

Pentagon officials disputed the findings. They said that a 1997 directive instructing commanders to investigate any anti-gay threats--the directive that SLDN says has yet to be passed down to field officers--remains in effect. They also said a year-long Pentagon review, completed last April, concluded that the policy on homosexuals was being properly applied and enforced.

Under the policy, which was painstakingly negotiated among administration officials, lawmakers and military leaders in 1993, the Pentagon agreed to stop searching out gays, provided they keep their sexual orientation private. Being homosexual is no longer a bar to military service, but admitting it or engaging in homosexual activity still brings expulsion.

The policy was a compromise between President Clinton's 1992 campaign pledge to eliminate the mandatory discharge of gays and resistance by the military and Congress to allowing homosexuals to serve freely.

According to the Pentagon's own count, discharges of gay service members have continued to climb since introduction of the policy, from 617 in 1994 to 1,145 last year--a jump of 86 percent.

Defense officials have said the vast majority of the discharges involved service members coming forward voluntarily to profess their homosexuality, automatically triggering their departure from military service. Officials also have suggested that some of the troops may be taking advantage of the policy to find an easy exit from the military.

But the SLDN report makes the case that many of those leaving are being compelled to go by persistent taunts or other abusive behavior that military leaders have allowed to go uncorrected. It argues that service members can do little to combat the harassment, since reporting it often has brought more of the same, and even has prompted investigations into the sexual orientation of those being harassed.

"It has become an acceptable part of military culture to pick on and demean suspected gay service members and no one is held accountable for those actions," said Jill Szymanski, a 12-year Navy veteran who resigned last August as a lieutenant commander. She was one of four former military members who appeared at a SLDN news conference yesterday to relate personal experiences.

In its report, SLDN added that the news "is not all bad." It said physical abuse by military investigators has declined. Mass investigations have waned. And criminal prosecutions of homosexual service members have decreased. ===== 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 #29131)
id <01J8XW14KPE8000N3H@PMDf.EOP.GOV> for Socarides_R@a1.eop.gov; Wed,
17 Mar 1999 15:06:00 EST

Received: from storm.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
with ESMTP id <01J8XW130FXS000NTY@PMDf.EOP.GOV> for Socarides_R@a1.eop.gov;
Wed, 17 Mar 1999 15:05:58 -0500 (EST)

Received: from netcom14.netcom.com ([192.100.81.126])
by EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.2-29 #34437) with ESMTP id <01J8XW0HH6F00003UD@EOP.GOV>
for Socarides_R@a1.eop.gov; Wed, 17 Mar 1999 15:05:28 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from rwockner@localhost)
by netcom14.netcom.com (8.8.5-r-beta/8.8.5/(NETCOM v1.02)) id MAA04410; Wed,
17 Mar 1999 12:04:30 -0800 (PST)

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)

CREATOR: Elizabeth R. Newman@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 22:20:00.00

SUBJECT: press conference table of contents

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

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

TO: SUNTUM_M (SUNTUM_M@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:18-MAR-1999 11:03:49.35

TO: OLCOTT_E (OLCOTT_E@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:18-MAR-1999 08:44:07.36

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

TO: Barry J. Toiv (Barry J. Toiv@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Dag Vega (Dag Vega@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Anne M. Edwards (Anne M. Edwards@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Brenda M. Anders (Brenda M. Anders@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Megan C. Moloney (Megan C. Moloney@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman (Elizabeth R. Newman@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Julia M. Payne (Julia M. Payne@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Julianne B. Corbett (Julianne B. Corbett@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Mark D. Neschis (Mark D. Neschis@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Nanda Chitre (Nanda Chitre@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: James M. Teague (James M. Teague@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Beverly J. Barnes (Beverly J. Barnes@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Mark A. Kitchens (Mark A. Kitchens@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jason H. Schechter (Jason H. Schechter@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Julie E. Mason (Julie E. Mason@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Dorinda A. Salcido (Dorinda A. Salcido@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sheyda Jahanbani (Sheyda Jahanbani@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jennifer M. Palmieri (Jennifer M. Palmieri@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Julie B. Goldberg (Julie B. Goldberg@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sarah E. Gegenheimer (Sarah E. Gegenheimer@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: David C. Leavy (David C. Leavy@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Heather M. Riley (Heather M. Riley@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Amy Weiss (Amy Weiss@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Susanna B. McGuire (Susanna B. McGuire@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Victoria L. Valentine (Victoria L. Valentine@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Michael A. Hammer (Michael A. Hammer@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Richard L. Siewert (Richard L. Siewert@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:

Message Creation Date was at 17-MAR-1999 22:17:00

Press Conference
March 19, 1999

Subject Tab
Domestic
Education
Gays in the Military
Gun Lawsuits/Legislation
Hormel Nomination
IOC
Medical Marijuana
Medicare
Passenger Bill of Rights
Patients , Bill of Rights
Police Integrity
Tobacco

Economic
Africa Trade
Budget/Social Security
Financial Services Modernization
Steel
Supplemental - to be forwarded
WTO - Bananas
WTO - China

Environmental
Climate Change
Liveability
Vehicle Emissions

Counsel

Foreign
To be forwarded separately

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:17-MAR-1999 22:24:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:D

TEXT:
The following attachments were included with this message:

TYPE : FILE
NAME : PC0319.WPD

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

===== ATTACHMENT 2 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:17-MAR-1999 22:24:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:p

ATT SUBJECT: PC0319.WPD

TEXT:

Unable to convert OA\$SHARA1431:ZXVJW0CNC.WPC to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

===== END ATTACHMENT 2 =====

**Press Conference
March 19, 1999**

Subject **Tab**

Domestic
Education
Gays in the Military
Gun Lawsuits/Legislation
Hormel Nomination
IOC
Medical Marijuana
Medicare
Passenger Bill of Rights
Patients' Bill of Rights
Police Integrity
Tobacco

Economic
Africa Trade
Budget/Social Security
Financial Services Modernization
Steel
Supplemental - to be forwarded
WTO - Bananas
WTO - China

Environmental
Climate Change
Liveability
Vehicle Emissions

Counsel

Foreign
To be forwarded separately

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 11:20:44.00

SUBJECT: NC9745: SLDN action alert

TO: Philip G Dufour (CN=Philip G Dufour/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Elizabeth J. Potter (CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Ron Klain (CN=Ron Klain/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

Jeff Trammell (Jeff Trammell [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

See below; you all are one of the subjects of the "mobilization." This continues to be a serious problem.

----- Forwarded by Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP on 03/17/99
11:18 AM -----

rwockner @ netcom.com
03/16/99 08:26:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Richard Socarides
cc:
Subject: NC9745: SLDN action alert

From SLDN

Date: Tue, 16 Mar 1999 17:00:09 EST
From: SLDNACTION@aol.com

Action Alert: Reports of Anti-Gay Harassment More than Doubled over Last Year.

Please write your local papers and contact government leaders (listed below) about the soaring gay harassment in the United States military.

Servicemembers Legal Defense Network (SLDN) released its Fifth Annual Report: Conduct Unbecoming, on March 15, 1999. The report finds that service members experience daily threats and harassment, including comments such as, "You'd better not be queer because in the Navy we kill our fags;" "That dyke is going to fry;" and "There's nothing to do in Sasebo unless you are a homo killer," a chilling reference to the murder of gay sailor Allen Schindler in 1992 by shipmates in Sasebo, Japan. These are just a few examples from SLDN's cases in the past year.

In your letter, please consider the following points:

H Anti-Gay Harassment More Than Doubles. SLDN documented 400 incidents of anti-gay harassment, including death threats and verbal gay-bashing. Anti-gay harassment surged 120% over the 182 violations documented in 1997.

H Reports of Asking and Pursuit Increases for Fifth Year. SLDN documented 511 incidents where service members were asked and pursued for being, or being perceived as, lesbian, gay or bisexual, up from 359 such violations in 1997.

H Pentagon Refuses to Distribute Guidance on Investigative Limits. Five years into "Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue," the Pentagon has refused to promulgate guidance on the policy's investigative limits intended to protect service members' privacy and get commanders to back off.

H Pentagon Fails to Distribute Guidance on Anti-Gay Harassment. SLDN documented in 1997 that the services failed to distribute the "Dorn memo" instructing commanders to investigate those who harass, not those who report it. In April 1998, DoD recommended reissuing the memo with a specific prohibition on harassment. The Pentagon continues to promise that it will distribute this guidance.

Please write to:

The Honorable Albert Gore
Vice-President, United States of America
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20500
(202)456-1111

The Honorable William S. Cohen
Secretary of Defense
1000 Defense Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301-1000
<http://www.defenselink.mil/faq/comment.html>
(703) 695-5261

General Henry H. Shelton
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff
9999 Defense Pentagon
Washington, DC 20318-9999

PublicAffairs@js.pentagon.mil
(703) 697-9121

The staff of SLDN and all of our service members thank you for your
continued
support and efforts!

===== 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 #29131)
id <01J8WSZ8ATGW000C6F@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for Socarides_R@a1.eop.gov; Tue,
16 Mar 1999 20:28:10 EST

Received: from storm.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
with ESMTP id <01J8WSZ0M24G0004GS@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for Socarides_R@a1.eop.gov;
Tue, 16 Mar 1999 20:28:01 -0500 (EST)

Received: from netcom2.netcom.com ([192.100.81.108])
by EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.2-29 #34437) with ESMTP id <01J8WSYG0E1W0001JR@EOP.GOV>
for Socarides_R@a1.eop.gov; Tue, 16 Mar 1999 20:27:31 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from rwockner@localhost)
by netcom2.netcom.com (8.8.5-r-beta/8.8.5/(NETCOM v1.02)) id RAA28456; Tue,
16 Mar 1999 17:26:11 -0800 (PST)

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 18:39:00.00

SUBJECT: for weekly

TO: Victoria A. Lynch (CN=Victoria A. Lynch/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Report on alleged anti-gay harassment in the military. The Servicemembers Legal Defense Network (SLDN) released its fifth annual report on don't ask, don't tell last Monday. The report alleges that gay service members experience daily threats and harassment, including comments such as, "You'd better not be queer because in the Navy we kill our fags;" and "That dyke is going to fry." SLDN cites 400 incidents of anti-gay harassment last year and claims these incidents have surged 120% over the 182 violations documented in 1997.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Doug.Case@sdsu.edu@INET@LNGTWY (Doug.Case@sdsu.edu@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:18-MAR-1999 05:41:41.00

SUBJECT: Military disputes SLDN's report of intimidation

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

WASHINGTON POST, March 16, 1999

Washington, D.C., USA

Military Still Said to Harass Gays

Pentagon Disputes Legal Group's Report of Intimidation

By Bradley Graham, Washington Post Staff Writer

A legal group that represents gay men and women in the military accused the Pentagon yesterday of doing little to stop harassment against homosexuals, saying a climate of intolerance and hostility is driving more gay service members to abandon the military.

Issuing its fifth annual assessment of the effectiveness of the Clinton administration's "don't ask, don't tell" policy, the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network (SLDN) said it had documented 400 reports of anti-gay harassment in the ranks last year, more than double the 182 cases found the year before.

Reports of military officials improperly asking service members about their sexual orientation or wrongly conducting inquiries into the sex lives of suspected homosexuals also rose from 583 to 934, the group said.

"These violations are due to a lack of leadership," SLDN concluded in an 85-page review. "Military leaders have refused to send guidance to the field explaining the explicit investigative limits" under the administration's policy. They also "have held no one accountable for asking, pursuits or harassment."

Pentagon officials disputed the findings. They said that a 1997 directive instructing commanders to investigate any anti-gay threats--the directive that SLDN says has yet to be passed down to field officers--remains in effect. They also said a year-long Pentagon review, completed last April, concluded that the policy on homosexuals was being properly applied and enforced.

Under the policy, which was painstakingly negotiated among administration officials, lawmakers and military leaders in 1993, the Pentagon agreed to stop searching out gays, provided they keep their sexual orientation private. Being homosexual is no longer a bar to military service, but admitting it or engaging in homosexual activity still brings expulsion.

The policy was a compromise between President Clinton's 1992 campaign pledge to eliminate the mandatory discharge of gays and resistance by the military and Congress to allowing homosexuals to serve

freely.

According to the Pentagon's own count, discharges of gay service members have continued to climb since introduction of the policy, from 617 in 1994 to 1,145 last year--a jump of 86 percent.

Defense officials have said the vast majority of the discharges involved service members coming forward voluntarily to profess their homosexuality, automatically triggering their departure from military service. Officials also have suggested that some of the troops may be taking advantage of the policy to find an easy exit from the military.

But the SLDN report makes the case that many of those leaving are being compelled to go by persistent taunts or other abusive behavior that military leaders have allowed to go uncorrected. It argues that service members can do little to combat the harassment, since reporting it often has brought more of the same, and even has prompted investigations into the sexual orientation of those being harassed.

