes in the size and
government, according to most experts interviewed
But a lack of reliable tools for gauging success,
of statistics and savings estimates being spun and

a wealth of
question
it was
[because] there is no
Kettl, a
written
has been a
against the
by
cutting
giving the
smallest
to have
often turn out
Tea-Tasters
taxpayers
pages of federal
number of pages
percent). And it
of innovation
its
employees
as proof
cornerstones of
question of who

contradictory evidence from other sources call into
reinvention's overall effectiveness, even assuming
oversold and overspun from the start.
. . . . "Assessing the NPR is difficult ...
such thing as the NPR," according to Donald F.
professor at the University of Wisconsin who has
frequently on the subject. "In practice, the NPR
messy and sometimes disorganized multifront war
government's performance problems."
. . . . NPR pledged to reduce the federal workforce
252,000 before the year 2000; it takes credit for
310,000 federal "full-time equivalents," or FTEs,
United States, the administration claims, the
government since the early 1960s. The NPR is said
eliminated hundreds of programs (although they
to have been no more significant than the National
Board) and claims its reforms so far have saved
\$137 billion (although the number never has been
independently verified).
. . . . Also, NPR says it has eliminated 16,000
regulation (never mind that under Clinton the
in the Federal Register has increased by 6
points to its 325 "reinvention labs," alleged oases
working within government, and 1,000 recipients of
Hammer Award, presented to teams of federal
applying reinvention principles in the workplace,
positive that government is performing better.
. . . . But look closely at downsizing, one of the
NPR, where neither the claims, benefits nor

deserves the credit are clear. The nonpostal federal workforce has undergone some contraction, for instance, but that tells very little about where alleged cuts may have occurred, ignores the thousands (maybe millions) of individuals now working for the government as contractors, says nothing about the overall efficiency of government and assumes that Americans were happy with the size of the government in the 1960s. . . . In fact, defense cuts resulting from post-Cold War base closures -- reductions well under way when President Bush left office -- account for nearly 70 percent of the 340,000 "on board" positions said to have been eliminated since 1993. Another 14,000 positions no longer were necessary when the Resolution Trust Corp. and other financial regulatory agencies finished the savings-and-loan cleanup. And more than 125,000 federal workers -- about 72 percent of whom were due to retire anyway, according to one estimate -- hung around just long enough to pocket a onetime \$25,000 buyout. Many of the rest were temporary employees, according to a General Accounting Office, or GAO, study -- with part-time temps being hit hardest by the cuts. And in any event, GAO found that the Clinton/Gore downsizing goals could have been met through attrition alone, thanks to an 8 percent average annual "quit rate." In the meantime, the number of political appointees has been increased by about 17 percent during reinvention. . . . All of this helps explain why salaries and benefits for a federal workforce that reportedly is 15 percent smaller on paper are costing taxpayers 8.2 percent more out of pocket -- growing from \$93.7 billion in 1992 to \$101.4

billion four years
later, according to a study by Scripps Howard News
Service.
Federal pay-grade inflation seems largely to blame
for the
oddity, according to the study, with middle- and
lower-grade
employees getting hit hardest by reductions, while
survivors in
the upper echelons have enjoyed a marked increase in
promotions and merit pay. Analysis showed the pay
of the
highest-ranking workers is rising considerably
faster (averaging
15.1 percent annually, from \$77,005 before Clinton
took office
to \$88,667 in 1996) than for the lowest ranking
(which rose at
12.5 percent annually).
... This and other evidence suggests that NPR's
bite out of
the bureaucratic food chain has been uneven at
best. "What's
happening is that we have a government where there
are
proportionately more chiefs and fewer Indians,"
says Kettl.
And a 1996 GAO report found that NPR was doing very
little
to change that. From 1992 to 1996, the nondefense
workforce
went from one supervisor for every seven employees
to one
supervisor for every 7.6 employees, the GAO found.
"Gore
wanted a 1 to 15 ratio to reduce the number of
layers from top
to bottom," recounts Paul Light, who has written
several books
on government reform. "That's a tangible measure
[of the
streamlining of government], and I don't think that
ratio has
changed much."
... Most agencies achieved reductions the
old-fashioned way
-- by showing white, male middle managers the door.
Others
did it through so-called "conversions," changing
the titles of
"supervisors" to "team leaders" or some other label
not on the
hit list. And NPR downsizing has cracked heads with
another

administration promise -- to hire 10,000 Americans
off the welfare rolls.
... Nor do the NPR downsizing figures account
for the largely uncounted, but undoubtedly vast, number of
people who work for the government as contractors. "The
idea that somehow the number of federal civilian employees is
any kind of indicator in any way of [the government's] size
is just nonsense," Kettl tells Insight. He explains that is
because "a lot of federal employees spend a lot of their time
leveraging activities in the outside world, whether it's
hiring contractors or sending out entitlement payments." In agencies such
as the Department of Energy or the Environmental
Protection Agency,
which rely heavily on outside contractors to do
their work, the number of people on the payroll is proportionately
small relative to the vast amount of money they spend,
Kettl points out. And as in the case of the Social Security
Administration, "it doesn't take very many people to run the programs
that spew out millions' worth of checks."
... University of Kansas public-administration
professor H. George Frederickson says "humbug" to the notion that
the NPR government is smaller. "It's deceptive," he says of
people claims. "If you add civil-servant jobs and all the
have a contracted out by government, it's no contest -- we
bigger government!"
... But downsizing isn't the only dubious NPR
"success story."
... NPR's claimed savings of \$137 billion never
have been independently verified and don't stand up even to
casual scrutiny. Although former NPR chief Kamarck
believes the savings estimates are "very real" -- that "if

anything, they are underestimated," she tells Insight -- others have their doubts. "We had GAO look at those estimates and they couldn't provide us with any reliable assessment of it," says Edward J. "Ned" Lynch, a senior researcher at the House Government Reform and Oversight subcommittee on Civil Service. "They're just repeating what they were told by the agencies and totaling it up," says a former Capitol Hill staffer who followed NPR closely. "It was never audited or anything." . . . And reading the fine print reveals, for instance, that just \$82.2 billion of the claimed savings had been "realized" as of Sept. 1, 1997, and that some unspecified portion of that total was due to "enactments by Congress." Much of the rest of the sum consists of projected savings or savings tied to "legislation pending before Congress." . . . Although unheralded in NPR press releases, Republicans in Congress deserve much of the credit for the successes Gore and the NPR claim for themselves. . . . Whatever downsizing has occurred might not have been possible were it not for the GOP-backed Federal Workforce Reduction Act of 1994, which ordered a 192,000-employee reduction by 1997. Procurement reform received a significant boost both from the Republican-backed Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 and the GOP's Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1996. And it was Republicans who spearheaded passage of 1990's Chief Financial Officers Act, which ordered federal agencies to begin keeping auditable financial statements; only now, eight years later, is it beginning to take hold. . . . Some of the most dramatic changes in government today

Results may be due to 1993's Government Performance and
by Act, or GPRA, according to many experts interviewed
agencies Insight, which for the first time holds federal
results. "My accountable for establishing and achieving tangible
says a Hill impression is that GPRA has taken over from NPR,"
initiative that staffer, who remembers it as a Republican
predated NPR.
an onlooker As often is the case in Washington, where
failures often stands on the question of NPR's successes and
spectrum. The depends on where one sits on the political
press dichotomy was evident last fall when, in dueling
released his conferences on the same day, the vice president
reinvention of fourth annual report extolling the virtues of his
of government, while House Majority Leader Dick Armey
complying Texas was giving the government failing grades in
trillion federal with the Results Act. Armey pointed to a \$1.6
Clinton's budget (up 20 percent since the beginning of
annually to presidency) and an estimated \$350 billion lost
changed. waste, fraud and abuse as evidence that little had
successful "One guy says this is the longest and most
agencies are reform effort in history, and the other says that
watcher Light failing in their efforts to improve results," NPR
remembers. "Now, which one do you believe?"
both. I think He continues: "My answer is that I believe
there's a lot of they're failing overall in performance, but I think
made a progress and a lot of creativity occurring."
living up to its If the jury is still out on whether NPR has
second promise of costing Americans less. Overall

federal

spending is at its highest level ever, both in
terms of real dollars

spent and as a percentage of gross domestic
product. That's

because NPR has "always been a project about how
government works, not what it does," says Light,

who adds:

"and some would argue that that's its fatal flaw."

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Kyle M. Baker (BAKER_K) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-FEB-1998 11:55:10.87

SUBJECT: ADVOCACY GROUP REPORTS MORE HARASSMENT FOR GAYS IN MILITARY

TO: Richard Socarides (Richard Socarides@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:

Date: 02/19/98 Time: 11:41

UAdvocacy group reports more harassment for gays in military

WASHINGTON (AP) Harassment of gays in the military has risen for the fourth straight year despite the Clinton administration's pledge to combat discrimination against homosexuals in the armed services, says a gay rights advocacy group.

"Commanders have ignored the limits to gay investigations and have ignored the intent to stop prying into people's private lives," C. Dixon Osborn, a director of the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, said today.

The Washington-based group said there is "a climate in many commands where 'anything goes' in the pursuit of suspected gay personnel."

In its annual report, the group cited 563 "command violations" that servicemembers had reported to it, including instances where commands asked, pursued and harassed service members in direct violation of President Clinton's "don't ask, don't tell" policy, which sets limits on gay investigations.

In contrast, the number of violations reported in 1996 by members of all the services was 443, the group said.

Last year's report said a total of 850 people had been discharged from the military for homosexuality in 1996, a five-year high. No figures were given discharges of gays in 1997.

"The difference is that last year we received the number of discharges from the Pentagon, but, despite repeated efforts, we have not been able to get them this year," said Kevin Winston, a spokesman for the group. "We'd love to have the numbers, but we can't get them."

A Pentagon spokesman, Capt. Jim Knotts, declined to comment on the report, saying the Defense Department had not had a chance to review it or analyze its contents.

"The reason underlying continued violations of (the administration's policy) is a lack of commitment from top military and civilian authorities," the document said.

It said the Navy was the worst service in anti-gay harassment and asking, with 193 violations.

The group's recommendations included placing strict limits on gay investigations, disciplining commanders who disobey them, and providing recourse to personnel involved in improper investigations.

"It is time for military leaders to obey the law," the report

concluded.

APNP-02-19-98 1152EST

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Darby E. Stott (CN=Darby E. Stott/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-FEB-1998 10:22:35.00

SUBJECT: Talking Points: Don't Ask, Don't Tell Report

TO: Jeremy M. Gaines (CN=Jeremy M. Gaines/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Darby E. Stott/WHO/EOP on 02/19/98
10:18 AM -----

Richard Socarides 02/19/98 10:16:14 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Amy W. Tobe/WHO/EOP, Darby E. Stott/WHO/EOP

cc: Laura S. Marcus/WHO/EOP

Subject: Talking Points: Don't Ask, Don't Tell Report

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D16]MAIL42367694K.026 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

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

ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL

- **Background:**
 - A report due out Thursday at 9am by the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, which monitors compliance with the gays in the military policy, show a 27% increase in 1997 of alleged violation in enforcement of don't ask, don't tell.
 - If true, this would be the third straight year in which this report has shown a significant increase.
 - DOD has not released the figures, but apparently concedes that 1997 also saw an overall increase in discharges of gays and lesbians.
 - This report comes soon after DOD's loss in the Federal Court litigation brought by Tim McVeigh, who the Navy had attempted to discharge based on an announoumous AOL computer profile.
- **Talking Points:**
 - The President and Secretary Cohen are concerned by recent press reports that raise questions about the fair and even-handed implementation of the "don't ask, don't tell policy."
 - Secretary Cohen has previously announced the creation at DOD of a review panel which is examining the implementation of this policy, and which we expect will shortly issue its report. This report, as we understand it, will be accompanied by new guidelines to all personnel detailing the specific procedures authorized in these cases.
 - It is our hope that these new guidelines will better ensure that the legitimate privacy rights of service members will be respected and maintained, while also enforcing both the letter and spirit of the policy.
 - In developing these guidelines, DOD has been and will continue to consult with both military personnel presently responsible for enforcing the policy and with the outside groups that monitor compliance.

Socarides 6-1611
2-18-98

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Laura S. Marcus (CN=Laura S. Marcus/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-FEB-1998 10:54:22.00

SUBJECT: Re: Talking Points: Don't Ask, Don't Tell Report

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I had sent to Rudy and asked him to disseminate.

don't worry - we'll hear from them!

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-FEB-1998 17:58:57.00

SUBJECT: NC6121: Gay harassment up in military

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP on 02/19/98
05:58 PM -----

rwockner @ netcom.com

02/19/98 05:03:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Stuart D. Rosenstein, Richard Socarides

cc:

Subject: NC6121: Gay harassment up in military

* Reprint rights for this copyrighted news article must be obtained *

* ---> by you <--- from the originating news organization. *

Group Cites More Gay Harassment

.c The Associated Press

By SLOBODAN LEKIC

WASHINGTON (AP) - The number of gays facing harassment in the military has risen for the fourth consecutive year, despite the Clinton administration's pledge to prevent further discrimination of homosexuals in the armed services, according to a gay rights advocacy group.

The Servicemembers Legal Defense Network attributed the increase to ``a climate in many commands where 'anything goes' in the pursuit of suspected gay personnel."

In its annual report, the group cited 563 ``command violations" that servicemembers had reported to it, including instances where commands asked, pursued and harassed service members in direct violation of President Clinton's ``don't ask, don't tell" policy, which sets limits on gay investigations.

In contrast, the number of violations reported in 1996 by members of all the services was 443, the group said.

Last year's report said a total of 850 people had been discharged from the military for homosexuality in 1996, a five-year high. No figures were given discharges of gays in 1997.

``The difference is that last year we received the number of discharges from the Pentagon, but, despite repeated efforts, we have not been able to get them this year," said Kevin Winston, a spokesman for the group. ``We'd love to have the numbers, but we can't get them."

A Pentagon spokesman, Capt. Jim Knotts, declined to comment on the report, saying the Defense Department had not had a chance to review it or analyze its contents.

``The reason underlying continued violations of (the administration's policy) is a lack of commitment from top military and civilian authorities," the document said.

It said the Navy was the worst service in anti-gay harassment and asking, with 193 violations.

The group's recommendations included placing strict limits on gay investigations, disciplining commanders who disobey them, and providing recourse to personnel involved in improper investigations.

``It is time for military leaders to obey the law," the report concluded.

AP-NY-02-19-98 0900EST

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879)

id <011TRSG2S1QO00JS4V@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Thu, 19 Feb 1998 17:11:00 -0500 (EST)

Received: from storm.eop.gov (storm.eop.gov)

by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879) id <011TRSFVBBQO00ORAL@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Thu,

19 Feb 1998 17:10:57 -0500 (EST)

Received: from netcom5.netcom.com ([192.100.81.113])

by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-7 #6879)

with ESMTP id <011TRSFY1F6002Z3D@STORM.EOP.GOV>; Thu,

19 Feb 1998 17:10:39 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from rwockner@localhost)

by netcom5.netcom.com (8.8.5-r-beta/8.8.5/(NETCOM v1.02)) id OAA13154; Thu,

19 Feb 1998 14:03:24 -0800 (PST)

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-FEB-1998 10:16:25.00

SUBJECT: Talking Points: Don't Ask, Don't Tell Report

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D54]MAIL486176941.026 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

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

ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL

- **Background:**
 - A report due out Thursday at 9am by the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, which monitors compliance with the gays in the military policy, show a 27% increase in 1997 of alleged violation in enforcement of don't ask, don't tell.
 - If true, this would be the third straight year in which this report has shown a significant increase.
 - DOD has not released the figures, but apparently concedes that 1997 also saw an overall increase in discharges of gays and lesbians.
 - This report comes soon after DOD's loss in the Federal Court litigation brought by Tim McVeigh, who the Navy had attempted to discharge based on an announoumous AOL computer profile.
- **Talking Points:**
 - The President and Secretary Cohen are concerned by recent press reports that raise questions about the fair and even-handed implementation of the "don't ask, don't tell policy."
 - Secretary Cohen has previously announced the creation at DOD of a review panel which is examining the implementation of this policy, and which we expect will shortly issue its report. This report, as we understand it, will be accompanied by new guidelines to all personnel detailing the specific procedures authorized in these cases.
 - It is our hope that these new guidelines will better ensure that the legitimate privacy rights of service members will be respected and maintained, while also enforcing both the letter and spirit of the policy.
 - In developing these guidelines, DOD has been and will continue to consult with both military personnel presently responsible for enforcing the policy and with the outside groups that monitor compliance.