"It has become an acceptable part of military culture to pick on and demean suspected gay service members and no one is held accountable for those actions," said Jill Szymanski, a 12-year Navy veteran who resigned last August as a lieutenant commander. She was one of four former military members who appeared at a SLDN news conference yesterday to relate personal experiences.

In its report, SLDN added that the news "is not all bad." It said physical abuse by military investigators has declined. Mass investigations have waned. And criminal prosecutions of homosexual service members have decreased.

This message has been distributed as a free, nonprofit informational service, to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving this information for non-profit research and educational purposes only. 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 #29131)
id <01J8YIEWQZ8W000S7J@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Thu, 18 Mar 1999 01:47:01 EST

Received: from storm.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
with ESMTP id <01J8YIEUIC34000ULA@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Thu,
18 Mar 1999 01:46:59 -0500 (EST)

Received: from mail.sdsu.edu ([130.191.25.1]) by EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.2-29 #34437)

with ESMTP id <01J8YIED5OQI00055W@EOP.GOV>; Thu,
18 Mar 1999 01:46:35 -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 WAA07440; Wed,
17 Mar 1999 22:46:02 -0800 (PST)

X-Sender: dcase@mail.sdsu.edu

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-MAR-1999 08:44:27.00

SUBJECT: for weekly -- please use this one

TO: Victoria A. Lynch (CN=Victoria A. Lynch/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I have revised this

----- Forwarded by Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP on 03/19/99
08:37 AM -----

Richard Socarides 03/17/99 06:37:57 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Victoria A. Lynch/WHO/EOP

cc:

Subject: for weekly

Report on alleged anti-gay harassment in the military. The Servicemembers Legal Defense Network (SLDN) released its fifth annual report on don't ask, don't tell last Monday. The report alleges that gay service members experience daily threats and harassment, including comments such as, "You'd better not be queer because in the Navy we kill our fags;" and "That dyke is going to fry." SLDN cites 400 incidents of anti-gay harassment last year and claims these incidents have surged 120% over the 182 violations documented in 1997. There is a widespread sense that the civilian leadership at DOD has ignored serious problems with the implementation of don't ask, don't tell and many of your supporters are urging you to speak privately with Secretary Cohen and ask him show some leadership on this issue internally.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Simon Rosenberg (Simon Rosenberg [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:22-MAR-1999 14:34:49.00

SUBJECT: an important article

TO: Marsha Scott (CN=Marsha Scott/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Marsha, just wanted to send this to you - it echoes some of the things we discussed...I'm not sure any one in our world would disagree with this analysis, nor would you I expect...Simon

Clinton's Reversion to Old Tactics Doesn't Bode Well for
Democrats

The president is once again worrying more about mollifying
his party than identifying it with the cause of reform.
By RONALD BROWNSTEIN, Washington Outlook

It's beginning to look as if George Stephanopoulos bailed out too soon. Not that he needed a grueling year of defending President Clinton from Monica revelations and impeachment. But at the end of that harrowing road, Clinton is moving back toward the strategy of deferring to congressional Democrats that Stephanopoulos always supported--with disastrous results. Not that you'd get much sense of that from Stephanopoulos' alternately engaging and superficial memoir, "All Too Human." Gracefully written, frequently self-critical and mostly generous in spirit, the book is extremely insightful about the strain of working in the modern White House. It's moderately insightful about Clinton's personality. (For all the furor about the author's alleged betrayal of Oval Office secrets, the president remains a surprisingly distant figure, possibly because by mid-1993 Stephanopoulos already felt exiled from his inner circle.)

But the book is virtually without insight about which of Clinton's policy and political choices worked--and which didn't. Which is too bad, because Clinton is drifting again into the fundamental mistakes that derailed his first two years--when he followed the advice of old-line Democrats like Stephanopoulos. Although he never owns up in the book, Stephanopoulos was a principal advocate of the legislative strategy that Clinton employed when he arrived in Washington. Convinced that Jimmy Carter had failed because he didn't court his party's congressional leaders, Stephanopoulos and

like-minded advisors pressed Clinton to accommodate rather than challenge Capitol Hill Democrats. The problem was that the congressional Democratic leadership--especially in the House--wasn't ready for the centrist reforms that Clinton promised in his 1992 campaign. House Democratic leaders--usually supported by Stephanopoulos and other White House liberals--resisted spending cuts in Clinton's initial budget (which pushed him to raise taxes more than he otherwise might); shelved campaign finance reform proposals that they thought would dilute their financial advantage; discouraged him from pursuing welfare reform (for fear of dividing Democrats); and accepted liberal amendments that poisoned Clinton's crime bill. All these decisions alienated swing voters--and fueled the GOP landslide in 1994. Clinton contributed to the disaster with his own missteps (gays in the military, an overreaching health care plan and shifting signals on taxes during the 1993 budget fight). But the president at least recognized the need to change course after 1994.

Whether through conviction--or a primal desire for survival manipulated by his ruffled Svengali, Dick Morris--Clinton learned a critical lesson after the deluge: If Democrats didn't take the lead on reforming government, they would leave open the door for Republicans to pursue much more sweeping reductions in Washington's role. As the book makes clear, Stephanopoulos never accepted that lesson. He staunchly opposed Clinton's call for a balanced budget in 1995--even though that decision allowed Clinton to shift the debate from whether to eliminate the deficit to how to eliminate it, and proved the turning point in his presidency. (At least, in the book, Stephanopoulos acknowledges that Clinton had a point.) More tellingly, Stephanopoulos criticizes Clinton for signing the GOP-drafted welfare reform bill in 1996--without ever acknowledging that if he and other liberals had supported reform while Democrats controlled Congress, they could have drafted a bill much more to their liking.

Ironically, even as Stephanopoulos is rehashing the left's case against Clinton, the president is now reverting to old habits. As if Stephanopoulos was still whispering into his ear, Clinton is once again worrying more about mollifying his party than identifying it with the cause of reform. The picture, as always with Clinton, isn't entirely black and white. The president is still challenging Democratic orthodoxy with an education reform package that demands tough accountability measures on local school districts--such as new teacher testing and an end to social promotion. But on Social Security and Medicare, his biggest decisions, he's ducking. Clinton has proposed to devote three-fourths of the federal budget surplus to Social Security and Medicare without demanding any specific cost-cutting reforms in return; to the contrary, last week Clinton pulled the rug out from under centrist Sen. John B. Breaux (D-La.), who was trying to push a reform plan through his bipartisan Medicare advisory committee. Breaux's plan to subject Medicare to greater market competition needs more work, but it offered a reasonable starting point for debate. Instead, his commission collapsed in deadlock, and the prospects for Medicare reform before 2000 are

flickering.

Short-run, this party-first political strategy keeps Clinton on the right side of Democratic legislators cool to entitlement reform and still unhappy about having to defend him from impeachment. It's also helping Vice President Al Gore minimize opposition on the left for his presidential bid in 2000--as symbolized by the endorsement he received last week from House Minority Leader Richard A. Gephardt (D-Mo.). Yet one overarching lesson of Clinton's presidency is that he cannot reinvigorate his party unless he's willing to accept internal conflict. For Clinton and Gore, resisting entitlement reform poses at least some political danger--in that it might help Republicans portray them in 2000 as big-spending defenders of an untenable status quo.

The larger risk is the one that Stephanopoulos and his allies missed on welfare: that if Democrats don't reform these programs today, they could cede the initiative for redesigning them to the GOP tomorrow.

In the book, Stephanopoulos says he left the White House partly because he believed Clinton's second term would be "complacent." In many ways (even leaving aside the obvious turmoil of impeachment) he was wrong. Working with

congressional Democrats, Clinton has been able to pack more activism (on initiatives such as expanding health care for uninsured children) into a balanced budget than the left expected. The complacency that threatens Clinton isn't the lack of new spending that Stephanopoulos feared; it's the reluctance to modernize core pillars of the welfare state that his former advisor would probably cheer.

Simon Rosenberg
New Democrat Network
(202) 544-9200
(202) 547-2929 fax

for the latest on the New Democrats, visit www.newdem.org

- att1.htm===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

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

TEXT:

Marsha, just wanted to send this to

you - it echoes some of the things we discussed...I'm not sure any one in our

world would disagree with this analysis, nor would you I expect...Simon

Clinton's Reversion to Old Tactics Doesn't Bode Well for

Democrats

The president is once again worrying more about mollifying
his party
than identifying it with the cause of reform.

&nb

sp;
By RONALD BROWNSTEIN, Washington
Outlook

&n

bsp;

It's beginning to look as if George Stephanopoulos bailed out too

soon. Not
that he needed a grueling year of defending
President Clinton

from Monica revelations and impeachment. But at the end of
that harrowing
road, Clinton is moving back toward the strategy of deferring
to
congressional Democrats that Stephanopoulos always supported--with
disastrou

s
results. Not that you'd get much sense of that from
Stephanopoulos'
alternately engaging and superficial memoir, "All
Too
Human."
Gracefully written, frequently self-critical and mostly

generous in spirit,
the book is extremely insightful about the strain of
working in the modern
White House. It's moderately insightful about Clinton'
s
personality. (For
all the furor about the author's alleged betrayal of Oval

Office secrets,
the president remains a surprisingly distant figure, possibl
y
because by

mid-1993 Stephanopoulos already felt exiled from his inner circle.)

&nb
sp; &nbs
p;

But the book is virtually without insight about which of Clinton's policy and political choices worked--and which didn't. Which is too bad, because Clinton is drifting again into the fundamental mistakes that derailed his first two years--when he followed the advice of old-line Democrats like Stephanopoulos. Although he never owns up in the book, Stephanopoulos was a principal advocate of the legislative strategy that Clinton employed when he arrived in Washington. Convinced that Jimmy Carter had failed because he didn't court his party's congressional leaders, Stephanopoulos and like-minded advisors pressed Clinton to accommodate rather than challenge Capitol Hill Democrats. The problem was that the congressional Democratic leadership--especially in the House--wasn't ready for the centrist reforms that Clinton promised in his 1992 campaign. House Democratic leaders--usually supported by Stephanopoulos and other White House liberals--resisted spending cuts in Clinton's initial budget (which pushed him to raise taxes more than he otherwise might); shelved campaign finance reform proposals that they thought would dilute their financial advantage; discouraged him from pursuing welfare reform (for fear of dividing Democrats); and accepted liberal amendments that poisoned Clinton's crime bill. All these decisions alienated swing voters--and fueled the GOP landslide in 1994. Clinton contributed to the disaster with his own missteps (gays in the military, an overreaching health care plan and

shifting signals on taxes during the 1993 budget fight). But the president at least recognized the need to change course after 1994.

Whether through conviction--or a primal desire for survival manipulated

by his rumpled Svengali, Dick Morris--Clinton learned a critical lesson after the deluge: If Democrats didn't take the lead on reforming government,

they would leave open the door for Republicans to pursue much more sweeping reductions in Washington's role. As the book makes clear, Stephanopoulos never accepted that lesson. He staunchly opposed Clinton's call for a balanced budget in 1995--even though that decision allowed Clinton to shift the debate from whether to eliminate the deficit to how to eliminate it, and proved the turning point in his presidency. (At least, in the book, Stephanopoulos acknowledges that Clinton had a point.) More tellingly, Stephanopoulos criticizes Clinton for signing the GOP-drafted welfare reform bill in 1996--without ever acknowledging that if he and other

liberals had supported reform while Democrats controlled Congress, they could have drafted a bill much more to their liking.

&nb
sp; &nbs
p;

Ironically, even as Stephanopoulos is rehashing the left's case against Clinton, the president is now reverting to old habits. As if Stephanopoulos was still whispering into his ear, Clinton is once again worrying more about mollifying his party than identifying it with the cause

of reform. The picture, as always with Clinton, isn't entirely black

and white. The president is still challenging Democratic orthodoxy with an education reform package that demands tough accountability measures on local

school districts--such as new teacher testing and an end to social promotion. But on Social Security and Medicare, his biggest decisions,

he's ducking. Clinton has proposed to devote three-fourths of the federal budget surplus to Social Security and Medicare without demanding any specific cost-cutting reforms in return; to the contrary, last week Clinton pulled the rug out from under centrist Sen. John B. Breaux (D-La.), who was trying to

push a reform plan through his bipartisan Medicare advisory committee.

Breaux's plan to subject Medicare to greater market competition needs more

work, but it offered a reasonable starting point for debate. Instead, his commission collapsed in deadlock, and the prospects for Medicare reform before 2000 are flickering.

Short-run, this party-first political strategy keeps Clinton on the right side of Democratic legislators

cool to entitlement reform and still unhappy about having to defend him from

impeachment. It's also helping Vice President Al Gore minimize opposition on

the left for his presidential bid in 2000--as symbolized by the endorsement

he received last week from House Minority Leader Richard A. Gephardt (D-Mo.). Yet one overarching lesson of Clinton's presidency is that he

cannot reinvigorate his party unless he's

willing to accept internal
conflict. For Clinton and Gore, resisting
entitlement reform poses at least

some political danger--in that it might
help Republicans portray them in 200
0

as big-spending defenders of an
untenable status quo.
The larger risk is

the one that Stephanopoulos and his allies missed on
welfare: that if
Democrats don't reform these programs today, they could
cede the initiative

for redesigning them to the GOP tomorrow.

&nb
sp; &nbs
p;

In the book, Stephanopoulos says he left the White House partly because

he
believed Clinton's second term would be "complacent." In many

ways (even
leaving aside the obvious turmoil of impeachment) he was wrong.

Working with
congressional Democrats, Clinton has been able to pack more
activism (on
initiatives such as expanding health care for uninsured
children) into a
balanced budget than the left expected. The complacency tha
t
threatens
Clinton isn't the lack of new spending that Stephanopoulos feared;

it's the
reluctance to modernize core pillars of the welfare state that his

former
advisor would probably cheer.

Simon Rosenberg
New Democrat
Network
(202) 544-9200
(202) 547-2929 fax
for the latest on the New
Democrats, visit www.newdem.org <<http://www.newdem.org/>>

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Doug.Case@sdsu.edu@INET@LNGTWY (Doug.Case@sdsu.edu@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-MAR-1999 13:13:11.00

SUBJECT: EBAH Conn.

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

THE HARTFORD COURANT

March 21, 1999

GAY ACTIVISM TURNS HOMEWARD

BY: DANIELA ALTIMARI

Courant Staff Writer

Weary of fighting the federal government, gay rights activists increasingly are bypassing Washington in their battle for equal rights.

Taking their cue from former U.S. House Speaker Tip O'Neill, who said all politics is local, gays and lesbians are making their voices heard at state capitols and town halls across the nation.

Along with the change of venue comes a new agenda that emphasizes family issues. In Connecticut, activists are pushing for domestic partner benefits and reform of adoption laws. On the local level, the new emphasis is evident in the gay community's fight for lower-priced family memberships at West Hartford's municipal pool.

"We're still going to pay attention to the national level," said Tracey Conaty, spokeswoman for the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force. "But it's become clear that the laws and policies that most directly affect the lives of gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender people are being made at the state and local level."

The new strategy will be on display this week, when thousands of gays and lesbians gather in state capitals across the nation. From Hartford to Helena, Concord to Cheyenne, they will lobby for parental rights, rally against hate crimes and circulate petitions denouncing workplace discrimination. In some places, the effort will focus on fighting anti-gay legislation, such as bills banning same-sex marriages.

In Connecticut, a weeklong schedule of events will begin today with a gathering at the Capitol, where activists will raise the Rainbow Flag, a symbol of gay rights. The flag, which will remain there for a week, has never flown over a state capitol, organizers assert.

"The flag sends a message that we have a place within the government, that

we are valued," said Richard Stillson, one of the leaders of the Connecticut Coalition for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Civil Rights, one of the organizers of today's rally. "It's so validating."

The campaign, dubbed "Equality Begins at Home," varies sharply from state to state. In some places, such as North Dakota, it offers a chance for a nascent gay rights movement to make a public splash.

Connecticut's gay and lesbian community is more established, but that doesn't mean it has won all its battles, said Pura Gomez, who is co-chairman of the state gay rights coalition with Stillson.

"We may be a little ahead of the game in comparison with the rest of the country, but we still have a lot of work to do," Gomez said.

The rallies, prayer breakfasts, seminars and lobbying efforts scheduled this week across the nation will serve another purpose, Conaty said. "We're going to put a face to the issues," she said. "We're your family, your friends and your neighbors, and we're going to be visible."

The increased visibility is a sign of the gay rights movement's growing confidence. Two decades ago, many gay men and lesbians were reluctant to take a public stance, particularly in their own communities. Now they are speaking out.

That activism was evident at a weekend convention for gay youth. Held at the University of Hartford and billed as the nation's largest gathering of gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender young people, the conference included a workshop on lobbying the state legislature.

"We are everywhere," Stillson said, "and we're coming out where we live, not anonymously going to Washington. And we're hoping our representatives take notice."

Connecticut activists will focus on reforming adoption laws to permit partners in a same-sex couple to adopt a child. They will also push for insurance coverage and other benefits for the unmarried partners of state employees.

Unlike the Pentagon's "don't ask, don't tell" policy, adoption and insurance coverage are issues that resonate with many gays and lesbians, Stillson said.

"Many of us don't believe in the military, so what the armed forces does doesn't really impact us," Stillson said. "But domestic partner benefits are more tangible. We're just looking for the same things that married couples receive."

The quest for equality is taking hold on a municipal level as well. From a Brookfield teacher's effort to provide a safe haven for homosexual students, to West Hartford's debate over what constitutes a family, gay rights activists are making their cases before school boards and town councils with increasing frequency.

"We face issues in our own cities and towns every day," said Conaty of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force. "That's the kind of organizing that's really going to make a difference. Piece by piece, step by step, we're going to stop discrimination against gay people."

This message has been distributed as a free, nonprofit informational service, to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving this information for non-profit research and educational purposes only. 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 #29131) id <01J9654TTBZ4002LH7@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Tue, 23 Mar 1999 12:53:23 EST

Received: from storm.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131) with ESMTP id <01J9654SCTJK001WOQ@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Tue, 23 Mar 1999 12:53:21 -0500 (EST)

Received: from mail.sdsu.edu ([130.191.25.1]) by EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.2-29 #34437)

with ESMTP id <01J96544256C000LSH@EOP.GOV>; Tue, 23 Mar 1999 12:52:49 -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 JAA01837; Tue, 23 Mar 1999 09:51:55 -0800 (PST)

X-Sender: dcase@mail.sdsu.edu

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-APR-1999 14:05:50.00

SUBJECT: Re: Gay/Lesbian Issues

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Mary E. Cahill (CN=Mary E. Cahill/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Who says there angry? We get lots of credit for the hate crimes stuff all the time and I'm planning a proclamation around stonewall. I'm not sure it's appropriate to do a stonewall anniversary event, but we should consider it. As for the military, I'm trying to get Chuck to work on it. Maybe you could say something to him. Tell him it's important.

Karen Tramontano

04/07/99 01:04:53 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Mary E. Cahill/WHO/EOP, Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP

cc:

Subject: Gay/Lesbian Issues

At a recent event, I was told the following: If the President did just 3 things the gay/lesbian community would not be as angry with him as they are -- 1. Discipline someone in the armed forces for going too far on the Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy and/or for not implementing the policy appropriately; 2. Push for enactment of the Hate Crimes Legislation so Gays and Lesbians can feel safe in America; 3. Invite Gay and Lesbian Leaders to the White House to commemorate the 30th anniversary of Stonewall.

As to 1. --- I think its quite accurate that we have to get a handle on what is happening and why its happening -- 2. it seems to me we make progress yesteray and will continue and, as to 3. maybe this would be a good thing --

in any event, just wanted to pass it on ---

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-APR-1999 13:04:26.00

SUBJECT: Gay/Lesbian Issues

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

At a recent event, I was told the following: If the President did just 3 things the gay/lesbian community would not be as angry with him as they are -- 1. Discipline someone in the armed forces for going too far on the Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy and/or for not implementing the policy appropriately; 2. Push for enactment of the Hate Crimes Legislation so Gays and Lesbians can feel safe in America; 3. Invite Gay and Lesbian Leaders to the White House to commemorate the 30th anniversary of Stonewall.

As to 1. --- I think its quite accurate that we have to get a handle on what is happening and why its happening -- 2. it seems to me we make progress yesteray and will continue and, as to 3. maybe this would be a good thing --

in any event, just wanted to pass it on ---

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-APR-1999 11:31:48.00

SUBJECT: Re: don't ask, don't tell

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP on 04/09/99
11:32 AM -----

Charles F. Ruff

04/09/99 11:31:35 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP

cc:

Subject: Re: don't ask, don't tell

I'd like to get together. Why don't you work out a convenient time with
Eddie -- I'm pretty flexible.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-APR-1999 11:54:52.00

SUBJECT: Re: don't ask, don't tell

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Good -- I'll set something up.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Charles F. Ruff (CN=Charles F. Ruff/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-APR-1999 11:31:09.00

SUBJECT: Re: don't ask, don't tell

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I'd like to get together. Why don't you work out a convenient time with
Eddie -- I'm pretty flexible.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-APR-1999 13:01:55.00

SUBJECT: Re: don't ask, don't tell

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Can you meet with Chuck and me at 10:00 this coming Tuesday in
Chuck's office?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-APR-1999 15:37:28.00

SUBJECT: Re: don't ask, don't tell

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

It's now at 10:30.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-APR-1999 09:36:30.00

SUBJECT: don't ask, don't tell

TO: Charles F. Ruff (CN=Charles F. Ruff/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I have some ideas on how we can help DOD improve on the implementation of don't ask, don't tell. Can I come by at some convenient time for a talk w/ you and Eddie.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-APR-1999 13:33:45.00

SUBJECT: Re: don't ask, don't tell

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

TEXT:
fine, but 10:30 would be slightly beter. can we try that. if not, 10

Edward W. Correia

04/09/99 01:02:22 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP
cc:
Subject: Re: don't ask, don't tell

Can you meet with Chuck and me at 10:00 this coming Tuesday in
Chuck's office?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: rwockner@netcom.com@INET@LNGTWY (rwockner@netcom.com@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-APR-1999 19:52:55.00

SUBJECT: NC9932: LCR responds to DNC

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

TEXT:
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE CONTACT: Kevin Ivers
April 15, 1999 (202) 347-5306 x12

LOG CABIN RESPONDS TO OPEN LETTER FROM DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

(WASHINGTON) Log Cabin Republicans released a response letter today to an "open letter" written by Jean O'Leary of the Democratic National Committee to Rich Tafel, LCR executive director. Below are the full texts of the DNC open letter to Log Cabin, and the LCR response:

FROM: Jean O'Leary, Chair
DNC Gay and Lesbian American Caucus

April 13, 1999

Rich Tafel, Executive Director
Log Cabin Republicans
Washington, DC

Dear Mr. Tafel and Log Cabin Republicans,

I was glad to hear that a prominent leader in the Republican Party has decided that gays and lesbians are fit to be employed in government. We always welcome the support of leaders who agree with us on equality. I would be remiss, however, if I didn't respond to your statement of last Friday afternoon.

Despite your hard work, it's plain the Republican Party can not come close to matching the extensive record of the Clinton-Gore Administration and the Democratic Party on behalf of gay and lesbian Americans. Under the leadership of President Clinton and Vice President Gore, we have come a long way. As our leaders, the President and Vice President are committed to working on behalf of all Americans. I think a comparison of our records makes my case. Democrats support basic fairness, equality, and inclusion. Republicans perpetuate divisiveness, discrimination, and demonization.

President Clinton and Vice President Gore have appointed the most inclusive Administration in history. Never before have we had over 200 openly gay and lesbian senior level White House and Administration officials including

Virginia Apuzzo, Karen Tramantano, Richard Socarides, Fred Hochberg, Todd Dickinson, and John Berry. With the support from Democrats and help from a progressive Republican or two, maybe Trent Lott will call for a vote to confirm the first ever openly gay US Ambassador.

President Clinton and Vice President Gore deserve praise for their record of accomplishments and on-going commitment to equality for gay men and lesbians. The Clinton-Gore Administration has once again endorsed on the Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA) and the Hate Crimes Prevention Act (HCPA). This is the first Administration in history to endorse non-discrimination legislation protecting gays and lesbians and the first President in history to discuss discrimination based on sexual orientation in his State of the Union address. In a White House announcement last week, President Clinton dedicated increased efforts to the passage of HCPA and a public-private partnership to reduce hate-related violence in schools.

The Administration has countered your party's intolerance and its calculated agenda of discrimination. We have waged and won considerable legislative battles against an extremely anti-gay Republican majority--battles over legislation endorsed by Republican leadership. Fortunately, the efforts of the Administration were successful. With the Hefley Amendment, Republican leaders tried but failed to gut President Clinton's Executive Order banning discrimination against gays and lesbians in the federal civilian workforce. The Republican-endorsed Largent Amendment, which would have banned adoptions by unmarried couples in the District of Columbia, was stripped from Appropriations legislation only because the Clinton-Gore Administration insisted on it.

This President and Vice President have taken unprecedented steps towards full inclusion of gay and lesbian Americans. To infer that Republican leaders have come close is wrong. Unlike the leadership of the Republican Party, President Clinton and Vice President Gore have made a clear commitment to equality and fairness. The Republican Party simply does not provide that kind of leadership. Until your hard work helps Republican leaders cease the gay-baiting and gay-bashing and start talking about gay and lesbian equality, your criticism would be more productive directed toward your own party.

Sincerely,
Jean O'Leary, Chair
DNC Gay and Lesbian American Caucus

April 15, 1999

TO: Ms. Jean O'Leary
Democratic National Committee

Dear Ms. O'Leary:

Thank you for your open letter praising Governor George W. Bush of Texas and the work of Log Cabin inside the Republican Party. I appreciate the

tone of the letter, compared to the ways the DNC has chosen to address our organization in the past. It is not my normal practice to write open letters, but in the spirit of your message to us I would like to respond in kind.