Socarides 6-1611
2-18-98

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:20-FEB-1998 11:03:19.00

SUBJECT: NC6122: SLDN action alert

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP on 02/19/98
05:57 PM -----

rwockner @ netcom.com

02/19/98 05:36:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Stuart D. Rosenstein, Richard Socarides

cc:

Subject: NC6122: SLDN action alert

From:SLDNI@aol.com

To: rwockner@netcom.com

Subject: Take Action: military harassment and pursuit surge

SLDN is proud to announce the release of our Fourth Annual Report on the implementation of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue" at a press conference at the National Press Club in Washington, DC this morning. For the fourth consecutive year, we have documented continued asking, harassment and witch hunts against military personnel suspected of being gay in violation of the Defense Department's own regulations. Among this year's top findings:

** The service branches have failed to train commanders and investigators in the limits placed on gay investigations.

** Inquiry officers and investigators use heavy-handed tactics (including threats of criminal charges, confinement, non-judicial punishment, and "outing" to family members, friends and colleagues) in pursuit of gay, lesbian and bisexual servicemembers.

** "Don't Ask" violations are up by 39% over last year, indicating a sharp increase in violations of the most simple of the policy's limits: Don't Ask.

** "Don't Pursue" violations are up 23%.

** "Don't Harass" violations are up 38%.

** Total DoD violations climb 29%.

** The Navy was the worst offender in violating DA, DT, DP last year.

For a full copy of this year's report, please visit
<http://www.sldn.org/reports/fourth.htm>.

>>>TAKE ACTION: YOUR VOICE IS IMPORTANT<<<

1. Let decision makers know that the Armed Forces must live up to their promises and regulations' requirements that asking, harassing and pursuing of suspected gay troops would stop. [see below for specific actions to take]
2. Write letters to the editors of your local newspapers alerting them to our report and to the Defense Department's failure to live up to it's end of

"Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue." Express your opinion that the Armed Forces must stop asking, harassing and pursuing suspected gay troops.

3. Contact your local public and school/university libraries; ask them to obtain a copy of our report and its supporting documents. Requests can be made to SLDN at (202) 328-3244 or jadams@sldn.org.

CONTACT DECISION MAKERS

Let decision makers know that you expect military commanders and investigators to respect the limits on gay investigations required by "Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue." The Armed Forces must live up to President Clinton's promise that there will be a "decent regard for the privacy and associational rights" of all military members regardless of their sexual orientation.

The list below of officials to contact is longer than most SLDN action alerts.

Realizing that your time is valuable, we urge to contact as many of the leaders below as you are able regarding this important issue. The first four

are essential decision makers who ****must**** get the message that the military

must observe the limits imposed on gay investigations by DA, DT, DP. The others on the list are important leaders whose guidance and oversight bears directly on how this policy is enforced. Unfortunately, not everyone has publicly available email addresses and some of the email addresses are for the public affairs offices in the various agencies.

President William Jefferson Clinton: email: president@whitehouse.gov; voice: (202) 456-1111; snail: White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20500.

Vice-President Albert Gore: vicepresident@whitehouse.gov, White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20500.

Secretary of Defense William Cohen: comment via DoD web page: <http://www.defenselink.mil/faq/comment.html>; voice: (703) 695-5261; fax: (703) 695-1219; snail: 1000 Defense Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20301-1000.

General Henry H. Shelton, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Email: PublicAffairs@js.pentagon.mil; voice: (703) 697-9121; mail: 9999 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC 20318-9999.

Your Representatives in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives.
Visit

the Human Rights Campaign's Congressional page at <http://www.hrc.org/actncntr/index.html> to learn who represents you in Congress and for a direct email link to their offices where possible.

The Honorable F. Whiten Peters, Acting Secretary of the Air Force. Air Force

comment link:

<http://www.af.mil/comment.html>; fax: (703) 693-7553; voice: (703) 697-7376;

mail: 1740 AF Pentagon, Room 4E871, Washington, DC 20330-1740.

General Michael E. Ryan, Chief of Staff of the Air Force. voice: (703) 697-1887; mail: 1670 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC 20330-1670.

CMSAF Eric W. Benken, Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force. voice (703) 695-0498; mail: 1670 Air Force Pentagon, Washington, DC 20330-1670.

The Honorable Togo West, Secretary of the Army. voice (703) 695-3211; mail:

101 Army Pentagon, Washington, DC 20310-0101.

General Dennis J. Reimer, Chief of Staff of the Army. Email: csaweb@hqda.army.mil; voice: (703) 695-2077; mail: 200 Army Pentagon, Washington, DC 20310-0200.

SMA Robert E. Hall, Sergeant Major of the Army. Email: smaweb@pentagon-hqda5.army.mil; voice: (703) 695-2150; mail: 200 Army Pentagon, Washington, DC 20310-0200.

The Honorable John Dalton, Secretary of the Navy. fax: (703) 617-3477; voice: (703) 695-3131; mail: 1000 Navy Pentagon, Washington, DC 20350-1000.

Admiral Jay Johnson, Chief of Naval Operations. voice: (703) 695-5664; mail: 2000 Navy Pentagon, Washington, DC 20350-2000.

General C. C. Krulak, Commandant of the Marine Corps. Email: mailm@mpg-smtp3.usmc.mil; voice: (703) 614-2500; mail: Washington, DC 20380-0001.

MCPON John Hagan, Master Chief Petty Officer of Navy. Email: mcpon@bupers.navy.mil; voice: (703) 614-4854.

SGTMAJ L. G. Lee, Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps. voice: (703) 614-2475; mail: Washington, DC 20380-0001.

The Honorable Rodney Slater, Secretary of Transportation. Email: webmaster@ost.dot.gov; voice: (202) 366-1111; mail: 400 7th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590.

Admiral Robert E. Kramek, Commandant of the Coast Guard. voice: (202)

267-2390; mail: 2100 2nd Street, SW, Washington, DC 20593-0001.

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879)

id <011TRTL3CLXC017RXY@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Thu, 19 Feb 1998 17:44:03 -0500 (EST)

Received: from storm.eop.gov (storm.eop.gov)

by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879) id <011TRTL260DC00C125@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Thu,

19 Feb 1998 17:44:01 -0500 (EST)

Received: from netcom5.netcom.com ([192.100.81.113])

by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-7 #6879)

with ESMTP id <011TRTJWMWU002XT6@STORM.EOP.GOV>; Thu,

19 Feb 1998 17:43:29 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from rwockner@localhost)

by netcom5.netcom.com (8.8.5-r-beta/8.8.5/(NETCOM v1.02)) id OAA17574; Thu,

19 Feb 1998 14:36:22 -0800 (PST)

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Robert N. Weiner (CN=Robert N. Weiner/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:20-FEB-1998 10:01:43.00

SUBJECT: McVeigh

TO: Dawn M. Chirwa (CN=Dawn M. Chirwa/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I left you a message before because I have a 10:30 meeting that touches on the McVeigh don't ask don't tell case, which I wanted to apprise you of based on an indication that you may have had some prior involvement with the broad issue. Call me if you want to discuss.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Robert N. Weiner (CN=Robert N. Weiner/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-MAR-1998 18:01:16.00

SUBJECT: Additional items

TO: Cheryl D. Mills (CN=Cheryl D. Mills/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I forgot: Presidential Records Act, 2 GAO inquiries, welfare reform questions from DPC, a don't ask/don't tell issue, labor questions, antilobbying act, climate control, and helping out on D.C. judges. I can enumerate the Congressional/privilege matters if you want. Thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Miguel M. Bustos (CN=Miguel M. Bustos/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-MAR-1998 17:23:08.00

SUBJECT: Re: poster

TO: C. Wayne Skinner (CN=C. Wayne Skinner/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Trooper wants to know how are you going to deal with the "Don't Ask Don't
Tell " policy

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-MAR-1998 08:42:32.00

SUBJECT: Lesbian Councilwoman Seeks Move From Local Politics to National

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Minyon Moore (CN=Minyon Moore/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Craig T. Smith (CN=Craig T. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP on 03/14/98
08:42 AM -----

Doug.Case @ sdsu.edu

03/14/98 02:57:00 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Stuart D. Rosenstein, Richard Socarides

cc:

Subject: Lesbian Councilwoman Seeks Move From Local Politics to National

FRONTIERS NEWSMAGAZINE

March 6, 1998

Volume 16, Issue 23

<http://www.frontiersweb.com/>

Up From the Trenches

Lesbian Councilwoman Seeks Move From Local Politics to National Office

by Chris Witt

Christine Kehoe, San Diego's first lesbian city councilmember, has set her sights on becoming California's first openly lesbian congressional representative.

The 48-year-old Kehoe has already made a good start, establishing herself as the sole Democratic candidate for the 49th Congressional District, a seat currently held by Republican Brian Bilbray.

Kehoe is such a highly visible figure both in local politics and in the gay-and-lesbian community that it is hard to imagine her not being a San Diego native. She hails, however, from Troy. Born in 1950, she has two sisters and two brothers. She attended the State University of New York in Albany where she majored in English Literature.

At the university she was greatly influenced by courses she took in women's studies and became a feminist. She also met and married a man.

In 1978 she moved to San Diego, which she describes as "the happiest move of my life." She was in the process of separating from her husband, and she wanted a change. In 1979, when she was twenty-nine, she came out. There was no precipitating issue or crisis, just what she describes as the culmination of a growing self-awareness.

An older brother had already come out and was living in Manhattan, so her announcement didn't greatly upset her family. Although her brothers and sisters have always been accepting of her as a lesbian, her parents, who are now deceased, avoided talking about it with her.

"Once I identified as a lesbian," she said, "gay and lesbian politics became of great interest to me. There are so many ways to get involved, from gay pride to the gay newspaper, and so many issues, from gays in the military to AIDS." In 1984 she became the editor of the San Diego Gayzette and later served as director of the AIDS Assistance Fund, which would eventually evolve into the San Diego AIDS Foundation. She was the co-chair of San Diego Lesbian and Gay Pride from 1989 to 1992 and was named its "Woman of the Year" in 1995. She joined the San Diego Democratic Club, a primarily gay and lesbian political activist organization, and, in 1986, won its Steinem Award.

At the time, Kehoe wasn't thinking about political office. "Politics didn't interest me, per se," she said. "I was more concerned about community issues." But her involvement in gay and lesbian issues pushed her more and more deeply into the local political scene.

In 1986, she headed up the local opposition to Proposition 64, the Lyndon LaRouche initiative that proposed physically identifying people with AIDS. "As the San Diego County coordinator," she said. "I organized a full-fledged campaign with phone banks, volunteers and speakers." After a successful campaign against Proposition 64, she worked on Neil Good's campaign for city council. "It was an evolution for me," she said. "I went from gay community politics to electoral issues to candidate politics." In 1993, Kehoe was elected to the City Council with 55 percent of the vote, beating out Evonne Schulze, to represent the 3rd District, which includes Hillcrest, the predominantly gay section of town. In 1996, she easily won re-election against recycling broker Jerry Balistreri with 80 percent of the vote.

She said that neither Schulze nor Balistreri made an issue of her sexual orientation during their campaigns, and she doesn't expect Bilbray to make an issue of it either. "Of course, you never can tell," she said, "so you have to be prepared." Kehoe has already lined up support from several national gay organizations and is viewed as having a legitimate shot at beating Bilbray in a district that is 40 percent registered Republican, 40 percent Democratic and 20 percent undeclared. (Kehoe's current city council district makes up 16 percent of the congressional district.) "The district's history and recent polling clearly show that Bilbray is vulnerable," says Brian Bond, executive director of the Gay and Lesbian Victory Fund, which endorsed Kehoe in November. "Christine Kehoe has the qualifications, courage and character to win this race. We're extremely proud to support a candidate of Christine Kehoe's caliber." "Christine Kehoe is a fantastic public servant, and she will make a fantastic member of the U.S. House of Representatives," says HRC Political Director Winnie Stachelberg. "Her record and commitment on a broad range of issues are superb." In 1996, in a controversial move that upset many

leaders in the local gay and lesbian community, HRC endorsed Bilbray in his race against Peter Navarro, a Democrat. No such controversy will occur in the current race. HRC endorsed Kehoe in December.

EMILY's List, which identifies and supports viable pro-choice Democratic women candidates for key federal and statewide offices, also endorsed Kehoe on January 29, 1998. "Christine Kehoe has built a strong campaign with a solid base of support," said EMILY's List President Ellen Malcolm. "She is one of San Diego's most popular public officials with an excellent record on fighting crime, environmental protection and small business expansion." Kehoe is tall, with short graying hair, a self-confident demeanor, and a ready smile. Like a consummate politician she enjoys working a crowd, greeting many people by name. She is friendly and easy to talk to, but she also gives the impression of being someone not easily bullied or pushed around.

She discusses political issues in depth and enthusiastically, without a hint of cynicism. "I love talking about issues, although sometimes I have to hold myself back," she says, laughing at herself. "When I discuss making our harbor competitive with the ports in L.A. and Long Beach, for example, it's all I can do to keep from explaining just how deep it should be dredged and what should be done with the sand." Although she has a long-established history of supporting gay and lesbian issues, she has managed to avoid being labeled a one-issue politician. "I want full civil rights for gays and lesbians, nothing less," Kehoe said. "That includes the right to marry, the right to serve in the military, the right to be protected from discrimination on the job or in housing-the same rights any American enjoys. At the same time, I'm concerned about a whole range of issues that are important to all the people of my district, of this city." Even the San Diego Union-Tribune acknowledged her record of representing the concerns of all of her constituents. It wrote: "She has muted some critics who expected a gay-rights zealot by focusing on an anti-crime, pro-business agenda." Kehoe has a reputation for speaking out forthrightly about the issues she supports. "Christine doesn't mince words or shy away from tackling hard issues head on," says Valerie Stallings, a fellow city councilmember. At the same time she is able to build a coalition. In 1997, she was appointed to the 12-person California Coastal Commission in part because of her broad range of support. "One of the reasons I got the appointment is that I was able to successfully demonstrate that I have a very moderate approach," Kehoe says. "I work well with business, agriculture, and environmental groups." In fact, she had the support of both the Sierra Club and the San Diego Chamber of Commerce, two groups that often oppose each other.

Kehoe and her partner, Julie Warren, have been together for fourteen years. "We knew each other for about a year before we began dating," she says, "so we mark our anniversary-March 17-from the time we fell in love." Warren teaches graphic design. She also helps with Kehoe's campaigns, belongs to the San Diego Democratic Club, and serves on the board of the San Diego Gay and Lesbian Historical Society. The couple lives in a house in the North Park section of town where Kehoe enjoys gardening in her rare time off.