As you know, Voter News Service exit polls show that one-third of the gay community has consistently supported Republican candidates for office since 1994, the second-largest share of minority votes the GOP has consistently won. This is a direct result of the work of Log Cabin Republicans in educating Republican candidates on the concerns of gay voters, leading more Republican candidates to actively seek and win gay votes. It has yielded tremendous results for our community, reinforcing the need for a strongly bi-partisan movement. We have been pleased to work with a number of gay organizations in this successful effort.

Much of what your letter enumerated as the record of the Clinton-Gore administration was familiar to me. We were happy to work closely with the White House on the Hormel nomination, as well as with important supporters such as Senator John McCain (R-AZ), Senator Gordon Smith (R-OR), Senator Orrin Hatch (R-UT), former Bush Secretary of State George Schultz and a number of other prominent Republicans. We were glad to play our part in gaining the support of Senator Christopher Bond (R-MO) and the leadership of former Senator Al D'Amato (R-NY) in the confirmation of Fred Hochberg. We're also glad that Governor Bush shares our views on the principles involved in those important issues.

We were also glad to work with Democrats in the winning strategy against the Hefley Amendment, which was led by openly gay Congressman Jim Kolbe (R-AZ), who chairs a key House Appropriations subcommittee. We have been glad to work with Senator Jim Jeffords (R-VT) and Congressman Tom Davis (R-VA) who have played a critical leadership role on D.C.-related issues of concern to our community in current and past GOP Congresses. We have been proud to work with Congressman John Porter (R-IL) and Senator Arlen Specter (R-PA), who have consistently joined with the Republican leadership in funding critical AIDS programs at record levels, hundreds of millions of dollars above every Clinton-Gore budget request submitted since 1995. We have been pleased to work with Republican National Committee Chairman Jim Nicholson, who rightly condemned the murders of Matthew Shepard and Billy Jack Gaither, and led other members of the GOP in denouncing anti-gay organizations like the Council of Conservative Citizens. To us, all of this represents positive steps forward.

There is still much work for Log Cabin to do, but we have never lost the focus of our mission -- to advance a set of core principles inside the Republican Party, advancing the cause of equality for all Americans including gays, and further expanding our community's political effectiveness across the nation by building a bi-partisan movement for the first time in our community's history. Because of our growing success, the disastrous shortcomings of the old one-party strategy are finally becoming history one step at a time.

As you have raised the issue of the Clinton-Gore record, there were many things I am also aware of which were not explained in your letter. I wish you had addressed the continued lack of attention paid by the Clinton-Gore

administration to the spiraling crisis in AIDS treatment funding since 1995, and how every year the Clinton-Gore budget requests are submitted with woefully inadequate funding levels for prevention and drug treatment access. I also wish you'd explained President Clinton's unwavering and proud opposition to gay marriage, and why he has presided over the largest full scale anti-gay witchhunt and purge the U.S. military has ever seen with his "don't ask, don't tell" policy, passed under a Democratic Congress.

However, the important thing for us as a community is not to look back, but to look forward. Regardless of all the setbacks behind us, we all have a job to do because the 2000 elections will be critical for our community's future. Through our "Strategy 2000" program, announced in February 1999, Log Cabin Republicans has declared its unwavering commitment to hold every Republican presidential candidate accountable for his or her public statements and positions on issues of concern to our community. In addition to citing the Clinton-Gore administration's role in a number of bi-partisan efforts, I hope you and gay Democratic activists will hold Vice President Gore to the same level of accountability. The gay community rightly demands that of all its political leadership, and we hope you will join us in carrying out that responsibility.

We at Log Cabin don't believe there is any time to lose. Pressure must be applied to all the candidates in both parties now, not later. We would like to see Vice President Gore to take a break from the fundraising circuit so he can catch up to certain Republican candidates in stating his clear and unambiguous positions on gay adoption, gay foster care and gay marriage immediately -- not through spokespersons, but from the Vice President himself. Furthermore, as he played a leading role in creating the "don't ask, don't tell" policy, we would like the Vice President to clearly articulate now what changes, if any, he will make in his administration's current policy on gays in the military, and what his opinion is of the record number of anti-gay discharges have taken place under the Clinton-Gore administration. Unless the Vice President does this, how will you know how to most effectively advance the interests of the community in the Gore campaign?

As we all advance the best interests of our community with all the candidates, we can't operate blindly with anyone, nor should any candidate -- Republican or Democrat -- get a free ride on these issues. I hope you will join us in getting Vice President Gore on the record, while we continue working hard to do it on the Republican side.

Sincerely,

RICHARD TAFEL
Executive Director

Log Cabin Republicans
(202) 347-5306 phone
(202) 347-5224 fax

Kevin Ivers
Director of Public Affairs

<http://www.lcr.org>===== ATTACHMENT 1

=====

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

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
id <01JA2OCQGHLS001705@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for Socarides_R@a1.eop.gov; Thu,
15 Apr 1999 19:48:46 EST

Received: from storm.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
with ESMTP id <01JA2OCM2E1S001QJB@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for Socarides_R@a1.eop.gov;
Thu, 15 Apr 1999 19:48:39 -0500 (EST)

Received: from netcom3.netcom.com ([192.100.81.103])
by EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.2-29 #34437) with ESMTP id <01JA2OBVLCM4000I0X@EOP.GOV>
for Socarides_R@a1.eop.gov; Thu, 15 Apr 1999 19:48:04 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from rwockner@localhost)
by netcom3.netcom.com (8.8.5-r-beta/8.8.5/(NETCOM v1.02)) id QAA24490; Thu,
15 Apr 1999 16:47:20 -0700 (PDT)

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Patrice L. Stanley (CN=Patrice L. Stanley/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-APR-1999 12:34:45.00

SUBJECT: Re:

TO: Fred DuVal (CN=Fred DuVal/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I see what I can get. They hand them out but then they take them back.
They have a don't ask don't tell policy over there that I really don't
understand at times.

Fred Duval 04/19/99 12:16:01 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Patrice L. Stanley/WHO/EOP@EOP

cc:

Subject: Re:

biggest possible draft - they have handed these out at some of the
meetings we've gone to

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Doug.Case@sdsu.edu@INET@LNGTWY (Doug.Case@sdsu.edu@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-APR-1999 19:30:32.00

SUBJECT: Lady in Waiting: Will DiFi Be the Next VP

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

FRONTIERS NEWSMAGZINE

Vol. 17, Issue 26, April 30, 1999

<http://www.frontiersweb.com>

Reporter's Notebook

Lady in Waiting: Will DiFi Be the Next VP

by Karen Ocamb

When the 66-year-old patrician senator who could be the next U.S. Vice President walked into the ANGLE breakfast at the Belage Hotel on April 8, her soft face looked gel-lensed Doris Dayish. But, after being described in Jean O'Leary's introduction as "passionate" and "caring," Dianne Feinstein quickly reminded the gay politicians that she could also be "stubborn and ornery." The audience laughed, a few having been the target of Feinstein's fury and others having heard about it. It was a good beginning-Feinstein isn't particularly known for self-effacement and the remark put wannabe supporters at ease.

Of course, the LGBT community will support Feinstein, especially considering the likely alternative in her Senate re-election race. Apparently Glendale Rep. James Rogan can't get re-elected in his Democrat-trending district after his performance as a conservative Republican impeachment manager, and so he is setting his sights on DiFi's seat. (Rogan shouldn't be underestimated. Many Republicans, Independents and even Democrats thought Rogan played his part with integrity compared to sexual hypocrite and Clinton-hater Bob Barr. In fact, Rogan might give Republicans a statewide cause to positively rally around, balancing out all that venom expected with the anti-gay Pete Knight Initiative.)

Like her or not, Feinstein has stature. If, as political game players like to speculate, George W. Bush becomes the Republican presidential nominee and he picks currently popular Elizabeth Dole as his VP running mate, that increases the pressure on Al Gore to pick a woman, too. And who better than Feinstein, who's been repeatedly mentioned as presidential material in some vague non-sexist future and, as author of the motion to censor Bill Clinton, gives Gore cover from impeachment leftovers. Interestingly, censorship was posited as a stopgap option to removing the president, but it also gave Feinstein the opportunity to unleash her fury at the man who had lied to her face. Such sympathetic righteousness, plus her track record as a centrist/conservative on the Judiciary, Appropriations and Rules

Committees, balance the perception of Gore as an Internet-creating, tree-hugging liberal.

Meanwhile, in California, she's mended fences with Gray Davis after a brutal gubernatorial race in 1990, and to her great credit, she didn't out Michael Huffington during their expensive mud-slinging Senate race in 1996. Her hard vote against the Defense of Marriage Act more than made up for her controversial and poorly explained vote against domestic partner benefits in San Francisco many moons ago. More recently, she's co-sponsored the Employment Non-Discrimination Act and the Hate Crimes Prevention Act, and she's fought vociferously for the confirmation of San Franciscan philanthropist Jim Hormel as Ambassador to Luxembourg-a country that wants him! In fact, Feinstein made a special plea to the LGBT community to harangue Clinton into giving Hormel a summer recess appointment-much as Clinton did with Acting Assistant Attorney General Bill Lann Lee.

But Feinstein's still got problems. Some think a Jew can't be VP, though John F. Kennedy beat a similar Catholic rap. Then there's the Latino community which any Californian will be expected to deliver against a Spanish-speaking, reaching-out-to-Hispanics George W. Bush. Pictures of Feinstein standing on the San Diego border vowing support for anti-immigrant Proposition 187 are seared into many activists' minds. And while some politicians shrug off the Latino vote, noting that 40 percent of the California population in 2000 doesn't equal a 40 percent vote, one look at the state Legislature and local city politics should alert the sleeping to the fact that Latinos are not just at the table, they're building them.

Jean O'Leary, famed Democratic National Committee honcho who is rightfully proud that the Party has officially recognized the gay and lesbian caucus as a minority, says you can "count on" what Feinstein says. But what was so striking at the ANGLE breakfast was how little she said that was bold or new. Attorney John Duran asked about her position on the Knight Initiative, which requires a response from every politician pitching for gay dollars and support in California. Feinstein said she's not really familiar with the initiative but it will probably "sweep through" and effort should be concentrated on fighting it later on constitutional grounds. Otherwise, she had no position. Nor would she take a position on gays in the military despite her moving account of why NATO must win in Kosovo and conceding that gays there must be afraid of both hostile and "friendly" fire. When asked if there's a chance that the blatantly discriminatory policy-which has proved to be a failure at stemming the tide of gay discharges-will be reconsidered, she said: "Realistically and honestly-no."

Realistically and honestly, after the bashing Clinton took over gays in the military when he was first elected, it is logical that some politicians might shy away from controversial positions. But it is also instructive to remember-as both Feinstein and Rogan have illustrated in their own ways-that one only truly gains stature by standing up for what they believe is morally and ethically right.

This message has been distributed as a free, nonprofit informational service, to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving this information for non-profit research and educational purposes only. 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 #29131)
id <01JADTYH5QGW000Y48@PMDf.EOP.GOV> for socarides_r@al.eop.gov; Fri,
23 Apr 1999 19:28:33 EST

Received: from storm.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDf V5.1-9 #29131)
with ESMTP id <01JADTYF1DM8000XPX@PMDf.EOP.GOV> for socarides_r@al.eop.gov;
Fri, 23 Apr 1999 19:28:30 -0500 (EST)

Received: from mail.sdsu.edu ([130.191.25.1]) by EOP.GOV (PMDf V5.2-29 #34437)

with ESMTP id <01JADTXXUM40017PK@EOP.GOV> for socarides_r@al.eop.gov; Fri,
23 Apr 1999 19:28:03 -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 QAA17052; Fri,
23 Apr 1999 16:23:43 -0700 (PDT)

X-Sender: dcase@mail.sdsu.edu

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

They are hunted, harassed, forced to conceal parts of themselves that cannot always be hidden. They are hounded and criminalized not so much for any actions as for the paranoid phantasm of what their unspoken desires might lead to. They are reminded every moment of their lives that those desires and what they might lead to render them unfit to protect their

country. Regardless of their skills, their training, their proven abilities, they are told that they are the enemy within. When the First Liar set in play the chain of betrayals that has come to characterize his presidency, he did so with a political move whose cynicism was uncharacteristically overt. Bill Clinton's "solution" to the Pentagon ban on gays in the military was to improvise a policy that traded self-erasure for protection. As it turned out, the protection offered by "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" was little more than illusion. And silence was not nearly enough.

According to a survey released last month and compiled by Servicemembers Legal Defense Network (SLDN), a Washington group providing legal aid to military personnel, the fallout of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" is far greater than previously understood. Annual discharges of lesbians, gays, and bisexuals from the military have almost doubled since the Clinton policy went into effect on February 28, 1994, with the Pentagon cashiering 1149 military members for being gay, lesbian, or bisexual in 1998 alone. Ironically, the discharges occurred at a time when the Pentagon is reporting drops in military enrollment that one high-ranking air force officer publicly proclaimed "the greatest shortage we've ever had in peacetime."