Kehoe's entry into the 49th District race comes in a year with an unprecedented number of lesbian candidates for Congress. In addition to Kehoe, lesbian candidates include retired Army Col. Margarethe Cammermeyer, who is running in Langley, Washington, and Tammy Baldwin, the first openly gay or lesbian elected state representative from Madison, Wis.

Baldwin was scheduled to join Kehoe at a March 5 fund-raiser in Los Angeles. Kehoe has already raised more than \$150,000 and hopes to bring in \$1.2 million, the same amount Bilbray raised during the last election. Contributions can be sent to Christine Kehoe for Congress, 1010 University Ave., Box 1998, San Diego, CA 92103.

This message has been forwarded as a free informational service. Please do not publish, or post in a public place on the Internet, copyrighted material without permission and attribution. (Note: Press releases are fine to reprint. Don't reprint wire stories, such as Associated Press stories, in their entirety unless you subscribe to that wire service.) Forwarding of this material should not necessarily be construed as an endorsement of the content. In fact, sometimes messages from anti-gay organizations are forwarded as "opposition research."

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #22921)

id <01IUN3C91HWG000IMT@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Sat, 14 Mar 1998 02:57:48 EST

Received: from Storm.EOP.GOV by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #22921)

with ESMTP id <01IUN3C7XKSG000IQX@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Sat,

14 Mar 1998 02:57:47 -0500 (EST)

Received: from mail.sdsu.edu ([130.191.25.1])

by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-7 #6879)

with ESMTP id <01IUN3BI97LO000M23@STORM.EOP.GOV>; Sat,

14 Mar 1998 02:57:15 -0500 (EST)

Received: from [130.191.242.121] ([130.191.242.121])

by mail.sdsu.edu (8.8.7/8.8.7) with ESMTP id XAA19322; Fri,

13 Mar 1998 23:56:07 -0800 (PST)

X-Sender: dcase@mail.sdsu.edu

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Dag Vega (CN=Dag Vega/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-MAR-1998 20:49:01.00

SUBJECT: NBC: Meet the Press, 3/15/98

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:
Meet the Press
Aired on Sunday, March 15, 1998

Interviews with:
DONOVAN CAMPBELL, Lead Attorney for Paula Jones
and DAN QUAYLE, Former Vice President

ROUNDTABLE GUESTS:
David Brock - Contributor, Esquire Magazine
Howard Kurtz - Author, &Spin Cycle8
and Evan Thomas - Newsweek

MR. RUSSERT: Welcome again to MEET THE PRESS. Our
issue this

Sunday morning: Paula Jones says she is not the only one,
that Bill Clinton has
a pattern of harassing other women. And the president,s
team fights back.

(Videotape):

MR. ROBERT BENNETT (President Clinton,s Lawyer):
Absolutely.
This is a filing to smear the president.

(End videotape)

MR. RUSSERT: What happens now? We,ll ask the lead
attorney for
Paula Jones, Donovan Campbell. And some presidential
hopefuls openly joke
about the president.

(Videotape):

MR. QUAYLE: Here,s the centerpiece of our
anti-crime plan: Three
interns and you,re out!

(End videotape)

MR. RUSSERT: How will these criticisms play with the
public? And what
would the GOP do about taxes, Social Security, immigration
and more? Our
guest, former vice president, and he hopes future
president, Dan Quayle.

And in our roundtable, the man whose story led to
the Paula Jones suit,
which led to the Monica Lewinsky affidavit, and who now
apologizes to
President Clinton. With us, David Brock, joined by Howard
Kurtz, author of
&Spin Cycle: Inside the Clinton Propaganda Machine8; and
Evan Thomas of
Newsweek, whose magazine has been the most aggressive in
pursuing the
Clinton-Lewinsky matter.

But first, the lead attorney for Paula Jones in her
sexual harassment suit
against President Clinton, with us, Donovan Campbell. Mr.
Campbell,
welcome.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you. Thank you for having me.

MR. RUSSERT: The president's lawyer had one response to your filing on Friday, & Paula Jones has not suffered any damages.⁸ What are Paula Jones, damages?

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, to analyze the damages, you have to analyze the different legal causes of action that have been brought. The primary thrust of our legal answer in our summary judgment responsive materials is that under the civil rights statute, section 1983, she has been discriminated against on the basis of her sex. To prevail on that basis, damagewise, all you have to show is some, even one dollar's worth of damage, whether it's emotional stress, trauma or whatever. And, certainly, our filing proves that she has suffered that. One of the premiere experts in the country has given an affidavit that she has suffered severe emotional trauma from that. So it's false to say that our case is a Title VII case and, therefore, you must show tangible job detriments because it's not; it's a section 1983 case.

MR. RUSSERT: Let me go through each of those. One would be her employment in Arkansas.

Newsday, the Long Island newspaper, did a review of her work record.

And let me show you what they found, put it on the screen and give you a chance to respond to it. It says, & In contrast to her claims of on-the-job discrimination and hostile and rude treatment after rejecting an alleged sexual advance from then-Governor Clinton, Paula Jones, state personnel records show a steady stream of positive evaluations from supervisors, no complaints from her during the year immediately afterward. Jones, personnel files indicate that she received raises of more than 20 percent in the 14 months after she says she rebuffed Clinton's come-on.⁸

MR. CAMPBELL: The response is, number one, you don't need to prove tangible job detriments. I've explained that. But if you want some

tangible job detriments, she certainly did suffer some under the law. One of the premier ones is the inability to pursue the grievance procedure that was set forth for the AIDC and all state employees. Our pleadings claim that defendant Clinton expressly threatened her and cautioned her to say nothing and, therefore, not follow those grievance procedures.

Now, the grievance procedures are a benefit of employment, and so she was basically stripped of that benefit of employment. In addition, our pleadings show that she was moved to basically a hallway desk.

All of her job duties were taken away from her. She was kept under constant surveillance and scrutiny.

So she attempted to rise in the levels and seek additional higher positions; she was actively discouraged from that from her immediate supervisor. And the case law is clear that in those situations, even much lesser job detriments satisfy the legal damage requirement.

MR. RUSSERT: Is there any evidence that the governor, Governor Clinton, called anyone in her office and tried to affect or influence their treatment of her?

MR. CAMPBELL: There is significant inferential evidence and at the summary judgment stage, which is where we are right now, all inferences are to be interpreted in favor of the non-movement, the plaintiff here. And so the fact that none of these job detriments and hostile environment activities took place before the incident in the Excelsior Hotel; they all took place after the fact that defendant Clinton expressly warned her in the hotel room, based on our pleadings, & I know your boss Dave Harrington very well, and I will speak to him right after you leave this room, & the inference is clear that she suffered the job detriments as a result of that incident.

MR. RUSSERT: Now, the president's lawyers say that Ms. Jones never

sought professional help, never took any medication, never complained about any kind of psychological trauma after this event and suddenly, this year, in February, seven years after the incident, you have an interview between Paula Jones and a psychologist who says now she has trauma. One, why did she wait seven years to make that allegation? And, two, by allowing a psychologist to talk about her sexual-related trauma, have you now opened up this case to talk about the Penthouse pictures that they have of Paula Jones or other sexual activity of Miss Jones?

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, number one, she didn't wait seven years to make this charge. She made that charge in her original complaint, which was three years later. Number two, why did she wait three years?

Well, if the boss of your network came to you and said, &Tim, keep your mouth shut. If you don't keep your mouth shut, you're out on the street, no matter what kind of horrific encounter you may have had with your boss, if he tells you to keep your mouth shut and he has an armed policeman outside the room when he's telling you to keep your mouth shut and you're a low-level, minimum-salary paid employee, you're generally going to follow what your boss says and you're going to keep your mouth shut as long as you can. This is not unusual at all in sexual harassment cases for the victim to feel ashamed, embarrassed and to remain silent for as long as possible, and when it's not possible to remain silent any longer, then sometimes they come public.

MR. RUSSERT: But she went to see a psychologist after the depositions have closed. You did not allow her psychologist to be cross-examined in depositions or discovery by President Clinton's lawyers.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's not true. We didn't disallow that at all. That possibility still exists. The fact is the schedules didn't work out where she could be interviewed by this expert until after the close

of discovery.

MR. RUSSERT: Have you now opened up her sex life and other activities to Mr.

Clinton,s lawyers?

MR. CAMPBELL: Of course we say absolutely not. And new evidence Rule 413 supports us on that.

That,s a part of the Violence Against Women Act, which President Clinton signed into law. Basically it says there is a huge burden in a civil suit that a defendant has to jump over in order to try to bring in prior sexual conduct and sexual history of a female plaintiff who is suing for sex-related incidents.

MR. RUSSERT: Can you cite any woman who has been denied a job because she was rebuffed-she rebuffed President Clinton for sex?

MR. CAMPBELL: Any woman who was denied a job? Well, our summary judgment pleadings show that after Dolly Kyle Browning cut off the sexual relationship with defendant Clinton, he did offer to help her get a job if she would move to Washington, D.C., and begin her activities with him again, and she said no. So if you want to call that a denial of a job, in essence it is.

MR. RUSSERT: Has any woman ever been given a job because of granting sex to President Clinton?

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, our position in the summary judgment pleading is clear on that. Absolutely.

Gennifer Flowers clearly was given a job because of that. Our summary judgment pleadings also present evidence that Kathleen Willey was given a number of jobs because of the incident involving defendant Clinton.

MR. RUSSERT: But Kathleen Willey rebuffed President

Clinton, so how
does that-logical? If she rebuffed President Clinton, she
was given a job?

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, it is logical in two ways.
First, there was a
sexual incident, which she couldn't stop entirely. It
proceeded for a short
period of time. So there was a sexual incident, according
to her pleadings. The
second point is, we believe and we have pled in the summary
judgment papers
that jobs were used to maintain silence, not just for
rewards. So after the
incident involving Ms. Willey, our pleadings claim that she
was given jobs and
positions to keep her quiet, not necessarily as a reward.

MR. RUSSERT: What is the significance of Kathleen
Willey's testimony
and her appearance on national television tonight?

MR. CAMPBELL: As far as appearance on national
television tonight, I
don't know. That is not a legal issue; I guess that is a
P.R. issue. In terms of
our lawsuit, her appearance and our lawsuit and her
evidence in our summary
judgment response, it is very important because it helps
establish the pattern or
practice that the plaintiff has claimed throughout this
case defendant Clinton
has shown with respect to female employees whom he
approaches for sexual
favors. And she fits that pattern precisely.

MR. RUSSERT: Joining me in the questioning today is
David Broder of
The Washington Post. David.

MR. BRODER: Mr. Campbell, are you past the point
where any
settlement of this case is possible?

MR. CAMPBELL: David, you will have to ask the
defendant's counsel
that question. We've never been past that point. We are
always open to
reasonable settlement negotiations. But, as we made public
about two weeks
ago, we don't believe that the other side is open to that
and has never
appeared to be open to that. And if they're not open to
that, this case is going

to trial.

MR. BRODER: It appears what we're dealing with here is allegations by a number of women to actions by Mr. Clinton when they were alone with him.

And with the single exception of one incident that he has now acknowledged with Gennifer Flowers, he has denied all these claims. Is there any evidence other than the statements of these women to disprove him?

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, yes. Our summary judgment evidence includes depositions of a number of the state trooper bodyguards of defendant Clinton when he was governor. And according to that evidence, he made numerous admissions to them that he had engaged in sexual activities with these women. And as I'm sure you know, an admission from a party defendant is substantial evidence of the truth of the admission.

MR. BRODER: We've just seen the case with Army Sergeant Major McKinney, who had six women testify that he had pressed them for sexual favors or, in one case, actually committed adultery with a woman. He was acquitted of all of those charges. Do you think that sends a message to you for your case?

MR. CAMPBELL: No, sir, I think that sends a message to the nation that jury trials are intended to sort out factual disputes. That's what juries are for. So we're looking forward to a jury to sort out the various factual disputes in this case. Whatever the jury says, if it's done correctly, we'll certainly abide by that.

MR. RUSSERT: If, in fact, you win the jury trial and Paula Jones wins her suit and the president is found that he, in fact, was engaged in sexual harassment, what happens to President Clinton?

MR. CAMPBELL: I have no idea, Tim. I'm a lawyer. I'm not a politician; I'm not a political analyst.

I don't know what happens to him. Hopefully, he pays the judgment to my client.

MR. RUSSERT: But you're an American. Are you concerned what this might do to the presidency?

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, Tim, I have been hired to represent my client in this lawsuit, and legal ethics require me to represent my client to the best of my ability, and legal ethics don't allow me to consider possible deleterious effects on other parties or even on the nation. So whether I have a personal opinion on that or not, it doesn't matter. Legal ethics require me to zealously represent my client, and that's what we're going to do.

MR. RUSSERT: You are, as well as Ms. Jones lawyer, the secretary treasurer of the Rutherford Institute, which is helping fund this lawsuit. The Rutherford Institute is very upset with Paula Jones, legal defense fund, which has raised hundreds of thousands of dollars in the letter it says for her lawsuit, but none of it is being used for her lawsuit. What does that say about your client?

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, what it says about your facts is that you're mixed up, Tim. You don't have the facts right. And I believe the Rutherford Institute will be releasing a press release tomorrow, Monday, to clear the air on this. What has happened is, someone has leaked discovery materials from certain depositions of letters or a letter that's three or four or five months old at this time discussing some of these early disputes. Those are past. They're gone. They're resolved.

Your figure of \$200,000 or

\$300,000, I am informed, is totally incorrect. And it is also incorrect to say that none of the money that was raised by the Paula Jones legal fund has gone for legal-related expenses.

That ,s just not true. It

has...

MR. RUSSERT: Well, let ,s clear it up. How much money has Paula Jones raised through direct mail?

MR. CAMPBELL: I don ,t know. I don ,t handle that, and I intentionally don ,t handle that, so I don ,t have the answers to it.

MR. RUSSERT: Has any of that been used for her personal use, hair care and air travel and entertainment and things like that?

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, Tim, that depends on what you call personal use. Do you call...

*MR. RUSSERT: Has all of it been used for her legal defense as she promised in her letter?

MR. CAMPBELL: ~~That depends on how you define legal defense. Do~~ you define an air ticket to go to a court-required proceeding as a legal expense? I do. Some people don ,t. Do you define money to buy a pant suit when the plaintiff had no wardrobe suitable for court appearances before to appear at a court appearance? Is that a valid expense for a legal case? I say it is. Our worthy opposition seems to think that it ,s not. So that depends on your definitions. I think based on the information that I have, all that money has been correctly spent.

MR. RUSSERT: And there ,s been no misuse by Paula Jones of money she has raised?

MR. CAMPBELL: Not that I ,m aware of and not under what I would term to be proper, legal related expenses.

MR. RUSSERT: At the end of the day, Mr. Campbell, are you concerned that the country is being dragged through a terribly unseemly event

which is not healthy for our democracy?

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, Tim, I would say the country is not being dragged; someone is dragging the country, and it's not my client. If it weren't for the alleged activities of the defendant, many activities of the defendant in this case, the country wouldn't be where it is today. So let's put the blame where the blame ought to be.

MR. RUSSERT: That has to be the last word. Donovan Campbell, we thank you very much for joining us this morning.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.

MR. RUSSERT: Coming next, former Vice President Dan Quayle speaks out. Then David Brock, Howard Kurtz, Evan Thomas sort out the reasons for Bill Clinton's current predicament.

(Announcements)

MR. RUSSERT: And we're back. Mr. Vice President, welcome.

MR. QUAYLE: Thank you.

MR. RUSSERT: As we speak this Sunday morning, what's the state of the Clinton presidency?

MR. QUAYLE: I think the Clinton presidency is in a state of crisis, and I'll tell you why. First of all, I know how focused and how much concentration it takes to be president of the United States, and you have to focus on the issues of the day. And you know, as well as I do, the amount of time that he is spending with his lawyers and his legal defense team is distracting from what needs to be done in the Middle East. We've got big issues now with Kosovo, the NATO extension, let alone the budget matters and domestic matters and trying to keep this economy going. And there's got to be a state of crisis that is in the White House today, and that's the way I would describe it.

MR. RUSSERT: What should the president do to deal with this crisis?

MR. QUAYLE: Well, obviously, I am not sure that I am the person that

he is going to listen to. But having been in the White House for four years, let

me just say a couple things. First, it is important to get the facts before the

American people. I don't know why they have decided, except for a strategy

to prolong this and to drag it out, hoping that it is eventually going to go away,

that they just don't come forward and let him sit down, come to MEET THE

PRESS or wherever it may be, and just talk about this, get it behind them. But

they can't do that because, apparently, they have something to hide. Bill

Clinton has not leveled with the American people. And he just needs to come

forth at the earliest opportunity and just tell us about all these allegations, not

only what went on in the Oval Office but address issues of perjury, of

suborning of perjury, obstruction of justice.

Now, those are far more

serious charges.

MR. RUSSERT: The Clinton people will say, & We can't do that because

Ken Starr, the independent counsel is, out of control and out to get us. 8

MR. QUAYLE: Well, OK, let me say a couple things about that. First of

all, why can't they? I mean, it is illegal for the president of the United States to

tell us what happened? That is a bunch of baloney.

You know that, and so do most Americans know that.

What you now see-and this is, I think, unconscionable-are White House

aides deliberately trying to intimidate and to harass Ken Starr and his staff.

They clearly have a strategy that they are deploying to try to get Ken Starr

either to back off or to discredit him. When I was in the White House for four

years, we had a guy around named Lawrence, Lawrence Walsh.
And we didn't think too highly of him, but I tell you, we never even thought about unleashing White House aides to attack him or his people.

We answered questions. And this shows the arrogance of the White House. This shows that White House staff members will go to any extreme necessary to protect Bill Clinton. And when you get into a deliberate strategy and have motivation to intimidate, to influence an independent prosecution investigation, that is serious business.

MR. RUSSERT: Do you believe Bill Clinton?

MR. QUAYLE: No.

MR. RUSSERT: You believe something happened?

MR. QUAYLE: Of course, I do. So do most of the American people.
And so do you.

MR. RUSSERT: Most American people believe that something happened, but two-thirds say he's doing a good job, and even if he's lying, lying under oath, he should still stay in office.

MR. QUAYLE: Well, I'm not so sure about all that. Let's step back and see where we are. Most people do not believe Bill Clinton. Our allies don't believe Bill Clinton. That's one of the reasons he had a difficult time putting that coalition together in this last showdown with Saddam Hussein. So people don't believe Bill Clinton.

Now, the question of resignation or should he stay on, that's an entirely different matter. And you have to step back and see what we're really talking about here. The more serious charges leveled against Bill Clinton are the criminal charges of perjury, obstruction of justice and suborning of perjury.
And Ken Starr, notwithstanding the attacks coming from the White House, will conclude his investigation and he will report to the American people. And

he may or may not give this recommendation to the House of Representatives and the Congress. I don't know. But that, in fact, is going to go forward.

I just don't buy this idea that the American people don't care if the president of the United States is lying and they don't care if he committed perjury or obstructed justice. I think they care deeply. And when those facts come out and you see a pattern of obstruction of justice, a pattern of perjury, there's going to be a dramatic change in public opinion polls.

MR. RUSSERT: If Ken Starr provides that report and shows such a pattern, do the Republicans have the political will, in this political climate, with the president's favorable rating in the 60s, to proceed with preliminary hearings on impeachment?

MR. QUAYLE: The Republicans privately all whisper this: &Let's keep Bill Clinton there. Let's make sure that he stays because we know that he's going to be weak come November 2000, and it'll be a lot easier for us to recapture the White House. 8 You know what I say to them? I say, &That's a bunch of nonsense. That may be political good advice, but it's not good advice for the country. We have to do what is right for the country, notwithstanding what may be to the Republican Party's best interest. 8 And, therefore, if Ken Starr submits a statement that says that he has reason to believe that perjury, obstruction of justice, suborning of perjury was committed, the Republicans will go forward with impeachment proceedings.

MR. RUSSERT: What if President Clinton refuses to testify before the grand jury or under oath with Ken Starr?

MR. QUAYLE: It's just one more indication that they have something to hide. That's why I said at the very beginning he needs to come forward, come clean, just tell the people what happened. He doesn't need to hide behind his

legal defense team. There is no law that I know of that precludes a president of the United States to talking and answering these questions that have come up.

MR. BRODER: If you run for president in 2000, would you expect to be asked whether you've ever had an extramarital affair?

MR. QUAYLE: I presume that that question's going to come up now because of Bill Clinton.

MR. BRODER: Do you think it's a proper question to ask of a candidate?

MR. QUAYLE: No, I don't. But it's going to come up and I expect it to come up and the people will have to deal with it accordingly.

MR. BRODER: Why do you think it's not a proper question?

MR. QUAYLE: Are you going to ask that of every vice presidential candidate, every congressman, every senator? I just do not believe that that is an appropriate question that you ask a presidential candidate.

MR. BRODER: Do you think marital fidelity has anything to do with qualifications of high office?

MR. QUAYLE: Yes, to some extent, I do. But if you had an affair 20 years ago, does that disqualify someone for running for president? If somebody has a pattern, I think that's an entirely different situation. But, no, I'm going to get the question, everyone's going to get the question, the press is going to ask that question and I intend to-I'll address it right here. The answer in my case is no.

Mr. BRODER: Mm-hmm.

MR. RUSSERT: Let me turn to some other issues the Republicans are dealing with. Puerto Rico, should it be a state?

MR. QUAYLE: That's up to the people of Puerto Rico, and I'll tell you this, it shouldn't just be a 51 percent, 49 percent disposition. You should have a significant vote down there; I'd say maybe even two-thirds. It's in the Senate now. It is an issue that the Republicans are somewhat divided on. But, no, it should be an overwhelming vote by the people of Puerto Rico.

MR. RUSSERT: And if they vote it overwhelmingly, you'd accept their judgment.

MR. QUAYLE: If two-thirds of the people of Puerto Rico vote for statehood, then I think we'd be in a position to try to have them become a state.

MR. RUSSERT: Let me turn to the issue of abortion. Does Dan Quayle still support a constitutional amendment to ban all abortions, even in case of rape and incest?

MR. QUAYLE: Well, my position on abortion's been consistent throughout. I have opposed abortion.

We have always had exceptions-if the life of the mother, rape and incest. The platform of the Republican Party is a pro-life platform. I see no reason to change the Republican platform. We welcome pro-choice Republicans into the party, but it is a pro-life party.

MR. RUSSERT: But you're for a constitutional amendment to ban abortion?

MR. QUAYLE: My support on constitutional amendment has always been consistent;

that a

constitutional amendment is an appropriate goal.

MR. RUSSERT: You were criticized by many

conservatives for going to
New Jersey and campaigning for Christine Todd Whitman, who
is in favor of
partial-birth abortion. And some suggest that you were
softening your position
on abortion because you're concerned that in your own
presidential campaign
you want to attract pro-choice voters.

MR. QUAYLE: I got elected twice a United States
senator from Indiana,
got elected twice as a member of Congress from the Fourth
Congressional
District of Indiana and I had many pro-choice people voting
for me because
they believed in most of the things that I stood for. They
may have disagreed
with me on the issue of abortion and it divides Americans.
Heck, our families
are divided on this issue. But what they respected was
somebody that would
stand up and say, &Here's where I stand on this issue and
let the chips fall
where they may. 8

Now, as far as Governor Whitman is concerned, I did
campaign for her,
and she has a very good record in the state of New Jersey.
Do we disagree on
this issue? Yes. But so what? We disagree on other issues.
And I have always
campaigning for Republicans, and I will continue to campaign
for good
Republicans. And Christie Todd Whitman, in my judgment, is
a good
Republican. She's been a good governor, even though I
disagree with her on
this issue.

MR. BRODER: Immigration-one of your potential rivals
for 2000,
Governor Wilson of California, has backed a measure in that
state that ends
benefits for the children of illegal immigrants-no
schooling, no medical services.
Another potential rival, Governor Bush of Texas, says he
flatly disagrees with
that.

Where is Vice President Quayle?

MR. QUAYLE: I'm more with Governor Wilson on that
issue. I think
Pete Wilson had a principled approach to deal with illegal

immigration. And
when it comes to illegal immigration, we have to be very
firm with that and be
very committed and we have to understand that there are no
exceptions; that
people come into this country illegally are not going to
have the social service
benefits that those that come into this country legally.
And I ,ll tell you why.
There ,s one very important reason. You can ,t reward
illegal conduct. And to
reward illegal immigration in that way-it ,s wrong, and it
will only encourage
further illegal immigration.

MR. BRODER: Republicans on Capitol Hill are
wrestling with a question
of paying the debt the U.S. owes to the United Nations and
supplying a new
round of money for the International Monetary Fund.

Would you favor that or oppose that?

MR. QUAYLE: I don ,t know exactly what the vote ,s
going to be, but let
me just address those two issues. First, as far as the
arrearage that we have
with the United Nations, of course, we ,re going to
eventually pay what we
owe to the United Nations. But let me just say a couple th
ings. First, there
should be some reforms attached to it. I think the United
States-you guys can
correct me-we pay about 22 percent, 23 percent of the U.N.
budget. If we ,re
going to pay that much of the budget, we ought to have
something to say about
that. The bureaucracy up there is unbelievable, and we
ought to make sure that
if we ,re going to pay that much in the future that we get
some reforms in the
United Nations.

As far as the IMF is concerned, I agree with George
Shultz. The IMF has
outlived its useful existence.

We ought to begin to look at another international
institution. Places
where the IMF has involved itself, it has, in fact, made
the economic
conditions worse rather than better, and it ,s time to
think anew.

MR. BRODER: Expanding NATO-would you tell me whether you think that bringing in Poland, Czechs and Hungarians will add to the security of the United States?

MR. QUAYLE: Yes, it will. It will add to our security because we have a trans-Atlantic security relationship with Europe. And by bringing Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary into NATO, it-we will begin to make sure that eastern and central Europe will be stable and will be peaceful and will be in a defensive posture. There are also five other nations that have been told that they will be admitted as well. We have the Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and I believe Romania and Slovenia have also been told that they will be next. I am very much in favor of expanding and extending NATO.

But let me be very clear on this. And we will see how this is going to work out. I am very concerned about this secondary advisory consultative commission that they have where the Russians are involved.

And if, in fact, that turns into to have de facto veto on NATO, then we are all going to have to rethink this arrangement.

But we said no to Russia joining NATO for one very practical reason. Because if Russia is part of that, we have to defend Russia on any kind of attack that would come her way. There is a lot of little conflicts that go on on the border all the time between Russia and China; therefore, we would be obligated to come to Russia's defense. It was not a very intelligent decision by some in the State Department that they wanted to push this. But if Russia today really can, in fact, veto what NATO wants to do, then we are going to have to think this whole arrangement all over again. I hope that is not the case, but some of the recent reports indicates that Russia has quite a leverage.

MR. BRODER: One last quick question. President Clinton is urging the

Federal Communications Commission to tell the networks to
give free time to
candidates in 2000.

Republicans on Capitol Hill say,

&Don't you dare do it. 8 Where are you on that?

MR. QUAYLE: It's tempting to have free time and not
have to pay for it,
but I don't think it's a good idea. And we don't need
more regulation; we
need less regulation. I don't think that's a wise idea.

MR. RUSSERT: Al Gore has come up with an idea. He
wants to spend
\$20 million to send a satellite up and beam pictures of Ea
rth for 24 hours
available on your television sets.

MR. QUAYLE: We'll have to wait see it. Normally Al
Gore-what he
proposes is not necessarily good for the country. We'll
have to wait and see
where this goes. I just don't know that much about it. I
read the same story
you did.

MR. RUSSERT: Good idea?

MR. QUAYLE: It's interesting. In fact, what we're
talking about is that
we have a global economy.

We do have satellite capability. We have all sorts
of new ways to get
information and get education into the schools. It may be
worthwhile. Whether
it's worth \$20 million and this is something the federal
government ought to do,
I'll have to reserve judgment on it.

MR. RUSSERT: Would you sit there and watch the Earth
for a day?

MR. QUAYLE: The whole day? Sort of doubt that.

MR. RUSSERT: Mr. Vice President, you going to run
for president in
2000?

MR. QUAYLE: I'm seriously considering that.

Obviously, I will make that decision in 1999. But, yes, I am very interested in it.

MR. RUSSERT: We talked to a lot of voters with The Wall Street Journal and did a poll in asking about you. I want to show you some numbers and get your reaction to it.

MR. QUAYLE: Polls. I cannot believe that we could...

MR. RUSSERT: Yeah. Yeah. & Would you consider voting for Dan Quayle? 8 As you can see, 28 percent of Americans said yes; 60 said they would not consider. We asked Republicans, it was 47 percent would consider; 42 percent would not consider. Now, you have been candid about this. There is a caricature of Dan Quayle. How do you overcome that so that people would even consider you?

MR. QUAYLE: I am going to go out and ask them to consider me if I decide to run for president. I am going to go out and ask them to look at my record. And, you know, Tim, I really welcome and relish the opportunity to engage the media once again to take a fair look at my record. Look at my leadership I provided on the Job Training Partnership Act, which now provides training for millions of disadvantaged youth. It replaced the old Cedar program.

Look at the leadership we provided in the Senate on saving the Patriot missile when some of the liberal Democrats wanted to get rid of it because it would be favorable towards SDI. Look at the leadership, speaking of satellites a moment ago, where I was a lone voice for GPS back in the early 1980s, and now GPS is very central to any cruise missile and has tremendous commercial application.

Look at the leadership that we provided as vice president in traveling to 47 different countries that David and others would go with me from time to time. Look at the leadership that we provided during Desert

Storm in visiting
the bases around the country and consoling families that
had lost loved ones,
and the leadership that we provided on Capitol Hill in
trying to get the votes
for George Bush.

So I really welcome that opportunity to once again
say, &Come on in.
Follow me around. Listen to what I have to say. Watch what
the people say
about me, and then judge me with others that might want to
be president. 8

MR. RUSSERT: Why do you think 60 percent of the
people say they
won't consider you? What happened?

MR. QUAYLE: Well, I discount these polls. Look, I'm
a person that
looks to the future. And the American people are fair. The
American people
are going to look at those of us that want to be president
in 2000 and they're
going to come and hear us.

And our vision for America is pretty straightforward
and one that I've
been consistent with throughout most of my public life, and
that is this: We
want a smaller, more responsive government; we want
dramatic tax cuts; we
want to strengthen the families and we want to reinvest in
national defense.
And I'll tell you this. I intend to make foreign policy an
issue in the year 2000.
It was not discussed in 1992, and it was a mistake. It
again was not discussed
in 1996 and it was a mistake. We cannot let another
presidential election go
by without discussing the importance of foreign policy.

You talk about NATO expansion, which is a very
important issue. What
about Kosovo? What about Iraq? We're now finding,
especially in this global
economy, that foreign policy, international affairs is very
important and I intend
to make that an issue. We have the hollowing of the
American armed forces
once again: 40 percent reduction in real terms in national
defense expenditures;
70 percent reduction in procurement.