The navy currently has 6900 unfilled positions. The air force, which suffered severe pilot shortages in recent years, projects that it will be at least 2000 pilots shy of the 13,641 enlistment quota it has set for 2002. Despite signing and retention bonuses, boosted college education funds, thousands of new recruiters in the field, and tens of millions of dollars in advertising campaigns (the navy opened 150 recruiting stations last year and increased its ad budget from \$58 million to \$72 million), the personnel deficit in an expanding military will soon reach many thousands. In February, Army Secretary Louis Caldera argued that the armed forces should relax their standards and permit recruitment of high school dropouts for the first time. "Frankly, right now we have rules that don't make sense," said Caldera. "Every day we turn away people who want to join."

Yet every year the armed forces jettison people whose sexuality is their only impediment to service. Of the 414 air force discharges reported last year, fully 271 were gay-related and took place at a single air force base in Texas. Throughout the services, reports of asking and pursuit have increased by 42 percent, according to the SLDN. Even by the downplayed standards of General Accounting Office estimates, the cost to taxpayers of discharging gay service members has already exceeded \$130 million. To calculate how conservative this figure is, consider the military's costs to replace people who are kicked out, to investigate suspected and accused homosexuals, and to defend the policy in federal court. Jill Szymanski left the navy after a 12-year stint during which she earned a master's degree in trauma and critical-care nursing, an education taxpayers funded. Despite a promising career, in which she oversaw the duties of 1000 nurses worldwide, Szymanski resigned last year. As she recently explained to The Advocate, "For years I figured that if I had a perfect record, I'd be safe in the navy even though I was a lesbian. But when I saw gay people being discharged, I wondered how I could continue to give 150 percent to an organization that could turn its back on me overnight."

Institutional betrayal is by no means the only threat facing service members. "It has become an increasingly hostile environment," says SLDN's Michelle Benecke, coauthor of "Conduct Unbecoming," a report documenting rampant escalation in antigay harassment throughout the armed forces. "Up to and including death threats."

The protective essence of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" lies buried in a Department of Defense directive stipulating that "sexual orientation is considered a personal and private matter, and homosexual orientation is not a bar to continued service unless manifested by homosexual conduct." But for many service members, following the letter of the policy offers little security. "Living in forced isolation, in constant fear of investigation and inadvertent disclosure is harmful to gay service personnel," wrote one naval officer last year, in a letter resigning his commission. "Each day I am witness to . . . antigay comments and attitudes. The navy takes no action to stop this improper and outrageous behavior on the part of its best and brightest officers. My witness to this unfortunate antigay climate and the direct harm that it causes me, forces me to disclose to you that I am gay."

Neither is silence enough. Testifying before Congress in 1993, General Colin Powell vowed that "we will not witch hunt. We will not chase. We will not seek to learn orientation." The witch hunts Powell referred to were hardly events in the misty past. Wholesale gay purges of the last decades included the 1980 investigation of women onboard the USS Norton Sound, which resulted in the discharge of eight women sailors; the army's ouster of eight military police officers at West Point in 1986; the 1988 investigation of 30 women, including every African American woman, onboard the destroyer-tender USS Yellowstone (eight were discharged); the 1988 investigation of five of the 13 female crew members onboard the USS Grapple; and the two-year investigation, beginning in 1986, of the Marine Corps Recruit Training Depot at Parris Island, South Carolina, where 246 women were questioned, at least 27 women were discharged, and three were sent to jail.

It was into this atmosphere of paranoia and intolerance that Bill Clinton delivered gay service members, armored with the flimsy rhetoric of a policy whose cornerstone is the imperative to lie. "The way it works is, if you don't constantly affirm heterosexuality, homosexuality is implicit," explains Mark Navin, who resigned from the naval ROTC last year out of concern not only for his career but for his life. "Never mind being 'out.' Just not acting completely straight was not an option. I was 'passing.' It was an act I perfected. But I was living in fear."

The 21-year-old Navin, son of a career naval officer, enlisted in the ROTC while an undergraduate at Cornell, in part because a \$100,000 scholarship package was "pretty appealing," but also because "my father was a great gentleman and a great citizen and I thought serving my country was something I really wanted to do."

>From the first weeks of basic training, however, Navin found himself "under constant suspicion. I was constantly being asked and constantly lying. There is tacit agreement that all fags are bad. You hid yourself if

you did not want to be mocked."

On a 1997 weekend trip with six other midshipmen to the military shooting range at Quantico, Virginia, Navin was publicly "accused" of being in a relationship with another midshipman. He was "called a fag and a homo." Navin continued his studies and remained in the ROTC, hoping his situation would improve when he reached the equivalent of junior officer status. Last year, before shipping out on a final training cruise, he came to the conclusion that his dreams of naval service were an impossibility. "I had thought maybe it was not going to be as bad among officers as among enlisted men," he explains. "No one ever threatened to kill me. But I know enough about things that have happened, guys saying, 'In port, we went and beat up some fags.' Stuff like that is tolerated at all command levels."

Recognizing the increased incidence of harassment under "Don't Ask, Don't Tell," Defense Secretary William Cohen ordered new antiharassment guidelines drawn up in April 1998; the guidelines built on an earlier memorandum drafted by Undersecretary of Defense Edwin Dorn. But the Pentagon has yet to distribute the Dorn memo to service chiefs, the SLDN claims. "They're accomplishing through harassment what the policy can't," Benecke says.

Overall discharges of gay service members have increased by 86 percent since the imposition of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell." Most, the Pentagon claims, involve service members who "voluntarily" state their sexual orientation. "There is no question that telling the military you are gay is the quickest way of getting an honorable discharge," says Charles Moskos, the military sociologist at Northwestern University who helped draft the policy. "And we know for a fact that there are false accusations of harassment."

Yet, as Benecke insists, "Pentagon officials have been less than forthcoming" in telling the American public that they define any disclosure of sexual orientation as "voluntary." Among the "voluntary" admissions that have resulted in discharge against gay service members are statements to psychotherapists, in personal journals, in response to direct questioning, in anonymous online profiles, to military clergy, and those "coerced out of service members due to fear, intimidation, assaults, death threats and threats of criminal prosecution." According to Pentagon Guidelines on Homosexual Conduct in the Armed Forces, "The listing by a service member of someone of the same gender as the person to be contacted in the case of an emergency, as an insurance beneficiary, or in a similar context, does not provide a basis for separation or further investigation." But designating a same-sex beneficiary, says one ex-navy officer, is equivalent to signing a confession. "Very few service members 'outed' by the military in these circumstances," asserts the SLDN report, "experience being forced out of the closet as voluntary."

Many who have served under the Clinton policy now find they "have had to leave the armed forces," says Benecke. "Harassment was not unheard of before, but it was not, in most units, a daily or hourly event. Now it's the norm. It's gotten bad, too, for people who support the rights of gay members to serve. They're seen as sympathizers. They can be investigated, too."

On Christmas Eve of 1998, Tom Reed * an army officer who asked that his real name be withheld * was conducting barracks check when two soldiers assaulted him. "My job that night," he explains, "was to maintain the security of the batallion, to babysit basically. I checked doors, looked for minors in the barracks, for alcohol. Being it was Christmas night, I stuck around longer than usual. And these guys were talking about this person is gay, that person is gay, baiting me into saying that I knew whoever. They thought I was gay, although I have never given any indication that I was." As Reed was getting ready to leave, one of the soldiers jumped up and attacked him. Although the two soldiers were later discharged on a variety of counts (not all related to the assault), their allegation that the incident began when Reed made a homosexual pass led the army to investigate him. Reed now faces not only discharge but possible criminal charges himself. "Five months later, there's still an investigation on me," he says, from his new posting. "They said I had been drinking. But I have years in recovery and I don't drink. I had to do staff duty again right after the incident and walk through barracks at night. I'm 28 and few things make me afraid. But that made me afraid. There's a lot of young ignorant kids out there who know nothing of life. You put a couple of drinks in them and they could do you some serious harm."

According to the Navy's General Medical Officer Manual, "one way of looking at homosexuals in the military is to distinguish between those who adapt to the military environment and those who do not. The adapters are invisible and do not seek to disclose their homosexuality." But fewer are finding it possible to remain invisible in an atmosphere of taunting and harassment, of threats arising on all sides, and of the dissembling that is its own form of death.

Brandon Dubroc filed for discharge from the navy on the eve of a six-month deployment. Dubroc originally enlisted because he "honestly enjoyed the discipline, the strict core structure, the fact that everything in the military is black or white." He also relished the "opportunity to serve my country. I'm patriotic, believe it or not." Dubroc says of himself that he "doesn't fit the stereotype of gay." He was never publicly identified as such in the service. Yet he found it increasingly difficult to "exist in this atmosphere of ridicule and hiding and constant discrimination," as shipmates joked openly and repeatedly that " 'nobody'd better be queer, because in the navy we kill our fags.' " Dubroc made a decision to seek discharge in 1998, "when I heard some guys talking and saying, 'If we find one on the ship, we'll throw him overboard.' I realized then that I couldn't go to my command and say, 'Look, this is what has been said,' because then it's me they'd investigate." Not wanting to choose "between silence and being murdered by my shipmates," Dubroc concluded that the only recourse was to sacrifice his career by committing an act whose probity has greater moral dimension than the man in the White House can ever hope to achieve. He came out.

Research assistance: Lou Bardel

Tell us what you think. editor@villagevoice.com

===== 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 #29131)
id <01JAV2MER92O001NFT@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for Socarides_R@a1.eop.gov; Thu,
6 May 1999 03:39:35 EST

Received: from storm.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
with ESMTP id <01JAV2MD4B5S001ZZC@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for Socarides_R@a1.eop.gov;
Thu, 06 May 1999 03:39:33 -0500 (EST)

Received: from netcom11.netcom.com ([192.100.81.121])
by EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.2-29 #34437) with ESMTP id <01JAV2LORLNE000S7M@EOP.GOV>
for Socarides_R@a1.eop.gov; Thu, 06 May 1999 03:39:01 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from rwockner@localhost)
by netcom11.netcom.com (8.8.5-r-beta/8.8.5/(NETCOM v1.02)) id AAA05454; Thu,
06 May 1999 00:38:02 -0700 (PDT)

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

They are hunted, harassed, forced to conceal parts of themselves that cannot always be hidden. They are hounded and criminalized not so much for any actions as for the paranoid phantasm of what their unspoken desires might lead to. They are reminded every moment of their lives that those desires and what they might lead to render them unfit to protect their country. Regardless of their skills, their training, their proven abilities, they are told that they are the enemy within. When the First Liar set in play the chain of betrayals that has come to characterize his

presidency, he did so with a political move whose cynicism was uncharacteristically overt. Bill Clinton's "solution" to the Pentagon ban on gays in the military was to improvise a policy that traded self-erasure for protection. As it turned out, the protection offered by "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" was little more than illusion. And silence was not nearly enough.

According to a survey released last month and compiled by Servicemembers Legal Defense Network (SLDN), a Washington group providing legal aid to military personnel, the fallout of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" is far greater than previously understood. Annual discharges of lesbians, gays, and bisexuals from the military have almost doubled since the Clinton policy went into effect on February 28, 1994, with the Pentagon cashiering 1149 military members for being gay, lesbian, or bisexual in 1998 alone. Ironically, the discharges occurred at a time when the Pentagon is reporting drops in military enrollment that one high-ranking air force officer publicly proclaimed "the greatest shortage we've ever had in peacetime."

The navy currently has 6900 unfilled positions. The air force, which suffered severe pilot shortages in recent years, projects that it will be at least 2000 pilots shy of the 13,641 enlistment quota it has set for 2002. Despite signing and retention bonuses, boosted college education funds, thousands of new recruiters in the field, and tens of millions of dollars in advertising campaigns (the navy opened 150 recruiting stations last year and increased its ad budget from \$58 million to \$72 million), the personnel deficit in an expanding military will soon reach many thousands. In February, Army Secretary Louis Caldera argued that the armed forces should relax their standards and permit recruitment of high school dropouts for the first time. "Frankly, right now we have rules that don't make sense," said Caldera. "Every day we turn away people who want to join."

Yet every year the armed forces jettison people whose sexuality is their only impediment to service. Of the 414 air force discharges reported last year, fully 271 were gay-related and took place at a single air force base in Texas. Throughout the services, reports of asking and pursuit have increased by 42 percent, according to the SLDN. Even by the downplayed standards of General Accounting Office estimates, the cost to taxpayers of discharging gay service members has already exceeded \$130 million. To calculate how conservative this figure is, consider the military's costs to replace people who are kicked out, to investigate suspected and accused homosexuals, and to defend the policy in federal court. Jill Szymanski left the navy after a 12-year stint during which she earned a master's degree in trauma and critical-care nursing, an education taxpayers funded. Despite a promising career, in which she oversaw the duties of 1000 nurses worldwide, Szymanski resigned last year. As she recently explained to The Advocate, "For years I figured that if I had a perfect record, I'd be safe in the navy even though I was a lesbian. But when I saw gay people being discharged, I wondered how I could continue to give 150 percent to an organization that could turn its back on me overnight."