Let me just give you one little situation that ought to open some eyes. If we had to do Desert Storm again today, here's what it would take: 100 percent of the Marine Corps; about two-thirds of the Army; about one-half of the Navy; and about one-half of the Air Force just to do Desert Storm today. It doesn't mean we can't do it. We can. What about our commitments to Korea and Japan through treaties? What about our commitment to NATO and the expansion of NATO taking in three countries and maybe five more down the road? We can't do it all with the current budget constraints that have been imposed upon us by Bill Clinton.

MR. RUSSERT: Do you think some of the allegations about Bill Clinton's characters will rub off on Al Gore?

MR. QUAYLE: Al Gore is connected to Bill Clinton. What Bill Clinton suffers, Al Gore suffers. Right now Al Gore is probably riding high because of so-called Bill Clinton's popularity. But no, the two are very close together. And if Bill Clinton is popular in the November 2000, Al Gore has a reasonable chance of getting elected. But that will not happen. And you heard it here first.

MR. RUSSERT: That has to be the last word. Vice President Dan Quayle, thanks very much for joining us.

Next up, David Brock apologizes to President Clinton, Howard Kurtz chronicles the White House propaganda machine and Evan Thomas explains Newsweek's aggressive coverage of Monica Lewinsky.

(Announcements)

MR. RUSSERT: And we're back. Howard Kurtz-your new book, &Inside the Clinton Propaganda Machine: Spin Cycle. 8 What is the spin cycle machine thinking, doing, this weekend to handle the latest revelations?

MR. KURTZ: Tim, using all the same techniques they've perfected

through so many scandals, ranging from attacking the messenger, leaking bad news about yourself first or leaking it late in the day or leaking it to newspapers to keep it off TV, but increasingly, stonewalling, not answering the questions, is becoming the major effort in the Lewinsky investigation. And you have this extraordinary spectacle of the press secretary, Mike McCurry, not only not providing answers to journalists from the podium, but by following a &don't ask, don't tell 8 policy. He doesn't want to ask the president these sensitive questions because he doesn't want to get a subpoena, he doesn't want to be in a position of not sharing information with the press that he knows. So he's staying out of the loop, and that leaves the journalists very frustrated.

MR. RUSSERT: The president, however, continues to have a favorable rating in the 60-percent range.

The White House is saying, &It's working. 8

MR. KURTZ: Well, an interesting dichotomy here is that the White House has this vaunted, state-of-the-art, 24-hour spin machine. These guys spin in their sleep. But the press has its own spin. The press is kind of fixated on scandal and wrongdoing and allegations. And many journalists that I talk to are frustrated that no matter what they throw at this guy-remember, we've been through Whitewater, Paula Jones, fund-raising, now Monica Lewinsky-his approval ratings are up and the media's approval ratings are down in the gutter. So there's a lot of hand-wringing on the part of the journalists about why they're not having an impact on this presidency.

MR. RUSSERT: David Brock, you started all this, American Spectator article back in 1994, His Cheatin', Heart, when you first raised the name Paula, as in Paula Jones. You have now written an article in Esquire where you apologize to the president, in effect, for having written

your first piece. Why
have you apologized?

MR. BROCK: Right. Well, Tim, you know, journalists
don't often come
on national television and admit a mistake, and I think a
lot of people,
particularly in the Washington press corps, find that
unimaginable. Let me give
you a few facts.

I had four sources on that piece, four troopers.
Ronnie Anderson
subsequently issued an affidavit saying that he was offered
\$1 million by Cliff
Jackson, who sort of orchestrated this thing back in
Arkansas to tell me and
other reporters second- and third-hand stories. Danny
Ferguson, in his
deposition in the Paula Jones case, said, &I don't know
that he fooled around
with anybody. 8

Third and fourth sources, Roger Perry and Larry
Paterson, took money
from a group allied with Jerry Falwell that put out the
infamous Falwell video
to make statements supporting a theory that Vince Foster
was murdered. So I
just want to ask you, you know, as a journalist, what are
you supposed to do
in that position? If you're afraid, if you're fearful,
maybe you don't say
anything. I'm out here holding myself publicly
accountable. I think if NBC
News was in that position, you know, you'd do the same
thing.

MR. RUSSERT: Those troopers lied to you?

MR. BROCK: I can't say that everything they told me
was true.

MR. RUSSERT: What specifically do you believe is
untrue and you
would take back this morning?

MR. BROCK: Well, as I said, I mean, there's
nothing-it's on their
credibility. There's nothing specific in the piece that I
know is wrong, and
that's the problem, Tim. You know, I don't know what is
right and what is
wrong in that piece, and that's why I can't stand by it.

MR. RUSSERT: Los Angeles Times , reporters who wrote a similar story saying you ,re being hypocritical, that you just have changed your political views and their journalism is solid, even though they found the same thing you did.

MR. BROCK: Right. Well, you know, first of all, this is not about my politics at all. Secondly, this is a critical self-examination of my journalism. If they want to take a second look at it, that ,s up to them.

If they want to stand by the story, I ,m not going to, you know, tell them what to do, certainly.

~~MR.~~RUSSERT: You also wrote a...

~~MR.~~BROCK: And they ,re going to find out-you know, ~~these-as.~~Duncan ~~Campbell~~said earlier today, these troopers are key to this Paula Jones case.

In the 700 pages that were released on Friday, Tim, a lot of that is based on the information from-now we ,re just down to two troopers. If this case goes to trial, we ,ll see about the troopers , credibility, we ,ll see if maybe my doubts are right or maybe the LA Times standing by the story turns out to be right. But it will be tested.

MR. RUSSERT: You also wrote a critical book of Anita Hill. Would you apologize to her in any way, shape or form this morning?

MR. BROCK: Well, Tim, you know, I said on national television about three years ago that there was some invective in a piece that I wrote for The American Spectator, not in the book, that I have already apologized for. Beyond that, no.

MR. RUSSERT: So everything in the book stands.

MR. BROCK: That ,s right.

MR. RUSSERT: One last point. Susan Carpenter-McMillan, spokesman for Paula Jones, was on MSNBC on Friday and said the reason

that you have
changed your view and apologized is because of your love
life; that you ,re
now in love with former press secretary for Hillary Clinton
and that that has
skewed your view.

MR. BROCK: Right.

MR. RUSSERT: Your reaction.

MR. BROCK: Well, let me just say that, you know, I
think that we ,re
now-you know, they ,re making the point in my piece, which
is there ,s a deep
irony in that I ,m out here talking about my second
thoughts about the politics
of personal destruction, and all the right wing can come up
with is a smear
against me.

Since they brought it up, since it ,s on national
television, let me just tell
you, to put it to rest, that-and they seem to be intent on
ruining this guy ,s life
because he happens to be a friend of mine-that we are
friends. We ,ve known
each other for about a year. I did-not know him at the time
I wrote my Hillary
Clinton book, to lay that conspiracy to rest. There are a
lot of reporters in this
town who have friends on both sides of the aisle. He does
not live with me. He
never has. We have not dated. There ,s no affair. There ,s
nothing to that. It ,s
just false, and I think it ,s really unfortunate. And,
again, it just makes my point
that, you know, in Washington we ,ve got to stop sliming
each other, I think.

MR. RUSSERT: Is there a right-wing conspiracy out to
get President
Clinton?

MR. BROCK: I think that a lot of people laughed when
Mrs. Clinton said
that, and one of the things that I think is important in my
letter, nobody else
here today ,s been in the right wing. I ,ve been in the
right wing. I know what
it ,s about. And, yes, you know, Cliff Jackson, as I said,
stage managed the
story, along with an ally of Speaker Gingrich ,s.

I ,ve worked at The American Spectator. I was paid by Richard Mellon Scaife. There was an Arkansas project specifically designed to dig up dirt on Bill Clinton; million of dollars went through there. One of the trooper was paid from that. I don ,t think that ,s ethical. And so the germ of it-I ,m not saying everything that happened since is a conspiracy, but I was there on day one and I can tell you that there were political forces, there was money behind this.

MR. RUSSERT: You also say in your Esquire article that Newsweek became The American Spectator.

MR. BROCK: Right.

~~MR.~~RUSSERT: What do you mean by that?

~~MR.~~BROCK: Well, I ,m really making a general point there that I don ,t think that five years ago, the stories we ,re seeing in the mainstream press today would necessarily have been done. I think they were confined at that time to something like The American Spectator or to the tabloids. And I think the culture ,s changed, and I ,ve had second thoughts about that.

MR. RUSSERT: Evan Thomas, the culture ,s changed and Newsweek has been most aggressive on this Monica Lewinsky story. Are you printing and reporting things that you wouldn ,t have gone near a year or two ago?

MR. THOMAS: Maybe. I think the culture has changed somewhat. But Newsweek is interested in sex.

If the president is having sex in the Oval Office with a woman who ,s looking for a job, we are interested in that. We ,re also interested if they ,re trying to cover up for it and if his aides are trying to cover up.

Those are legitimate stories, and we ,re going to pursue them.

MR. RUSSERT: What about the reaction of the public

saying, & We don't
want to hear this. Why are you guys down in the gutter
talking about sex, sex,
sex? Talk about other issues that really matter 8?

MR. THOMAS: I think people are ambivalent. They are
interested.

They're reading the magazine.

They're buying it. There's immense talk about it.
But at the same time,
they feel squeamish about the subject. It is a difficult
subject. It's difficult to get
right. I mean, there's a lot of nervousness when we do
these stories that we're
going to make the big mistake. We live in dread of that,
and we are pretty
careful not to make the big mistake.

MR. RUSSERT: David Broder, what do you make of all
this?

MR. BRODER: Well, I think Evan's right, that
allegations of this

character, about the president of the United States, are
legitimate news stories.

And I think also, David, that it's useful. I do it at the
end of every year to go
back and say, & This is what I got wrong. This is what I'd
like to reconsider or
have an opportunity to take another swing at. 8 But I think
Howie's basic point
is right. The reason that the press has taken it in the
chin on this story is that the
people understand that there are a lot of other things
which affect their lives a
hell of a lot more than this stuff...

MR. KURTZ: And...

MR. BRODER: ...which we're not dealing with.

MR. KURTZ: And, in fact, that's the biggest spin
problem for the White
House right now. Throughout all the previous scandals, Tim,
they were able
not only to deflect and knock down and beat back the
negative, damaging
stories but to grab some of the media oxygen for things the
president wanted
to talk about: health care, education. Right now, that's
all but impossible
because shows like this-week after week, we're all talking
about Kathleen

Willey, Monica Lewinsky, allegations of oral sex. And it has sort of blotted out their usually very remarkable attempts to get their agenda on the radar screen.

And that, I think, is the biggest difficulty for the Clinton presidency right now.

MR. RUSSERT: Is President Clinton a victim of his own success? The economy is so strong, people are doing so well, there's not any real issue to divide the country, and so they're focusing on issues like this.

MR. KURTZ: Well, I'll tell you, the people who work in the White House, who are a part of the spin machine, they are very upset. I mean, they're loyal to the president, but things that they've worked for so hard for so many years they now see threatened, to say the least, by these seamy allegations that have so absorb the press. And so they are not celebrating, even though the polls remain good.

MR. RUSSERT: David Brock, how will history remember Bill Clinton?

MR. BROCK: Well, you know, I think the scandal fever that we've seen for the past five years are going to affect him. But, you know, I'd just remind people that, you know, we've been through Troopergate, Whitewater, Paula Jones. Nothing's been proven yet. And I think if it is, it will hurt him quite a bit, and if it isn't, it won't. And we'll know.

MR. RUSSERT: Evan, where's the story go?

MR. THOMAS: I don't know. The press has a very fast spin cycle, is how he calls it. We have an appetite for instant news. But the legal process is very slow. And there's a disconnect; it's out of sync.

The legal process is creeping along here gradually, working through the grand jury. The news cycle's spinning along. And I don't know where it's going. Maybe to the House of Representatives for impeachment hearings. But we really don't know, because all the facts aren't out

yet.

MR. RUSSERT: We have to take a quick break. Be right back with more of MEET THE PRESS right after this.

(Announcements)

MR. RUSSERT: Howard Kurtz, real fast, how will the spin cycle propaganda machine handle Kathleen Willey?

MR. KURTZ: Well, Mike McCurry last summer managed to beat back that story, in part by calling top editors like Evan Thomas, other news organizations, and saying, "You shouldn't go with this story." 8

It went away for a while. It's back. And now, of course, they'll fall back on the old reliable, "It's old news. We already knew that." Yesterday's news. 8

MR. RUSSERT: Howard Kurtz, David Broder, Evan Thomas, David Brock, thanks very much.

On "Dateline" 8 tonight...

MS. JANE PAULEY ("Dateline" 8): Thanks, Tim. What would you do if your brother told you secrets about unspeakable crimes? The story of a man who chooses between his conscience and his own brother, tonight on "Dateline." 8

MR. RUSSERT: Thank you, Jane.

Start your day tomorrow on "Today" 8 with Katie and Matt, then the "NBC Nightly News" 8 with Tom Brokaw.

That's all for today. We'll be back next week. If it's Sunday, it's "Meet the Press." 8

END

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Ruby Shamir (CN=Ruby Shamir/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-MAR-1998 10:24:45.00

SUBJECT: CNN: Larry King, 3/13/98

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by: Ruby Shamir/WHO/EOP on 03/16/98 10:24
AM -----

Dag Vega
03/16/98 10:17:35 AM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: CNN: Larry King, 3/13/98

Larry King Live
Aired March 13, 1998 - 9:00 p.m. ET

Investigating the President: Journalist Roundtable on the "Spin Cycle"

LARRY KING, HOST: Tonight, inside the White House spin machine, a new book reveals how the Clinton administration works the media. Our guests in Washington, Howard Kurtz, media reporter for "The Washington Post" and author of a hot new book, "Spin Cycle"; our senior White House correspondent at CNN and the host of "LATE EDITION," Wolf Blitzer; the former Clinton special counsel, a very outspoken Lanny Davis; the

veteran

Washington journalist and author, Sally Quinn; and in New York, David Brock, the journalist who broke the Paula Jones story; and Bob Schieffer, host of CBS's long-running "Face The Nation."

They're all next on LARRY KING LIVE.

Am I on? We're back. Oh, we're on, I think. And welcome to this

edition of LARRY KING LIVE. We have two people in New York, four people here. We're going to begin by

talking to

Howard Kurtz about his book which has caused all of

this furor,

but first, Mr. Blitzer. Tonight, and probably this is

all over the

country already -- there was a book party for my new

book. And

I am not here to plug my book. I am here to tell you

at the book

party, William Ginsburg, the attorney for Monica

Lewinsky, was

there. Monica came. She was there for an hour and a

half. She

mingled with everyone. She spoke with Sally. She was

very nice to

everybody. Then when Wolf came over, and Wolf said,

hello,

Monica. She said, you don't remember me, do you? I

was just a

peon. You used to pass me in the White House all the

time.

WOLF BLITZER, CNN CORRESPONDENT: You know, she really...

KING: You didn't have the journalistic acumen to spot something.

BLITZER: I guess I didn't realize when she was an intern at the

White House that this was a person that I should try to cultivate.

(LAUGHTER)

She said that she used to see the reporters, you know, Mike

McCurry does every morning at 9:30 at what we call a gaggle a

briefing off camera just to sort of lay out the day.

We all get there

just a little bit before. We hang out outside his office. And Monica said that she used to walk by and she used to see all of these famous journalists.

KING: She saw you, nodded to you, she was just a pee-on. Wolf, you could have had a biggie.

BLITZER: She looked like a young kid. What did I know? The interesting thing is though that afterwards, I did sit down and talk with her for a few minutes while she was having dinner with her two lawyers, Nate Speights and Bill Ginsburg. And she is very poised.

She is very nice obviously, very intelligent and articulate. But you ~~could also tell there's a fragility there that she's nervous. She has~~ gone through a lot over these eight weeks and her -- what we saw very positive, very nice, very friendly demeanor could easily go the other way...

KING: In all fairness, she was very nice for a party of Washington insiders, I mean, we're talking Tim Russert and William Safire and John McLaughlin. I mean, this was a heavy crowd to go into like that. She loved my wife. They talked a lot.

BLITZER: Who wouldn't?

KING: Who wouldn't. All right, Howard, "Spin Cycle," the point is?

HOWARD KURTZ, AUTHOR "SPIN CYCLE": The point is to explain what it is that the folks at the White House do everyday, at every hour in terms of trying to bob and weave and what I think of as kind of laundering the news taking sort of a greasy shirt with all kinds of scandal stains and contradictions and presenting it to the country as a clean white garment.

KING: Is that their job?

KURTZ: Of course it's their job. It's what they get paid to do. One might well argue that the press, the journalists, like Wolf who cover the White House, engaging their own form of spin. They're concerned mostly with negative news, bad news, scandal stories all the way from Gennifer Flowers in 1992 to the woman that you met tonight, Monica Lewinsky. So it's almost sort of a game between two self-absorbed groups spin and counter spin, but it's a game that's a serious matter because it affects very much the news that we see and hear and read.

KING: And you reveal certain things, how this is done, right? How did you get access?

KURTZ: Well, a number of people in the White House were willing to talk to me for a book...

KING: He is very upset over this, but go ahead.

KURTZ: We'll get to that in a moment. I think because they see themselves, Larry, not as some sort of Nixonian stonewalls, but as the good guys who have to operate in a very hostile press environment. They wanted people to know at least those are willing to talk to me at what they have to put up with.

KING: They do not see themselves as employees of the people responsible to the people and therefore the press presenting the people?

KURTZ: Well, they see themselves as trying to tell the truth, tell the truth slowly as press secretary...

KING: Spinning implies not truth?

KURTZ: No, I think spinning just implies taking a basic set of facts and trying to cast them in the most favorable light. You may say, Larry, all the politicians do this. Of course. But in this administration, in this presidency, because there have been such a barrage of scandalous accusations, it seems that these folks have raised it to the state of the art. They have to do it all the time, because we're on their case all the time.

KING: Is this in praise of them then?

KURTZ: Well, even the most severe critic of the Clinton White House would say these people are awfully good at getting out of danger.

KING: I want to cover a couple of points you made in the book. The entire panel will be kicking in a while. You said that it's impossible to be an investigative reporter on the White House beat.

KURTZ: Most White House reporters tell me, Larry, because they're in the dingy White House press room every day, because they have to deal with the official news and presidential announcements and because they have to deal with them at least on the record, those are not the people who do the digging, who break the Lewinsky scandals, the Whitewater scandal.

There's another corps of investigative reporters, Jeff Kurz (ph) of "The New York Times," (INAUDIBLE), who do the real investigative work. So the White House has many constituencies, the daily beat reporters, like Wolf, the investigative folks, and the columnists who are free to beat up whoever they wish.

KING: We'll get a chance to beat up on Howard in a while. You also say the Clinton administration, the

administration Lanny
served, doesn't really make news. They leak stories.
They see how
they play, then change them to fit the agenda. Strong
stuff.

KURTZ: Two points on that. One is that McCurry
himself would
be the first to tell you that in a media-saturated
age where you're
trying to break through the static and get attention
for the
president's agenda, you can't just have the president
give a speech.
You give it to somebody a day in advance, you come up
with a
second day story. You try to stretch the positive
news you want to
make into more of a story. But also they're constantly
back-pedaling on defense and sometimes information is
coming out
in dribs and drabs, to use a quote from "The
~~Washington Post~~."
Lanny, among others, argued often in internal
counsels that they
should just these stuff out, take these documents,
give them to the
press, take the hits. But there were other in White
House, who did
not have that point of view.

KING: Television more important than newspapers?

BLITZER: Well, if you were the White House, when a
damaging
story was coming out, they really wanted to keep it
off television.
They'd do that in a couple of different ways, Larry.
They would
put out the news at 6:00 or 7:00 night, too late for
the network
newscasts or a couple of time when Rita Braver for
example, of
CBS was close to

breaking a story, they'd quietly give it to, say,
"The Wall Street
Journal" or another newspaper. You say why would they
do that?
It's going to come out anyway. But they feel that the
print lacks the
power and the region the impact of television. So
they're
concerned about the TV exposure.

KING: ... Mr. McCurry, a new hire, not an old Clinton fan...

KURTZ: Absolutely.

KING: He worked for other areas. You called him the "master of spin."

KURTZ: Well, in the estimation of almost everyone I talk to, probably mine as well, Mike McCurry is a very decent guy, who is one of the best press secretary of the modern age, but he is also caught in an impossible job. He has to be the ambassador between a president who distrusts reporters and reporters who don't believe the president. And increasingly in the Monica Lewinsky story, he is the guy sent out there on the podium to say, I don't know, you have to ask the lawyers, I'm not going to check on that. He almost doesn't want to know. That's an awfully tough position, because McCurry wants to protect his own personal credibility. All the reporters have known him for year, but at the same time, he has got to serve his client, Mr. Clinton.

KING: Are you surprised that this book is a hit? I think it comes on "The New York Times" list next week, I was told.

KURTZ: I am little surprised, Larry, all the attention it's getting. I knew it because of the Monica Lewinsky story would probably got little more than it would usually, but I must say this was not a secret plan of mine. I'm a little surprised.

KING: How did she get in the front page of the introduction when books go to print much sooner?

KURTZ: By spending about a week without sleeping and trying to update the book so it would have the feel of a real time book.

other
LARRY KING: We're going to take break. Come back, bring our
panelists in. Then we wheel it the whole way. This is
KING LIVE in Washington. Don't go away.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

thoughts
KING: Some books offer solutions. Howard Kurtz, any
on the next White House?

administration is
I think... KURTZ: Well, it's hard to imagine that another
going to face this kind of barrage of accusation, but

spin.
KING: So it had to be the barge first to create the

..learns from
-people have
continued high
effectively, you
KURTZ: Yeah. But I think that every administration
the previous administration. And what the Clinton
demonstrated clearly as reflected by the president's
popularity ratings is that if you can manage the news

embarrass the
is going to
frustrated, Larry,
armor.
can deflect the bad news, if you can sometimes
reporters and you can put out your own agenda, that
translate in the population. And the journalists are
at their inability to make a dent in the presidential

is wrong?
current issue
David, in
story on
then, David? Was
you say
KING: Now we enter into what if the attack, the story
One of our guests in New York is David Brock. The
of "Esquire" magazine has an extraordinary story by
which he apologizes to the president for breaking the
Paula Jones. Did -- were they spinning correctly
the White House correct the way they responded, since
your story was wrong?

DAVID BROCK, FREELANCE WRITER: Well, you know, I think that the White House didn't do a lot of spin on Troopergate.

But in retrospect, what I am saying to the president and really to the media in this piece is that I have grown over time in the last five years to become somewhat worried about what's happening in our journalism and our politics.

And there are two different questions. One is, do you investigate this sort of thing? Do you investigate a president's private life? And the second thing is, what standard of proof do you apply? I have come to the conclusion that I really think, you know, it would be great to have a debate about Bill Clinton's character; but it really ~~should be~~ on his public record not on his private life.

I think on the facts I have grown concerned that the troopers have said and done things in the time since the piece was published that have caused me to doubt, you know, to what extent those allegations were solid.

KING: Did you feel, therefore, that you morally owed it to do that apology?

BROCK: Well, you know, I think I had something valuable to say about this. And as I thought about this, you know, the genesis of it was that I saw the president being brought in to be deposed about eight Saturdays ago by Paula Jones. I just happened to be talking to my editor at "Esquire" that day about my feeling that even if you disagree with Bill Clinton's policies, I thought it was a tragedy for the country that the president was being put under oath and testifying about the most intimate details of his private life. I felt all the more so when I saw Monica Lewinsky break and I saw some

excess on the part of the rest of the media. That sort of prompted me to go and look back at some of my own excess.

KING: So you have changed?

BROCK: I've certainly changed my view of this, yeah.

KING: Sally, what do you think of the concept of Howard's book this?

SALLY QUINN, AUTHOR, JOURNALIST: Well, I was talking to Howard earlier about how it seems almost unbelievable when you read this book that this is the way the system works. It is a game. And it's extraordinary, I mean, the kind of spinning and -- weaving and bobbing and lying and obfuscating and manipulating -- that goes on on all sides.

And I wrote a novel once, where I had a scene where there was a journalist -- they were in the press room. One of them was chasing another one around, stealing her grapefruit. And she was screaming and crying. He was throwing the grapefruit around. This was in the middle of one of the press briefings.

And everybody said, you know, you can't write this, because it just doesn't -- it's not believable. And in fact it's a true story. I think that it's really -- it's the throwing of the grapefruit. You can't believe it unless you see it. But the fact is this is an adversary situation that is set up in the White House when the media and the administration.

KING: That's the way it should be?

QUINN: That's the way it should be.

KING: Bob Schieffer, do you agree with Sally?

BOB SCHIEFFER, "FACE THE NATION": Well, I think the significant thing about Howard's book and it's an excellent book, I

think, is that it puts in perspective just how sophisticated this whole business of government public relations has become. And it's not just in the government, it's -- we see it in industry. We see it in every walk of American life. I mean, I can remember when press manipulation was deciding who was going to announce something and what time you were going to announce it.

I always remember long back when I was covering the Pentagon and Mel Layer (ph) was the secretary of defense. And he had the job of sort of going out and announcing all the bad news that was happening about Vietnam. And one day I was told that he said during a staff meeting, I wish I'd had some good news to announce. And he said, no, if there were good news, the president would announce it. And that's how the manipulation used to go on.

~~KING: That was spinning then.~~

SCHIEFFER: If it was good news, the president announced it. It was really bad news, some corporal announced it late on a Friday afternoon when everybody left the press room. But now -- that's what Howard's brought together in this book just how sophisticated this whole situation has become.

KING: Lanny, are you offended by this book, or in a way, proud of it?

LANNY DAVIS, FMR. CLINTON SPECIAL COUNSEL: Well, I think we need another view point from some of the things that I have heard tonight. I am not offended by the book, but it's an incomplete portrait. I respect Howie very much, but the first point I want to make can take this occasion to make it is that I simply don't agree that it was factual, that there was a faction in the White House opposed to putting out information. The

president gave me

...

KING: No one was opposed to putting...

DAVIS: I never in all the months I was in the White House had

anybody ever tell me don't put that out because it's bad. Chuck Ruff

and Lanny Breuer in the counsel's office, the president of the

United States, Mike McCurry, mandated me to help reporters

write stories on campaign finance and to get it out proactively -- let

me add just one other point, the only discussion we ever had is

whether or not you put out information if you have 90 percent and

what happens if the 10 percent you don't find turns out to be bad?

When I won argument, let's put out the 90 percent. If we find the

10 percent, people will appreciate that we're doing our best to get

information out. Howard Kurtz's newspaper "The Washington

Post" would write an editorial of accusing the White House of

dribs and drabs, while we were trying to get information out. Does

the president get credit? Does the White House get credit?

Perhaps unprecedented from Sally, Howie, and all the journalists

that we proactively helped reporters write stories.

KING: You're saying Howard got it wrong.

DAVIS: I think Howard got it incomplete not wrong.

KING: So a lot of it is right?

DAVIS: I think a lot of it is right, but I think what he doesn't say

about his own journalists is that reporters write with their own

viewpoint. In the scandal press, there's innuendo that operates as a

surrogate for fact. In the Arlington cemetery story, which "The

Washington Post," "The New York Times," all the main line

organizations we printed and played for three days,
turned out to
be utterly, totally wrong.

KING: And we'll bring Wolf in. Everybody else will be
taking your
calls too. Don't go away.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: By the way the secretary of defense, William
Cohen, is
Wolf Blitzer's guest Sunday on "LATE EDITION." We'll
have
Wolf respond to something Howard wrote about him.

You wrote about our friend Mr. Blitzer that Wolf
Blitzer was
voracious news around the clock. He'd take almost
anything Mike
McCurry would put out set up on the lawn and broke
it. Other
reporters would snicker at him thinking that McCurry
was
spoon-feeding him, and wolf's constant presence at
the White
House as an-insider made the others around him a
little aghast.

Would you respond to that?

BLITZER: I am sure -- I know that a lot of my
colleague, fellow
reporters from other news organizations always
assumed when I
got out on the White House lawn and broke a story,
reported
something first, that somebody in the White House had
just said,
let's give it to wolf. What they didn't realize was
that very often -- I
am not saying all the time -- but very often that was
the result of lot
of hard work,

getting a tip from somebody, checking it out, digging
and digging
finally coming out with story first.

KING: Do you read this, then, as praise, you got that
access.

BLITZER: I got that can access, but I also had to
check it out with

capitol hill, sources maybe outside the White House maybe go to
say one thing speak to people outside in the private sector. I will
effective about what Lanny Davis just said, because he was very
news media. I as special counsel to the president dealing with the
there. dealt with him probably every single day while he was

corrected. He But he did say something that I think needs to be
were just said that he was trying to help the news media -- we
these trying to help the news media. That's why we'd leak
news media. It documents in advance. It wasn't trying to help the
going ~~was~~ because the White House knew these documents were
these to come out anyhow. Senator Thompson at the Senate
the ~~Governmental~~ Affairs Committee was going to release
the ~~documents~~ in a few months they thought if they'd give
earlier, proactively ~~documents~~ a few months earlier or a few weeks
in his words, that would diffuse.

KING: You're saying Howard's book is on the mark?

that was BLITZER: Yes, Howard's book is on the mark, because
a deliberate strategy Lanny.

DAVIS: Can I give a quick answer to that?

KING: Quick answer.

for our own DAVIS: You're absolutely right. We helped the media
self-interest...

to make. BLITZER: Right. That's the only point that I wanted

complete by our DAVIS: ... but that is getting it accurate and
being complete helping the media write it, we have a better shot
didn't help. and getting our viewpoint expressed, than if we

help the BLITZER: It wasn't just to help the media, it was to president.

KING: Sally and then David's thoughts on is.

spin. QUINN: I think we have seen a brilliant example of

KING: It was just fun.

help the QUINN: He was talking about how they were trying to media and there was nobody in the White House ever who didn't want to put the story about.

our guests KING: We're discussing the "Spin Cycle" and one of spun.

I started QUINN: I am sitting there going oh, yeah right, then saying, no, no, no Sally, get a grip.

facts DAVIS: But Sally, facts are facts. You can interpret differently. The good spin is taking facts we can agree on and I'll interpret them one way and you'll interpret them another.

write KING: David Brock, you're kind of an outsider. You of the White magazines, books, you're not a day to day coverer of the White House.

discussion? What do you make of the Kurtz book and this

scandal mania BROCK: I think Howie's book, as it describes the or almost a virus is really fascinating. I have to say if you look at the scandal, you look at troopergate, Paula Jones, Whitewater, campaign finance and now Monica Lewinsky, and stop for a minute and think, you know, what has been proven factually out of all of that?

I don't know what the answer to that is. If anybody

else on the

panel knows, I don't think that's necessarily a triumph of spin.

There's spin in there. But what do we really know that is an

absolute fact out of all of that.

KING: Are you suspicious, David, in the nature of anything released by major bureaucracy, if the White House releases something, are you suspicious? Most reporters are, you?

BROCK: Yes fundamentally I am a skeptic, just like everybody...

KING: Are all good reporters skeptics Bob?

SCHIEFFER: I should hope so. The problem is when they become cynical. That's when it's not good.

KING: It's a thin line?