Institutional betrayal is by no means the only threat facing service members. "It has become an increasingly hostile environment," says SLDN's

Michelle Benecke, coauthor of "Conduct Unbecoming," a report documenting rampant escalation in antigay harassment throughout the armed forces. "Up to and including death threats."

The protective essence of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" lies buried in a Department of Defense directive stipulating that "sexual orientation is considered a personal and private matter, and homosexual orientation is not a bar to continued service unless manifested by homosexual conduct." But for many service members, following the letter of the policy offers little security. "Living in forced isolation, in constant fear of investigation and inadvertent disclosure is harmful to gay service personnel," wrote one naval officer last year, in a letter resigning his commission. "Each day I am witness to . . . antigay comments and attitudes. The navy takes no action to stop this improper and outrageous behavior on the part of its best and brightest officers. My witness to this unfortunate antigay climate and the direct harm that it causes me, forces me to disclose to you that I am gay."

Neither is silence enough. Testifying before Congress in 1993, General Colin Powell vowed that "we will not witch hunt. We will not chase. We will not seek to learn orientation." The witch hunts Powell referred to were hardly events in the misty past. Wholesale gay purges of the last decades included the 1980 investigation of women onboard the USS Norton Sound, which resulted in the discharge of eight women sailors; the army's ouster of eight military police officers at West Point in 1986; the 1988 investigation of 30 women, including every African American woman, onboard the destroyer-tender USS Yellowstone (eight were discharged); the 1988 investigation of five of the 13 female crew members onboard the USS Grapple; and the two-year investigation, beginning in 1986, of the Marine Corps Recruit Training Depot at Parris Island, South Carolina, where 246 women were questioned, at least 27 women were discharged, and three were sent to jail.

It was into this atmosphere of paranoia and intolerance that Bill Clinton delivered gay service members, armored with the flimsy rhetoric of a policy whose cornerstone is the imperative to lie. "The way it works is, if you don't constantly affirm heterosexuality, homosexuality is implicit," explains Mark Navin, who resigned from the naval ROTC last year out of concern not only for his career but for his life. "Never mind being 'out.' Just not acting completely straight was not an option. I was 'passing.' It was an act I perfected. But I was living in fear."

The 21-year-old Navin, son of a career naval officer, enlisted in the ROTC while an undergraduate at Cornell, in part because a \$100,000 scholarship package was "pretty appealing," but also because "my father was a great gentleman and a great citizen and I thought serving my country was something I really wanted to do."

>From the first weeks of basic training, however, Navin found himself "under constant suspicion. I was constantly being asked and constantly lying. There is tacit agreement that all fags are bad. You hid yourself if you did not want to be mocked."

On a 1997 weekend trip with six other midshipmen to the military shooting

range at Quantico, Virginia, Navin was publicly "accused" of being in a relationship with another midshipman. He was "called a fag and a homo." Navin continued his studies and remained in the ROTC, hoping his situation would improve when he reached the equivalent of junior officer status. Last year, before shipping out on a final training cruise, he came to the conclusion that his dreams of naval service were an impossibility. "I had thought maybe it was not going to be as bad among officers as among enlisted men," he explains. "No one ever threatened to kill me. But I know enough about things that have happened, guys saying, 'In port, we went and beat up some fags.' Stuff like that is tolerated at all command levels."

Recognizing the increased incidence of harassment under "Don't Ask, Don't Tell," Defense Secretary William Cohen ordered new antiharassment guidelines drawn up in April 1998; the guidelines built on an earlier memorandum drafted by Undersecretary of Defense Edwin Dorn. But the Pentagon has yet to distribute the Dorn memo to service chiefs, the SLDN claims. "They're accomplishing through harassment what the policy can't," Benecke says.

Overall discharges of gay service members have increased by 86 percent since the imposition of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell." Most, the Pentagon claims, involve service members who "voluntarily" state their sexual orientation. "There is no question that telling the military you are gay is the quickest way of getting an honorable discharge," says Charles Moskos, the military sociologist at Northwestern University who helped draft the policy. "And we know for a fact that there are false accusations of harassment."

Yet, as Benecke insists, "Pentagon officials have been less than forthcoming" in telling the American public that they define any disclosure of sexual orientation as "voluntary." Among the "voluntary" admissions that have resulted in discharge against gay service members are statements to psychotherapists, in personal journals, in response to direct questioning, in anonymous online profiles, to military clergy, and those "coerced out of service members due to fear, intimidation, assaults, death threats and threats of criminal prosecution." According to Pentagon Guidelines on Homosexual Conduct in the Armed Forces, "The listing by a service member of someone of the same gender as the person to be contacted in the case of an emergency, as an insurance beneficiary, or in a similar context, does not provide a basis for separation or further investigation." But designating a same-sex beneficiary, says one ex-navy officer, is equivalent to signing a confession. "Very few service members 'outed' by the military in these circumstances," asserts the SLDN report, "experience being forced out of the closet as voluntary."

Many who have served under the Clinton policy now find they "have had to leave the armed forces," says Benecke. "Harassment was not unheard of before, but it was not, in most units, a daily or hourly event. Now it's the norm. It's gotten bad, too, for people who support the rights of gay members to serve. They're seen as sympathizers. They can be investigated, too."

On Christmas Eve of 1998, Tom Reed * an army officer who asked that his real name be withheld * was conducting barracks check when two soldiers

assaulted him. "My job that night," he explains, "was to maintain the security of the battalion, to babysit basically. I checked doors, looked for minors in the barracks, for alcohol. Being it was Christmas night, I stuck around longer than usual. And these guys were talking about this person is gay, that person is gay, baiting me into saying that I knew whoever. They thought I was gay, although I have never given any indication that I was." As Reed was getting ready to leave, one of the soldiers jumped up and attacked him. Although the two soldiers were later discharged on a variety of counts (not all related to the assault), their allegation that the incident began when Reed made a homosexual pass led the army to investigate him. Reed now faces not only discharge but possible criminal charges himself. "Five months later, there's still an investigation on me," he says, from his new posting. "They said I had been drinking. But I have years in recovery and I don't drink. I had to do staff duty again right after the incident and walk through barracks at night. I'm 28 and few things make me afraid. But that made me afraid. There's a lot of young ignorant kids out there who know nothing of life. You put a couple of drinks in them and they could do you some serious harm."

According to the Navy's General Medical Officer Manual, "one way of looking at homosexuals in the military is to distinguish between those who adapt to the military environment and those who do not. The adapters are invisible and do not seek to disclose their homosexuality." But fewer are finding it possible to remain invisible in an atmosphere of taunting and harassment, of threats arising on all sides, and of the dissembling that is its own form of death.

Brandon Dubroc filed for discharge from the navy on the eve of a six-month deployment. Dubroc originally enlisted because he "honestly enjoyed the discipline, the strict core structure, the fact that everything in the military is black or white." He also relished the "opportunity to serve my country. I'm patriotic, believe it or not." Dubroc says of himself that he "doesn't fit the stereotype of gay." He was never publicly identified as such in the service. Yet he found it increasingly difficult to "exist in this atmosphere of ridicule and hiding and constant discrimination," as shipmates joked openly and repeatedly that "'nobody'd better be queer, because in the navy we kill our fags.'" Dubroc made a decision to seek discharge in 1998, "when I heard some guys talking and saying, 'If we find one on the ship, we'll throw him overboard.' I realized then that I couldn't go to my command and say, 'Look, this is what has been said,' because then it's me they'd investigate." Not wanting to choose "between silence and being murdered by my shipmates," Dubroc concluded that the only recourse was to sacrifice his career by committing an act whose probity has greater moral dimension than the man in the White House can ever hope to achieve. He came out.

Research assistance: Lou Bardel

Tell us what you think. editor@villagevoice.com

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

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
id <01JAV2MER92O001NFT@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for Socarides_R@a1.eop.gov; Thu,
6 May 1999 03:39:35 EST

Received: from storm.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
with ESMTP id <01JAV2MD4B5S001ZZC@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for Socarides_R@a1.eop.gov;
Thu, 06 May 1999 03:39:33 -0500 (EST)

Received: from netcom11.netcom.com ([192.100.81.121])
by EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.2-29 #34437) with ESMTP id <01JAV2LORLNE000S7M@EOP.GOV>
for Socarides_R@a1.eop.gov; Thu, 06 May 1999 03:39:01 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from rwockner@localhost)
by netcom11.netcom.com (8.8.5-r-beta/8.8.5/(NETCOM v1.02)) id AAA05454; Thu,
06 May 1999 00:38:02 -0700 (PDT)

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Doug.Case@sdsu.edu@INET@LNGTWY (Doug.Case@sdsu.edu@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-JUN-1999 20:40:44.00

SUBJECT: Playboy: Barney Frank Interview (Part 2 of 3)

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

PLAYBOY INTERVIEW: BARNEY FRANK, part 2

FRANK: He never lied to me. I never asked him what happened. By the way, I never said I believed him. There were all these people fretting that

he lied not only to the public-as if that were excusable-but also to his friends and cabinet members. That's crazy. In fact, if a public figure were

telling a lie to the public and the truth to his staff, he would be putting his staff in a worse position. He would then be asking them to lie.

PLAYBOY: But do you acknowledge that he lied to the American people?

FRANK: Sure, and that was wrong. He lied in the deposition when he said he

didn't remember being alone with Monica Lewinsky. It wasn't perjury, since it wasn't material to the case, but it was a lie. But the lie that bothered

me the most was when he lied to the American people. He thought that he was

technically telling the truth, but he was wrong and he shouldn't have done it. He had the right not to say anything, but he should not have lied.

That's why I was for censure early on.

PLAYBOY: Was the vote to impeach the low point for you?

FRANK: The low point was when the House voted in September to release the

Starr material. Three hundred and sixty members of the House, including the

great majority of the Democrats, voted with all the Republicans. Everybody thought it would kill Clinton. Everyone expected nasty salacious stuff.

That was the low point, because I thought that he might be thrown out of office - a terrible victory for the right wing. It wasn't that I didn't

think we could survive Bill Clinton not being president, but I didn't want to

see that set of values win. Also, I thought it would do tremendous damage to

the Democrats. People like Dick Morris, whose desire for vengeance on Bill Clinton has driven him around the bend, were writing stories about how the

Democrats were going to get wiped out. So was Bob Novak. They've all forgotten that now. So that was worse for me than the vote to impeach,

because the impeachment vote was clearly partisan and everyone knew it.

PLAYBOY: When the impeachment was handed to the Senate, did that body

behave better than the House?

FRANK: The moderate Republicans in the Senate showed more spine, though only slightly more.

PLAYBOY: Were they acting out of political expediency?

FRANK: They were being politically expedient when they voted in the beginning to keep the trial going. They could have ended it--there were numerous calls to dismiss. If they had really voted their consciences, they would have stopped it. No one other than the rabid right wingers believed this was the kind of thing you throw out a president over. Every Republican on the House judiciary Committee, even after Newt Gingrich was found to have lied 13 times to the House Ethics Committee, voted to give him a new term as Speaker. How in the hell do you make a man Speaker for a new term if he has lied 13 times to the House Ethics Committee over campaign financing, and then go after Clinton? These are people who praised George Bush's pardoning Caspar Weinberger when he was indicted for perjury. So, no, I don't believe that most of them seriously cared about the charges. It was miscalculated political expediency.

PLAYBOY: When you look back at Clinton's part in the scandal, do you blame his arrogance, or did the president simply use bad judgment?

FRANK: There was a lapse in judgment when he engaged in sex with Monica Lewinsky in the first place. Beyond that, saying "I didn't have sexual relations with her" reflects one of his weaknesses. He thinks he can talk his way out of anything. He's a good talker, but he's not as good as he thinks he is.

PLAYBOY: What did you make of the charges that came out after the impeachment that he raped Juanita Broaddrick?

FRANK: I'm glad he can't run for reelection. If he were able to run again, we would all be obligated to come to judgment about whether that is true or not. If it's true, he shouldn't be impeached, he should be imprisoned. On the other hand, that's why we have a statute of limitations.

There's no way anyone can tell whether this charge is true. The statute of limitations doesn't exist to protect people who did bad things a long time ago. It exists because it's impossible to come to a judgment about whether something happened or not many years after the fact. Witnesses' memories just aren't that reliable. I feel that this accusation isn't consistent with other accusations against the president, so I'm less inclined to believe it. It doesn't make sense in terms of a pattern, but there's no way to know about something that happened 20 years ago.

PLAYBOY: What's your reaction to George Stephanopoulos' account of the scandal and the Clinton presidency in his book?

FRANK: Mixed. He has a right to write a book about Bill Clinton that's critical of the president's policies. I worked for Kevin White, then the

mayor of Boston, and was very high on him-thought he did a great job. But then I came to disagree with things he did and opposed him when he ran for his last term. People said I was being disloyal. But the idea is not to work for a person but for your ideals. You are working for the public interest. So I don't fault Stephanopoulos for disloyalty. I do, however, criticize him for quoting private conversations. That's wrong.

PLAYBOY: After the books and news accounts and yearlong attention to the Clinton scandal, what is your prediction for the 2000 elections?

FRANK: The Republicans hope new issues will come along and the public won't care about the impeachment. But the public now judges everything the Republicans do through a screen of dislike. If they fight with Clinton, they are not going to get a fair shake. I would be surprised if the Democrats don't do much better than usual in 2000. We'll take the House and will make serious gains in the Senate-perhaps take it back.

PLAYBOY: Yet early polls suggest that a Republican, specifically George Bush, could beat Al Gore for president.

FRANK: Personality can transcend other factors when it comes to the presidency. Those poll results aren't a foregone conclusion by any means. George Bush has a long way to go before an election. So far, he has taken a pass on the Republican right's issues, but they aren't going to allow him to continue to take a pass. We'll see how he comes out of it all.

PLAYBOY: How about the next race in New York for the U.S. Senate? Would you support a bid by Hillary Clinton?

FRANK: I think it will be great if she runs. She would be very good.

PLAYBOY: What will happen to the Republicans? Will the moderates in the party break with the right?

FRANK: At some point they are going to have to. But part of the reason the right has so much strength is that its members vote. There's a catch-22.

The more the right dominates the party, the less other people will vote. Though they are a minority in this country, considerably less than 20 percent, the right is well organized. They are a powerful force. They register to vote and show up at the polls. I wish gay and lesbian people and African Americans and others would follow their example and organize. So I don't know how the Republicans will break out of that. I assume at some point they will throw out the ultra right if they lose badly enough. But it may take a truly disastrous defeat for that to happen more disastrous than the 1998 elections.

PLAYBOY: One casualty of those elections was another former adversary of yours, Newt Gingrich. Were you happy to see him go?

FRANK: Thrilled. Gingrich represented the worst trends in American politics. He more than anyone else brought in the negativism. He made a conscious decision in the Eighties to attempt to elevate his party by delegitimizing the opposition. He said to the others in his party, "Don't

act as if these are reasonable people with whom you disagree. These are bad people, corrupt people." He was creative in his vicious and negative campaign, and he was successful. But it ultimately consumed him, which was extremely satisfying.

PLAYBOY: Besides the possibility of gaining seats in the House and the Senate, how does the Democratic Party stand after the impeachment?

FRANK: We are on the verge of doing well. Bill Clinton has done a good job of purging our excesses.

PLAYBOY: Do you mean that he brought the party into the center?

FRANK: Yes, though in some cases he went too far.

PLAYBOY: On which issues do you think he went too far?

FRANK: Welfare, for example. I'm still worried about the repercussions of welfare reform-the part that says you are cut off after five years.

There

are people who just won't make it. What about the people who have kids? I don't understand punishing kids because they have lousy parents. And I don't

think it's necessary. I am all in favor of getting people working, but it isn't the only issue. The economy has been good, so we have been able to get

a lot of these people jobs. But what happens when we reach people on welfare

who no one would hire? They aren't quite disabled, but you wouldn't hire them. The bill doesn't consider them. Cutting them off assumes they are all

just lazy. Some aren't. Some are dysfunctional.

PLAYBOY: How would you help them?

FRANK: We are a rich country. If we were a poor country, maybe we'd have

to worry that somebody might get a nickel they don't deserve. But we are rich enough to err on the side of not starving or abusing children. I believe in the safety net. It's essential and humane. Sadly, there may be casualties before people see the need to fix it.

PLAYBOY: Other than welfare, what issues have you and President Clinton disagreed on?

FRANK: The biggest policy split between us was when he bought into the global trickle-down theory. A lot of us on the Democratic side support a global free market, too, but only if we can address labor rights and general

human rights as well as environmental protection. We also have to take care

of the people at home. The president is now moving in that direction. The defeat of fast track [which increases the president's power over trade issues] was very important. The passing of the International Monetary Fund bill was important because it included a lot of stuff about human rights and

environmental concerns. There will be more of those.

PLAYBOY: But you opposed the North American Free Trade Agreement, which Clinton supported.

FRANK: That is the best example of why trickle-down doesn't work. What we need is an international New Deal. Essentially what is happening is that

technology has transformed capitalism. What FDR did was deal with fully mature capitalism on a national level. He found a system that produced a lot of wealth but also assured stability and equality. The free market system worked as the main generator of wealth, but there were controls to protect people from unrestrained capitalism. Now technology has come along and transformed everything. Borders don't mean much anymore. But as we take our place in the new world economy, we need to protect our workers. We need to protect the environment. We need to protect the poor in other countries from being exploited and at the same time protect American companies from unfair foreign competition. So what we now need is an international New Deal.

PLAYBOY: How do you protect American interests beyond our borders?

FRANK: We can't tell other countries what to do, but we can use the fact that other countries want two things from us: American capital, encouraged and to some extent protected by the American government, and the ability to sell in the best market in the world. We have the right to condition access to our capital and our market. Clinton is coming around. In his State of the Union address he said, "We have got to put a human face on the global economy." We can do that by saying that if you want money from the World Bank, you have to agree to let your workers join unions. Our companies shouldn't have to compete against companies that pay their workers ten cents an hour. Other countries need environmental rules that are enforced. If they use child labor, they shouldn't be able to sell goods in America. We want to protect people and we want competition to be fair.

PLAYBOY: But Nafta addressed issues such as child labor, the minimum wage and environmental protections.

FRANK: Nafta paid lip service to them. I say let's redo Nafta with teeth. I think Clinton sees that that's what we need. We're stronger now as a party and we can go forward with tougher stands on issues like this. We're more united on a plausible agenda than we have been in my memory. Clinton did a lot of this: He purged, a lot of the negatives associated with Democrats.

PLAYBOY: Is liberalism still a bad word?

FRANK: It is, but it shouldn't be. I want to make it a better word.

PLAYBOY: Democrats are traditionally seen as weaker on defense. Are we underdefended now?

FRANK: No, we are not underdefended.

PLAYBOY: Some of your colleagues argue that we need to be-and aren't-ready to fight two wars at the same time.

FRANK: Against whom? It's ridiculous. South Korea is already well armed. We have to help South Korea against North Korea and we have to fight Iraq, but Iraq is in pretty weak shape. We could help South Korea against North Korea and defeat Iraq with much less than we now have. We have way too

many nuclear weapons. We haven't really scaled down since the end of the cold war. There has been a qualitative change. For 50 years, from the late

Thirties until 1990, we faced heavily armed totalitarians who opposed freedom

and were ready to attack us and had the capacity to damage us. The Nazis and

the Communists had the capacity to do real damage to America. Since then, there have been countries that are irresponsible, dangerous to their neighbors, but none are a danger to us. It is a qualitative difference.

There is no combination of forces in the world today that threatens our existence as a free society.

PLAYBOY: If the new threat is terrorism, what more would you have us do?

FRANK: We've done a fairly effective job so far. There has been virtually

no successful foreign terrorism inside the U.S. But we need to continue to fight it through intelligence and other means.

PLAYBOY: What would you do with the freed money if you were successful in

trimming the military budget?

FRANK: We need money in many domestic areas. My single greatest priority

is universal health care. Then I would improve education, the environment,

housing and law enforcement. There are a lot of things that involve the quality of life in a complicated urban society that you can't pay for as an individual. We must again look at all the people in our society - the ones falling through the cracks.

PLAYBOY: Another contentious issue is affirmative action. Do you think it is doomed?

FRANK: Because of the courts, we may have to use economics instead of race as a marker. It is not a perfect marker, but it's better than nothing.

There is no constitutional argument against economic discrimination.

Politically, the enemies of affirmative action will have a hard time arguing

against economic-based affirmative action. They say they aren't against helping poor people, they just don't think it should be based on race. I

disagree, of course. It should be about race because America has a long racist past and we can't get from prejudice to no prejudice without

corrections, taking our history into account. It would be better than

nothing to have it be income based, though, because race and income are related. PLAYBOY: After the divisive impeachment ordeal, will you be able

to

work with the Republicans on this or other issues?

FRANK: I Will. I can't work with Barr or Burton, but I couldn't work with them before. I'll work with the others. When you're a professional, you do that. This is not the sharpest dispute I've had with those people. I

was pretty angry at the demagoguery on the Defense of Marriage act. I have been angry at their homophobia and racism. But you learn to work with them because you have to.

PLAYBOY: But how deep does this sort of rancor go?

FRANK: With most people, not that deep. I think they way overdid it,

but Bill Clinton was not some innocent person walking down the street.

They didn't mug a charity case. He brought a little of this on himself, which mitigates the anger.

PLAYBOY: But do you like these guys? Do you argue with them in front of the camera and then go out for cocktails?

FRANK: No, we don't do that. We don't socialize much across party lines.

But we can work together.

PLAYBOY: Were you surprised if not horrified when you heard that Dick Armey referred to you as Barney Fag?

FRANK: Yeah, I was. I usually shoot from the hip and comment. But I took this one very seriously. I checked the tape to make sure he'd said it.

Then I sat and thought about it for a while before I decided on a response.

It seemed to me very grave. This was early 1995. The Republicans had just taken over as kings of the hill. So it felt pretty serious to have one of the major figures in the Republican Party-one of the top five Republicans in

the country-say something like that. He's fallen pretty far since then in terms of people's opinion of him, but it was serious. I thought hard about how to respond. I wanted to show my anger, but I didn't want to look like a

victim. People don't respect victims. I never want to project weakness.

I don't want to say, "Oh, poor me." I want to say, "Poor son of a bitch who crosses me." I want to be aggressive in defense of my rights.

PLAYBOY: Were you surprised that he said it or surprised that he said it out loud?

FRANK: That he said it out loud, mostly. I was talking to Steve Gunderson, who is a gay Republican who does very good work but is far too prone to apologize for his gay-bashing colleagues. Gunderson said, "I know Dick Armey and he doesn't have, a prejudiced bone in his body." I said, "I don't know about prejudiced bones in his body, but I know he has a prejudiced thought in his head."

PLAYBOY: How did you decide to respond to him?

FRANK: I held a press conference. I explained that I wanted to respond on behalf of all gay people who feel prejudice such as that expressed by Armey. I said, "This is an outrageous example of bigotry. Armey said he didn't mean to say it. I accept that, but he was thinking it. His argument was that it was simply a physical mispronunciation-he had simply mangled the

syllable." I said that that was preposterous. I said, "I don't think he intended to say it. But it wasn't a physical mispronunciation. He blurted out something he had been thinking, and I'm sure he wishes he hadn't said it." I also wanted to point out that this whole thing may have shown some progress. Fifteen years ago, he wouldn't have had to pretend he hadn't meant

it. I love my mother's reaction. Armey said it was just a mispronunciation

of Frank. When she heard about it, my mother said, "In the 59 years since

I married your father, no one has ever called me Elsie Fag."

PLAYBOY: is that an indication of how Armev and his colleagues talk about you in private?

FRANK: I don't think so. Maybe I'm kidding myself. I think Armev is unusually boorish. But I really don't think there is much of that. I would hear about it - there are gay staff people in their offices who are in the closet, and I would hear it from them. Part of the reason it came out then was the Republicans were particularly mad at me during that period. They had taken over and were running the House. A lot of Democrats were discouraged to find themselves in the minority. A lot of my colleagues had never been in the minority before. But I've been a minority all my life. I'm gay, Jewish and left-handed. I'm used to it. So I was more visible as one of their opponents, and they found me particularly obnoxious.

PLAYBOY: As the first openly gay congressperson, you drew a lot of attention to gay issues. One was gays in the military. Do you feel Clinton sold out the gay community in his compromise?

FRANK: No, because he got through as much as he could have at the time. I was against the don't-ask-don't-tell policy, but it wasn't his preference, either. PLAYBOY: Didn't you help make the compromise?

FRANK: No. I voted against it. Sam Nunn first came up with a version of the policy. I presented an alternative version that was rejected. The villains in this are Sam Nunn and Colin Powell. Powell wouldn't go along with anything meaningful.

PLAYBOY: What were you pushing?

FRANK: I would have accepted a policy that says, "You won't talk about being gay while you are on duty, but when you are off duty it is not a problem. If somebody finds out, it's none of his business." The policy they adopted is not a very good one. What's even worse is that the military has been abusive of the policy. They hate it. They think it goes too far, though it doesn't go nearly far enough. Clinton has been so afraid of the military that he won't enforce it. He lets them get away with abusing people.

PLAYBOY: Is it just a matter of time before that changes?

FRANK: Nothing is automatic. It's a matter of our mobilizing politically.

P LAYBOY: Meanwhile, there seems to be less, not more, tolerance of gays.