SCHIEFFER: I think skepticism and curiosity are the two main ingredients of being a good reporters, first curiosity.

KING: We'll be back with more and we'll be including your phone calls as well. Don't go away.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: Americans have gotten to know, indeed the world has gotten to know Mike McCurry and Mike McCurry, the press secretary is a lot looked at in Howard Kurtz's book -- got a whole chapter on him. And it has been kind of an enigma as you paint it. Some of the quotes, he was not blindly loyal to his team. His reputation was easy going, is wrong. He was an erratic personality.

He could be abrupt. He could be short. He told a reporter once his story was sophomoric. He snapped at another reporter as being puny minded. He bullied reporters as well. He thrashed Clinton when he worked on Senators Kerrey's

presidential

campaign, even passed along sexual gossip on
President Clinton.

KURTZ: Yet for all of that, the reporters love him
because he's a
very charming guy, who does the job very well, and
protects the
press.
president's interests, but also accommodates the

KING: So therefore, he is not spinning?

KURTZ: Well of course he's spinning, but he doesn't
make any
bones about it.

KING: He is an admitted spinner?

KURTZ: He is acknowledged and confessed spinner.

(LAUGHTER)

--I want to surprise Lanny Davis with agreeing with
what he said
these
document dumps-when they're overtly putting out
scandal papers,
or sometimes leaking them quietly, he didn't get much
credit in the
press. Instead the press would say you answered this,
this, and
this, but you didn't answer these questions. They
would look for
contradictions, and I think one of the reasons was
there was an
underlying feeling of distrust among a lot of the
journalists toward
the White House spinmiesters, going back to all of
the other
scandals where they felt they didn't got complete and
straight
answers.

KING: Sally is the current plan, we base it on
Kurtz's book. We
stay away from everything, don't talk, we hole up. We
circle the
wagons?

QUINN: I don't see there's any reason not to because
it's
working. The longer they say nothing, the more the

polls go up.

KING: How do you explain that?

QUINN: Well, I think people don't really want to know the truth. I think people...

KING: Don't want to know...

QUINN: They don't want to deal with the whole scandal, the whole Monica Lewinsky scandal or any of the sexual stuff. They don't want to deal. It's too depressing. It's too awful. They don't want to know it. But -- and so when -- if they're not told they don't have to deal with it.

KING: So there's no anger at the president who said he wanted to get it out quickly and has never been heard from since?

QUINN: I think there -- I mean, I can't answer for the American people but I suspect the polls are soft. And I suspect that there's a lot of underlying anger, and I even think that part of that came out in that Columbus, Ohio symposium against the three surrogates when people were screaming and yelling about Iraq. I had the sense that it wasn't Iraq they were angry about, but they feel somehow it's not right to be angry about someone's private life.

KING: How can he keep quiet, wolf?

BLITZER: I don't think it's helping him -- the stonewalling, the keeping quiet. I think the longer he refuses to tell the American public the nature of his relationship with Monica Lewinsky the more the story is going to continue. The more dirt will be dug up, the more the appetite will grow.

KING: Such as occurred in L.A. and Little Rock today?

BLITZER: Right. He could have put an end to this relatively quickly, early on if he would have done something his political advisers wanted him to do, as opposed to his legal advisers. Look as bad as it is, it can't be that bad. Just tell the American public what your relationship was with Monica Lewinsky. We'll take a hit and move on. Now it's going to get worse and worse. I don't think his -- these poll numbers are very soft I don't think it's going to do him much good a long run.

SCHIEFFER: Larry, could I just...

KING: Go ahead Bob, then Howard.

turning
of self-
SCHIEFFER: I think this story may be about to reach a point here in the sense -- I don't want to be accused promotion for CBS News, but Ed Bradley has done an extraordinary interview with Kathleen Willey.

KING: Going to play Sunday night.

Sunday
went to see the
the Oval Office. He
I'll wait and let
about it. But I
Paula Jones
these kind
SCHIEFFER: That is going to be on "60 Minutes" on night. She is going to say in that interview that she president. He invited her into the little study off the Oval Office. He began to fondle her. He did some other things that you see the interview to let you see what you think about it. But I think this is going to be the first time since we saw Paula Jones make accusations that we have heard somebody make these kind of accusations on TV.

KING: Was the interview edited?

SCHIEFFER: No. I don't know. It will be on "60 Minutes." May edit it before it's on "60 Minutes" but it's going to be quite a long interview. And I think for the first time we're going to see somebody -- Ed tells me this is a very believable

woman. So I
think...

other things KING: Can you give us a hint as to what one of the
might have been. .

SCHIEFFER: I beg your pardon.

KING: You say he fondled her and other things.

her hand SCHIEFFER: He placed her hand -- she says he placed
the neck and on his groin, as it were. And he began kissing her on
something I have on the lips and on the face, and said "this is
always wanted to do." Up until now, we have been
talking about source stories. We have been talking about documents.
I think that this may -- we may see a change in the story.

KING: I want to get a break. Let us all digest that.

(LAUGHTER)

And we'll be right back.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

about KING: Welcome back. We're discussing a great new book
It's "Spin media spin at the White House, already a best seller.
reporter Howard Cycle," written by "The Washington Post" media
tonight. Kurtz. Howard is one of our distinguished guests

senior White He is here in our Washington bureau along with our
by House correspondent Wolf Blitzer, who also hosts "LATE
the former EDITION" on CBS -- CNN every Sunday -- I am affected
Quinn, the what Bob Schieffer had is say. We have Lanny Davis,
and party special counsel to President Clinton, to -- and Sally
David Brock. veteran Washington journalist and author and mother
goer of the year. And in New York, we're joined by
His 1993 story in the "American Spectator" broke the

Paula Jones

issue of story. And now he kind of takes that back in the new
"Face The Nation" on CBS.

We're going Lanny wanted to respond to what bob just revealed.
I think to hear -- see part of on "60 Minutes" Sunday night.
this. Howard wanted to say something first, you shocked by

Wiley KURTZ: No, because it's fascinating that the Kathleen
last summer by story -- this alleged groping incident was broken
president "Newsweek's" Michael Isikoff. But McCurry went to the
comment and and said; I'm going to deal with this by refusing to
it. In fact, he trying to embarrass the reporters and to not pursuing
editors at "The wouldn't talk about it at the briefing, he called
pressure Washington Post" and "Newsweek" basically tried to
follow the them not to run the story. Most of the press didn't
thanked Kathleen Willey story, and afterwards the president
popped back McCurry for his handling of it. Now, of course, it's
up because of the suit.

didn't want KING: Did McCurry as the president for the truth or
to know?

handle KURTZ: McCurry told the president how he was going to
his modus it. He didn't ask the president for the truth because
Office and say Mr. operendi is he doesn't want to go into the Oval
because he might President did you do this, that, the other thing,
responsibility to tell the get subpoenaed. He might feel then some
tell press what happened. He follows a don't ask, don't
philosophy, which is a very unusual posture for a

press secretary.

KING: You would think he would want to know. Ron Ziegler was perturbed in the Nixon era of not knowing. Before Lanny responds, David, did this information cause you -- Bob says Ms. Willey, according to Ed Bradley, is a very believable person -- caused you double-think?

BROCK: Not at all. Actually a daylight today just reinforces the thoughts I have been having for the past several month, Larry. Look, we have all gotten excited before. And I have been there -- about the next dramatic revelation and then we have seen in the days following that it gets murkier and murkier.

~~We saw that~~ with Monica Lewinsky, where we had predictions ~~that the president~~ would be gone within five days from a lot of well respected people in Washington. It didn't happen, and what I've learned, one thing I have learned in all of this is, these sex stories by their very nature are very difficult to prove.

I understand, you know, there are at least one witness disputing the Willey story. And I just have a question. You know, I mean, this is the kind of thing that I wonder if would have been on "60 Minutes" five years ago? It might have been in the spectator. I don't know. I am just concerned.

SCHIEFFER: Let me add that the president has flatly denied this. The president flatly denies that this took place. But I am just telling you what she told Ed Bradley in this...

KING: Lanny Davis, we hear now, the spin -- I am only kidding.

(LAUGHTER)

DAVIS: One person's facts are another person's spin.

KING: It's obviously -- ain't a plus story.

DAVIS: Let's first of all, be fair. And let's be factual. The president has spoken out about the Lewinsky story and made two categorical statements. There was no sexual relationship. And I never told anybody to lie. Now, those are the two legal issues, and he's categorically denied that.

KING: And he'll deny Willey.

DAVIS: Because other reporters, as wolf rightfully, asks, want him to go beyond that, that's their job. That's not someone who is in the crosshairs.

KING: He'll deny Kathleen Willey. He's told reporters, deny, deny, deny.

DAVIS: Secondly he's denied Willey and a witness -- friend of Willey's has also said she believes the story is not true. The second point -- I'll respond to what Sally said. We started out this story assuming this was going to be a catastrophic and that the American people were going to condemn President Clinton. All the journalists told me that in the first week of the story. People were talking impeachment and worse. The journalists were wrong. The American people had wisdom. They have wisdom now to presume President Clinton...

KING: What are they going to think of this if she's...

DAVIS: They're going to think that the decision of the CBS network to put this interview on is no different than the "National Enquirer" delving into issues that the American people don't think are relevant to get into involving the president of the United States.

KING: Seriously, Lanny, if you ran "60 Minutes" you would have turned down booking her?

DAVIS: I would have felt dirty to put this story on the air at this time?

KING: Sally, would you?

QUINN: First of all, when he said that the reporters were talking impeachment, don't forget the first person who brought that up was George Stephanopoulos.

DAVIS: Who claims to be now a reporter.

QUINN: Well, all right. If you want to call him a journalist, but the fact...

~~King~~ KING: If Ms. Willey said sit down with me for a style session, I'll tell you everything...

QUINN: I would say name the time.

KING: It is tabloid?

QUINN: Is it tabloid?

KING: Is he right?

QUINN: No I don't think so.

DAVIS: What is your definition of tabloid?

KING: Noting to do with the...

QUINN: What?

KING: Nothing to do with the...

QUINN: Sexual harassment. We're talking about sexual harassment. This is a legal issue.

BLITZER: This was a woman, Larry, who was a volunteer in the White House in 1993 whose husband was in financial straits. She went to the president and she asked for a paying job -- that day in 1993 when he invited her into the private study.

There's no dispute
that they had this meeting. The dispute is over what
happened.

Ironically, or sadly, or tragically later that day,
her husband killed
himself, having nothing to do with any of any this.

DAVIS: The American people reject the connection
between
alleged personal activities and the performance of
President
Clinton in office. That's why the polls are the way
they are. They're
not going

to change the because the American eastern people
have made a
judgment already that this is not relevant to public
performance.

BLITZER: She did get a paying job.

KING: This is not going to affect it?

QUINN: There's a big difference between somebody's
private sex
life and sexual harassment.

DAVIS: There is no evidence of sexual harassment
here. In fact
even Linda Tripp says the opposite. On national
television, Sally,
for you to use an expression when the president
denies it, Linda
Tripp said there was no evidence of sexual
harassment. For me to
everyone cite her makes me feel a little unclean. Be
careful about
that expression.

KING: Bob, Lanny says you're lowering your standards.
And
that's not your program but do you have a statement
about that?

SCHIEFFER: It's where I work. I would just ask Lanny,
what are
you suppose to do with stories like this? When a
woman says that
she sat down. She'd come into the office and asked
for help. And
she goes through an experience like this, she seems
to be a
credible woman.

DAVIS: I'll tell you what you do.

SCHIEFFER: She seems...

DAVIS: You put on the individual -- which camera am I
talk to?

You put on the individual also to provide some
balance who says
that Ms. Willey called her and asked her to back up a
story that
wasn't true. You put on some counter points as to
whether an issue
such as this is relevant to job performance, whether
the American
people believe the program ought to be on. You don't
just put an
interview without any counter point, without any
balance. When
CBS makes that judgment, it does it with the point of
view that this
is legitimate, and I seriously question that
judgment.

-- KING: All right.

SCHIEFFER: Let me just make one -- let me just point
out one
thing to Lanny.

KING: We're going to break after this then we will
get everybody
in and some phone calls in. Go ahead, bob.

SCHIEFFER: I want to say, we haven't put the program
on yet.

Lanny Davis doesn't know what is going to be in the
story. On the
CBS Evening News Tonight we had the president's
lawyer saying
it was untrue. We don't put on one-sided story and
Lanny Davis
knows better than that.

KING: We'll take a break, come back, include more
phone calls
with your comments on the subject that doesn't go
away: Monica.
We'll be right back.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: We want to include some phone calls, then get
back to this

free wheeling discussion. So let's try one. Caldwell,
Texas, hello.

CALLER: Yeah, thanks for taking my call, Larry. My
question is
for Howard.

KING: Yep.

CALLER: When they catch these spin masters in a lie,
why don't
the news people -- why don't they confront them right
on the spot?

KURTZ: Well...

KING: OK, Howard, you know someone is lying. Look at
them
and say you're lying. Thank you, sir.

KURTZ: In fact, there has been no shortage of
journalists beating
up on the administration about this or that. It's
usually not a lie. It's
usually an omission, shading of the truth, some semblance of the
spin game. In fact, I think the White House, the
president himself in
private conversations feels that the media have been
unfair in their
sort of prosecutorial approach.

KING: How would another woman know what happened
between two people behind closed doors on this Willey
matter?

KURTZ: Well, the story is that a good friend, former
good friend,
of Kathleen Willey, a woman by the name of Julie
Steele (ph), says
that several months ago, last year, when Michael
Isikoff of
"Newsweek" magazine was investigating the Kathleen
Willey story,
he approached Kathleen Willey. And Kathleen Willey
said I told
friends about it. And Kathleen Willey says that he
put Michael
Isikoff onto Julie Steele who was his friend. And
Julie Steele since
then has said through her lawyer in Richmond,
Virginia, that
Kathleen Willey asked her to lie about the whole
incident.

KING: For purpose...

KURTZ: ... to Michael Isikoff, to make it look like there was an incident when she said in fact there wasn't an incident. So I am sure, if I know "60 Minutes" and Don Hewitt and Ed Bradley, they'll have the whole Julie Steele aspect when it airs Sunday night.

KING: Greer, South Carolina, hello.

CALLER: Hello?

KING: Hi.

CALLER: Larry.

KING: Yeah, go ahead.

CALLER: Good evening. The question is for the whole panel: We hear about negative and spin and positive spin. How about neutral spin? Jim McDougal recently died in federal prison. Why no questions into his death? Is not a discussion of this described as neutral spin?

KING: All right, he had severe heart trouble. The question would be, why was he put -- David, do you know why he was put in solitary confinement, a white collar crime?

BROCK: I don't, Larry, but...

KING: You do know?

BLITZER: Yes, he refused to take an urine test.

KING: I know, but it's over 60, has terrible heart trouble.

BLITZER: He was 57.

KING: And he's in on a white-collar crime, you put him in solitary?

BLITZER: But the policy of that facility was if you refused to take

a urine, you go into solitary confinement.

put him KING: If he'd have had a heart attack, we would have right back in if he lived. Right?

BLITZER: Right.

KING: Does anyone have any suspicion, any Vance Foster carrying over into this death?

BROCK: Well, I have heard it, Larry. You know...

KING: You're kidding?

BROCK: Sure -- no. I mean, I got...

BLITZER: It's all over talk radio too.

KING: Oh, yeah, that's no surprise.

~~else on the~~
~~part of it. And I~~
~~some of these~~
~~about that,~~
Troopergate
were instigated by political enemies of the
president. I found in
Arkansas, you know, after I broke a story that I
thought was new
and exciting that a lot of these were old recycled
stories, never
proven. And today, as you know, the Paula Jones peo
ple released
some of their findings or spent a lot money, a lot of
time looking at
this. And what are they basically relying on? They're
relying on the
two Arkansas state troopers who talked to me five
years ago who
really don't have any proof of what they saw they
saw.

KING: Howie, we seem to be coming to the conclusion
that
everybody spins?

KURTZ: Well, that's probably true, but one difference
here in the

evolving spin cycle is that back when we were all talking about Charlie Trie and John Huang instead of Monica Lewinsky and Paula Jones, the administration, A, did try to some limit extent to put out information, and B, try with great success, which I think is part of the president's continued popularity to change the subject, to shift the focus of media focus to health care, education, things that they're convinced people care about.

In this current environment, it's very, very difficult to do that, even more difficult because shows like this all the time, night after night, are focusing on Monica Lewinsky, so it's harder to break through the static.

DAVIS: Let me go back to something David Brock says.

Remind all of you that 10 allegations without evidence equals zero. A lot of people in this ...

KING: It is a little like the duck looks like the duck.

DAVIS: A lot of people in this country believe that where there's smoke there's fire, that if you have constant headlines about scandal, there must be something there. I submit to you that the scandal press, this machine that's operated has created the impression that innuendo can be a surrogate for fact, that you can have charges about John Huang being a bad guy. You can have charges about people who haven't been convicted of anything, having done something wrong and an impression is left that there's actually evidence when there isn't.

KURTZ: Lanny, you seem to go a step further than I have ever heard you go in saying that the questions themselves now perhaps are illegitimate, that we shouldn't heard from

Kathleen Willey. Why
isn't her story illegitimate? Isn't that part of how
the public and the
media find out what's going on?

DAVIS: You're right. I draw the line on the issue of
the private
behavior of a president that doesn't affect job
performance. I
believe the Starr investigation has gone over that
line. I believe "60
Minutes" has gone over that line, that's my...

KING: Quickly though, Sally, will the women's
movement, will the
those on that side...

QUINN: What women's movement? Doesn't exist anymore.

KING: Will they support Miss Willey?

QUINN: I don't see how they can't at least give her
hearing as
they do so many other women who claim sexual
harassment.

KING: We'll be back with more and more phone calls
after this.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: Another quick call, Dallas, hello.

CALLER: Hi, Larry. My question is to Bob Schieffer.
Do they for
one second think how the public will see some of
these so-called
stories like the one they're probably going to run on
the Sunday on
"60 Minutes?" And secondly, do the press realize, and
when will
they realize, that no amount of steam is going to let
the people
back away from this president, especially relating to
all of these
sexual allegations?

KING: In other words, Bob, no matter what you do,
they like
them.

SCHIEFFER: Well, I'll tell you what I believe. I
believe that no
matter what you do, in the end, the truth generally

comes out. That
has been my experience through all of these years in
Washington. I
have seen the spinners come and I have seen the
spinners go. I
have seen them get very sophisticated. I remember
Watergate
when we were told it was just a third rate burglary.
I remember all
the time when we were told that people were too smart
to get
themselves into the situations they got in. In the
end, it all pretty
much came out right.

KING: But have you ever seen a president like this
one?

SCHIEFFER: He is very, very popular. And he is a very
good
politician. I would also say I think he's done some
very good
things, but I agree with something Sally Quinn said
at beginning of
the program. The American people are good people.
They want to
give their president the benefit of the doubt. They
don't want to
believe bad things about the president. They'll go
with the president
until the very end. I have to interest in what the
president does in
his private life, but if it becomes known somewhere
down the line
that the president has lied to the American people --
I don't know
he has or not -- if that becomes known, then the
president will be
in trouble. The rest of it I think is just detail.

KING: Let's get a quick opinion from everyone. David,
do you
think we will learn the whole story as Bob just said?

BROCK: Oh, absolutely.

KING: We will?

BROCK: Yeah, we'll learn it all, sure.

KING: Wolf?

BLITZER: Yes, I do believe we will.

KING: Sally?

QUINN: Absolutely. You know, I want to ask...

KING: I want to get Howard's point in. Will we?

KURTZ: I think there's the possibility this will remain a he said-she said. There'll be certain thing about the relationship between the president and the intern that will not fully be resolved.

KING: Now quickly, Sally.

QUINN: I want to ask Lanny, the one thing I don't get is how all the people who work in the White House can stand sitting there and not knowing and not ask the president what really happened?

KING: How can they not ask the president?

Post" QUINN: I just think if it were in "The Washington newsroom, and someday, if your boss was accused...

KING: Or CNN! Wolf Blitzer -- I would say, Wolf, what happened?

QUINN: ... and the entire newsroom would be in there to stand up for demanding, if I am going to be loyal and if I'm going you day after day after day, how is it...

KING: I give you credit...

QUINN: I don't want to beat up on Lanny, but how can you not ask and how can you not want to know and how can you allow yourself to go out and defend and defend and defend, when you don't know the truth?

DAVIS: That's a great question. Sally, there are two answers, one is very personal and one would be more what you call spin. The personal is fear that Ken Starr is going to drag you before a grand jury inappropriately as he did with Sidney Blumenthal and that your

life with legal fees and perhaps worse is at risk.
The second point
is, that at this point in time, given this process, P
resident Clinton is
acting no differently than any other citizen. We say
to him, you're
not above the law. He shouldn't be below the law. To
answer your
question, Larry, I think the truth will come out. I
think President
Clinton wants to be able to tell his story. When Ken
Starr ends this
obsession and ends this endless obsession to bring
Bill Clinton
down, I think we'll hear the full story.

KING: We'll be back with our remaining moments. Get
another
call too right after this.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: One more quick call and then a wind up session
with our
guests: Peoria, Illinois, hello.

CALLER: Hello.

KING: Hi.

CALLER: Don't you all want to know how it plays in
Peoria,
Illinois?

KING: How does it play in Peoria?

CALLER: It's the media putting a spin on it. The
president has
answered the question. He had no sexual relationship
with Monica
Lewinsky.

KING: Are you going to watch "60 Minutes" Sunday
night,
ma'am?

CALLER: I always watch "60 Minutes," so I'll have to
be bored
with another female acting like she had sex with the
president.

KING: In other words, if a hundred females came
forward, you
would believe none of them?

CALLER: In the whole cosmic scheme of things, if all
hundred of
them had sex with the president, it -- this is going
to keep good
people from running for president. Who wants to be in
office when
you take these kind of attacks?

KING: OK, now, thank you. That's a great close here.

Peoria, Howie, the summation of conservative, heart
of -- will it
play in Peoria? They are for the president if we're
going by this
lady. And they are if we're going by polls.

KURTZ: There's a lot of anger here at the me media
here, which
some of my colleagues underestimate the extent that
they think
we're too obsessed and too focused on this. The White
House
understands this.

KING: and plays to it.

KURTZ: And plays to it. That's one of the reasons
-that the White
House has been able to play the spin cycle games all
effectively.

KING: Sally, does it upset you that Peoria is mad at
"60 Minutes?"

QUINN: No. This is what we do. Our job is to bring
the truth to
the people. And there's only one person, by the way,
who is
responsible for this story. And he is sitting in the
White House.

KING: Wolf?

BLITZER: I think that the caller underscores the
point I was
making earlier, if the president had come clean right
away as bad
as it was, simply said here's the truth, the country
would have
accepted it. He would have gone on. This story
probably would
have been over by now. The cover-up is always worse
than the

original sin.

KING: David, what do you make of Peoria?

BROCK: Well, you know, Larry, I live in Washington,
but I think

I am a little more in sync with Peoria tonight than
what I am hearing
from Washington. That's one of the things I have
learned. And I
just have to say there's a lot more at work here.
We're going to
see hopefully the press look into some of it as to
the origins of
some of these stories. I think there is a lot more at
work than
simply it all being on Bill Clinton.

KING: You come from the wing where it might have come
from?

BROCK: I do. Yeah. I talk about this at length in my
"Esquire"
piece.

KING: Bob, what do you make of Peoria?

SCHIEFFER: Well, I don't know. Peoria is Peoria. I
think what's
going to happen in this case is that I think,
eventually, Ken Starr is
going to turn some of this information over to the
house. I don't
think there is going to be an impeachment hearing,
but I think there
will be some sort of inquiry. We'll see some of this
put on the
record. I think you may see Monica Lewinsky and maybe
Kathleen Willey subpoenaed and sitting at a table
being questioned
and telling what they know about all of this. My
guess is you'll also
hear some of those tapes.

KING: Everyone at the White House watch that Sunday?

DAVIS: First I would like to thank my wife for call
in from Peoria.

(LAUGHTER)

I think that I would like again go back to something
that Sally has
said. The press tries to do its job. Its job is to

report facts at the
White House. And others don't give the press facts, then they
won't do their job. And that's what we try to do. But
one point, if
the press uses facts and then tries to connect them
with innuendo
to suggest wrongdoing, that's when they get beyond
the facts. I
think they have done this on this Lewinsky story.
They have to pull
back and stick with the facts.

KING: We only have 30 seconds. One other fascinating
thing in
your book among many is Dick Morris was able to spin
in "The
New York Times" guys so much. He knew the questions
the
"Times" is going to ask the president, right?

KURTZ: Well, Dick Morris helped to arrange the
interview with
the president for "New York Times" reporters. He
chatted with
the reporter. He then told the president reporter
probably going to
ask X, Y and Z. The reporter wasn't displeased with
the way it
came out, but it was in Morris' view another triumph
of that spin
game.

KING: Would that be to his credit or to detriment as
you see it?

KURTZ: As I see it, it's manipulative. As he sees it,
it's good
public relations.

KING: Thank you all very much. Fascinating
discussion. We'll
have them back. Once again it's attack Lanny night.
But if you
were to tell him three years ago, your best friend in
this, this's going
to David Brock, Lanny would do flips.

(LAUGHTER)

Tomorrow night, we'll repeat our interview with Eric
Clapton.
Good night.

END

Message Sent

To:

Michelle Crisci/WHO/EOP
-Brenda M. Anders/WHO/EOP
gamble-bennett @ dol.gov @ inet
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP
Jonathan Murchinson/WHO/EOP
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP
Jake Siewert/OPD/EOP
Jordan Tamagni/WHO/EOP
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP
Brian D. Smith/WHO/EOP
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP
Julianne B. Corbett/WHO/EOP
Jeffrey M. Smith/OSTP/EOP
Lowell A. Weiss/WHO/EOP
Estela Mendoza/WHO/EOP
Jonathan A. Kaplan/OPD/EOP
Jonathan Orszag/OPD/EOP
Thurgood-Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP
Kara Gerhardt/WHO/EOP
Elisabeth Steele/WHO/EOP
Jennifer Ferguson/OMB/EOP
Mark D. Neschis/WHO/EOP
Eleanor S. Parker/WHO/EOP
Matthew I. Fraidin/OVP @ OVP
David K. Chai/PIR/EOP
Ruby Shamir/WHO/EOP
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP
Amy W. Tobe/WHO/EOP
David S. Beaubaire/WHO/EOP
Lisa J. Levin/WHO/EOP
Peter A. Weissman/OPD/EOP
William A. Halter/OMB/EOP
Eli G. Attie/OVP @ OVP
Patricia M. Ewing/OVP @ OVP
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP
Jonathan E. Smith/WHO/EOP
Miriam H. Vogel/WHO/EOP
Lori L. Anderson/WHO/EOP
Darby E. Stott/WHO/EOP
Joshua Silverman/WHO/EOP
Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP
Michael Waldman/WHO/EOP
Gene B. Sperling/OPD/EOP
Rahm I. Emanuel/WHO/EOP
Paul K. Engskov/WHO/EOP

Virginia M. Terzano/OVP @ OVP
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP
Jason S. Goldberg/WHO/EOP
Jeremy M. Gaines/WHO/EOP
Julie E. Mason/WHO/EOP
Steven A. Cohen/WHO/EOP
Russell W. Horwitz/OPD/EOP
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP
Jill M. Blickstein/OMB/EOP
Daniel J. Gunia/OA/EOP
Karen E. Finney/WHO/EOP
Alison Muscatine/WHO/EOP
Gordon Li/WHO/EOP
Terri J. Tingen/WHO/EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:27-MAR-1998 10:54:53.00

SUBJECT: NC6481: Navy ordered to reinstate McVeigh

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marjorie Tarmey (CN=Marjorie Tarmey/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP on 03/27/98

10:53 AM -----

rwockner @ netcom.com
03/27/98 01:31:00 AM
Record Type: Record

To: Stuart D. Rosenstein, Richard Socarides
cc:
Subject: NC6481: Navy ordered to reinstate McVeigh

* Reprint rights for this copyrighted news article must be obtained *
* ---> by you <--- from the originating news organization. *

Navy Ordered To Reinstate Officer

.c The Associated Press

By LAURA MYERS

WASHINGTON (AP) - A federal judge told the Navy on Thursday to comply with his order reinstating a chief petty officer who successfully fought dismissal from the military over allegations of homosexuality.

U.S. District Court Judge Stanley Sporkin said the Navy should return Timothy R. McVeigh to his old status as the top enlisted man on a nuclear attack submarine rather than give him only clerical jobs.

Setting a June 1 hearing, Sporkin gave the Navy two months to comply with his January order in the case in which he said the Navy wrongly enforced the Pentagon's "don't ask, don't tell" policy on gays in the military.

Christopher Wolf, McVeigh's attorney, accused the Navy of "dragging its feet" and purposely keeping the decorated 17-year veteran from returning to his former duties that would let him advance his career.

"He used to be in the chief of boat position," Wolf said after the court hearing Thursday. In that job, McVeigh managed the day-to-day activities of a nuclear attack submarine, the USS Chicago. "And now he's stuck with clerical duties."

Justice Department attorney David Glass, representing the government, told the judge one chief of boat position had opened up recently, but McVeigh wasn't deemed the best candidate. The judge ordered the Navy to justify its decision by May 1.

Glass refused to comment after the court hearing.

Joe Krovisky, a Justice spokesman, said the government intends to fully reinstate McVeigh.

"He just didn't qualify for this particular chief of boat position,"

Krovisky said. ``The Navy felt someone else would do a better job."

McVeigh, who is not related to the Oklahoma City bomber, was dismissed in December on charges he is homosexual and engaged in sodomy.

The 36-year-old, stationed at Pearl Harbor in Hawaii, has not commented on his sexuality.

Pentagon policy allows dismissal of someone who discloses he's gay, but the military cannot raise the issue without sufficient cause.

Sporkin said the Navy went too far in investigating McVeigh, who was linked to an anonymous America Online Inc. computer profile page that suggested he had a sexual interest in young men. The judge also said the Navy violated the 1986 Electronic Communications Privacy Act by obtaining confidential information about McVeigh from AOL without a warrant or court order.

The Navy is appealing, while McVeigh is pursuing a lawsuit against the military, seeking unspecified damages.

AP=NY-03-26-98 1412EST

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

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #22921)
id <01IV5FA3IXQO000MCA@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Fri, 27 Mar 1998 05:53:56 EST

Received: from Storm.EOP.GOV by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #22921)
with ESMTP id <01IV5F9ZFULS000NCH@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Fri,
27 Mar 1998 05:53:51 -0500 (EST)

Received: from netcom9.netcom.com ([192.100.81.119])
by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-10 #22921)
with ESMTP id <01IV5F7RCGUK000051@STORM.EOP.GOV>; Fri,
27 Mar 1998 05:52:04 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from rwockner@localhost)
by netcom9.netcom.com (8.8.5-r-beta/8.8.5/(NETCOM v1.02)) id WAA29688; Thu,
26 Mar 1998 22:31:11 -0800 (PST)

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