A survey showed that homophobia is on the rise among teenagers. Also, there has been a spate of hate crimes against gays.

FRANK: What we need to do is fully support secondary schools teaching that

prejudice-any prejudice-is wrong and that you don't beat people up because you don't like them. The two thugs who murdered Matthew Shepard were sadly just a few years out of high school, 21-year-old pieces of shit. Kids have to be educated about tolerance-of different races, sexual orientation, whatever.

PLAYBOY: Did you take it as a personal affront when the Republicans pushed through the Defense of Marriage Act, which essentially prohibits same-sex marriages?

FRANK: Of course. When Henry Hyde's marital affairs were revealed, I said to him, "I agree with those who say that this isn't relevant as far as the impeachment is concerned. But it is as far as *Doma* is concerned." Given his prominence as committee chairman in pressing *Doma* and arguing to me that gay marriages violate the sacrosanct institution of marriage, I think there was justification in what I said. They are arguing that legally acknowledging gay unions will undermine conventional marriages. It's nonsense. They're saying I can't get married. They're saying that my ability to marry another man somehow jeopardizes heterosexual marriage. Then they go out and cheat on their wives. That doesn't jeopardize heterosexual marriage? So there's some reconciling to do.

PLAYBOY: When you confronted Hyde, how did he respond?

FRANK: He said, "It's complicated. I understand your point." But we'll see what happens.

PLAYBOY: What can you do?

FRANK: The vicious part of *Doma* says that if a state recognizes same-sex marriage, the federal government will not honor it. So if and when a state recognizes gay marriage, I will try to push through legislation that challenges the federal government's stand. It will be a state's-right argument-that it's not up to the federal government. It will also be challenged in court.

PLAYBOY: What do you think is behind the right wing's homophobia?

FRANK: I think it is a vestige of religious influence. Beyond them, however, Americans take a generally pro-gay position, though not yet on marriage. If you ask the public, "Should you be fired because you are gay?" they say, "Of course not." Knowing that, when the bigots try to kill legislation that prohibits discrimination, they say, "Gays already are protected. Everyone is protected. Gays are looking for special rights." They get support that way, but it's nonsense. If the question were, "Should people be able to have recognition of the fact that they love someone else and legally share rights with them?" you would get a yes. I think everyone should have the same rights and anyone being discriminated against should have special protection. *Doma* meanwhile was mostly political. Hawaii was debating same-sex marriage and some gay groups said, "If Hawaii allows it, we're going to use the U.S. Constitution to argue that every state must allow it." It isn't good constitutional law, but it gave the Republicans a plausible argument that a decision in Hawaii to allow gay marriages was

going to lead to gay marriages everywhere in America. Hawaii unfortunately didn't go through with it, but it helped the right-wingers push the Defense of Marriage Act. Republicans saw a political wedge issue. They proposed Doma in 1996 and brought it to a vote. They figured they were going to make Clinton either sign the bill and piss off gay people or veto the bill and piss off everybody else. It was political. Completely.

PLAYBOY: After serving as long as you have in this House, are you less idealistic and more pragmatic?

FRANK: I'm no different now. And I reject the idea that pragmatism and idealism are opposed. The more idealistic you are, the more pragmatic you should be. The more you care about your values, the more you are morally obligated to get them implemented. It is not always easy to figure out how, but you have to try: You try to reconcile your ideals and the real world.

PLAYBOY: Do you have a plan for the next election? Do you see yourself running for a different office, or will you run again for Congress?

FRANK: I am going to run again. The only other office I would run for would be the Senate, and there are already two very good senators from Massachusetts. I'm 59 years old, rather late in life to be picking a new job. I expect to spend the next 15 or so years at this job and move on to retirement.

PLAYBOY: Does it get tedious, or is it still interesting?

(continud)

This message has been distributed as a free, nonprofit informational service, to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving this information for non-profit research and educational purposes only. 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."

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Doug.Case@sdsu.edu@INET@LNGTWY (Doug.Case@sdsu.edu@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:12-JUN-1999 00:38:09.00

SUBJECT: Apuzzo resigns position, plans to return to NY

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

WASHINGTON BLADE

June 11, 1999

<http://www.washblade.com>

Apuzzo resigns position
Assistant to Clinton plans return to New York

by Lou Chibbaro Jr.

Virginia Apuzzo, the veteran Gay civil rights leader who became the highest-ranking openly Gay official at the White House two years ago, leaves her White House job today to return to her home in New York City, where she will begin work at the Manhattan-based think tank of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force.

Beginning in September, Apuzzo, 57, will serve as the first occupant of the newly created Virginia Apuzzo Chair for Leadership and Public Policy at the NGLTF Policy Institute, which sponsors academic-oriented research into Gay-related topics. The new job represents what Apuzzo calls a "full circle" in her career. Apuzzo served as executive director of NGLTF from 1982 to 1985 at the time the national Gay civil rights group was based in New York. The group's headquarters is now located in Washington, D.C.

Since September 1997, Apuzzo has worked as assistant to the president for management and administration, a position that placed her in charge of the daily, non-political and non-policy operations at the White House. The job put her in charge of more than 1,800 people who work at the White House and White House related facilities, including the White House military detail and the Air Force operation that flies Air Force One and the presidential helicopters. Among other things, she was responsible for overseeing facilities ranging from the presidential retreat at Camp David and the White House travel office to the management of the "old" and "new" executive office buildings.

She called the job one of the most "gratifying and rewarding experiences" of her life.

Apuzzo said she chose to leave her White House job out of a desire to be closer to her family in New York, including her 80-year-old mother.

President Clinton and First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton were scheduled to

hold a reception in Apuzzo's honor at the White House residence Thursday afternoon. In addition to a larger staff "going away" party held for her Tuesday, the White House military detail was scheduled to hold its own separate reception for her Thursday before the president's and Hillary Clinton's reception.

"I can't tell you how much this means to me," Apuzzo said, in discussing the receptions held for her this week.

She said she was especially moved that officials with the military detail chose to hold a reception for her. Despite the longstanding tension between the Gay community and military officials over the issue of Gays in the military, Apuzzo said her relationship with officials ranging from generals to middle and lower-ranking officers during her White House tenure has been marked by respect and professionalism. Earlier this year, Apuzzo was the person who hired the chief of the White House military office.

Friends and associates of Apuzzo in the Gay movement have said her wide-ranging background has played a key role in her success in the areas of both Gay activism and politics. A former nun, Apuzzo became active in the Gay civil rights movement in New York in the early 1970s. After serving as head of NGLTF and working in other Gay movement positions, she served in two high-level positions in the administration of former New York Gov. Mario Cuomo (D). She began her stint in the Clinton administration in September 1996 as assistant deputy secretary at the Department of Labor.

At the time Clinton appointed her to her post as assistant to the president for management and administration, she became the highest-ranking openly Gay person in the U.S. government. Since that time, Clinton has appointed two other open Gays to posts at the rank of assistant to the president - Karen Tramontano and Sean Maloney.

Kerry Lobel, NGLTF's executive director, called the creation of the Virginia Apuzzo Chair at the group's New York-based Policy Institute an important development for the Gay movement. Lobel said the chair is modeled after positions in other think tanks, which often hire veteran government and business leaders to help advance the goals and mission of various political causes.

In a statement, Lobel said the chair, which will be funded by an endowment, will give Apuzzo and future holders of the chair the opportunity to "think, write, strategize and develop new ideas for advancing the educational and policy objectives" of the Gay civil rights movement.

"We're thrilled to have Ginny Apuzzo rejoin the NGLTF family," Lobel said.

This message has been distributed as a free, nonprofit informational service, to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving this information for non-profit research and educational purposes only. 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."

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Doug.Case@sdsu.edu@INET@LNGTWY (Doug.Case@sdsu.edu@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-JUN-1999 23:14:11.00

SUBJECT: Gore criticizes "don't ask, don't tell"

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Advocate.com Daily News

<http://www.advocate.com>

June 17, 1999

Gore criticizes "don't ask, don't tell"

Vice President Al Gore, who kicked off his campaign for the presidency this week, says in a television interview scheduled to air Wednesday night that the Pentagon ban on gays in the military is too restrictive. In an interview with Diane Sawyer on ABC's 20/20, Gore says he wants to ease the policy on gays in the military to make it easier for gays and lesbians to serve in the armed forces. "I'd like to see the policy implemented differently," Gore told Sawyer. "I don't think there's been enough compassion in that policy." The policy was instituted as a compromise after President Clinton failed in his effort to lift the military ban. Although Clinton has argued that the policy is fairer to gay service members, activists have noted that discharges under the policy have soared and charge that the policy is routinely violated by officers.

This message has been distributed as a free, nonprofit informational service, to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving this information for non-profit research and educational purposes only. 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."

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: System Administrator <postmaster@state.gov> (System Administrator <postmaster@state.gov> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 17-JUN-1999 10:17:14.00

SUBJECT: Undeliverable: ABC 20/20

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

TEXT:
Your message

To: Strell, Jay
Subject: ABC 20/20
Sent: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 10:14:29 -0400

did not reach the following recipient(s):

Strell, Jay MSX on Thu, 17 Jun 1999 10:16:15 -0400
Unable to deliver the message due to a communications failure
The MTS-ID of the original message is: c=US;a=;
p=GOV+DOS;l=AMERICAS019906171422NCNGKLN7
MSEXCH:MSEExchangeMTA:USUNB:USUNSNTSB

Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 10:14:29 -0400
From: Jeffrey_A._Shesol@who.eop.gov
Subject: ABC 20/20
To: "Strell, Jay" <StrellJ@state.gov>
Message-id: <85256793.004E3A08.00@lgate3.eop.gov>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=windows-1252
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
X-MS-Embedded-Report:
----- Forwarded by Jeffrey A. Shesol/WHO/EOP on 06/17/99
10:14 AM -----

Dag Vega
06/17/99 09:21:52 AM

Record Type: Record

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

cc:

Subject: ABC 20/20

ABC 20/20
JUNE 16, 1999

Interview with ALBERT GORE, JR., VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES
and TIPPER GORE, SECOND LADY OF THE UNITED STATES

ANNOUNCER: From ABC News around the world and into your home, the stories that touch your life, this is 20/20 -- with Barbara Walters, Diane Sawyer, Sam Donaldson, Connie Chung, Charles Gibson and Hugh Downs.

Tonight...

DIANE SAWYER, ABC News: Yes or no, did Bill Clinton compromise the dignity of the presidency?

ANNOUNCER: He's been waiting in the wings of the White House for seven years. Now, Al Gore is ready to take center stage.

Vice Pres. AL GORE: I'm just going to be who I am.

ANNOUNCER: Staking out his own territory on the most controversial issues of the day, like Social Security...

DIANE SAWYER: You will never reduce benefits or raise Social Security taxes?

ANNOUNCER: And Senator Hillary Clinton?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: Is she supposed to defer her ambitions yet again?

ANNOUNCER: Al and Tipper Gore with provocative answers to the questions the country's wanted to ask.

DIANE SAWYER: An intern in the White House, in the Oval Office. Did it outrage you?

ANNOUNCER: In Washington and on their Tennessee farm, candid talk about fidelity and family, about politics and policy, about her struggle with depression and his with being labeled, well, boring.

DIANE SAWYER: Did you have a wild man day?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: A minute.

ANNOUNCER: As his election campaign kicks off, Diane Sawyer with the man who would be president. Al Gore finally "Speaking For Himself."

Plus, round and round they go. Where they stop, depends on these -- batteries. So many brands, so many claims.

DURACELL SPOKESMAN (TV Commercial): Duracell outlasts Energizer.

RAYOVAC SPOKESMAN (TV Commercial): Get the maximum.

ANNOUNCER: Which batteries last the longest? Does price make a difference? We talked to experts and timed our batteries in action. Arnold Diaz taking charge to give you "The Rundown On Batteries."

Those stories tonight, June 16, 1999.

(Commercial Break)

ANNOUNCER: From ABC News in New York, Diane Sawyer and Charles Gibson.

DIANE SAWYER, ABC News: Good evening, and welcome to 20/20 Wednesday. Sam is on assignment, so Charlie Gibson is staying up late.

Well, it's official. The battle for the presidency in the year 2,000 has been joined. Vice President Al Gore moved to center stage today, announcing

his candidacy in front of the courthouse in Carthage, Tennessee.

CHARLES GIBSON, ABC News: Gore has an interesting problem. He has been vice president now for nearly seven years, and yet polls show that many Americans are uncertain about his leadership qualities. Is he really as stiff as the jokes make him seem? Was he truly disturbed by the Monica Lewinsky scandal, or just blindly loyal to his friend, the President?

DIANE SAWYER: Well, we tried to explore some of those issues as we interviewed Vice President and Mrs. Gore, first in Tennessee and then in Washington. And we started with the question, who is this man who has been waiting so long in the wings?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: And that is why today I announce that I am a candidate for president of the United States!

(Applause)

DIANE SAWYER: (voice-over) After almost eight years, today, Al Gore is striking out on his own. He announced his campaign for president in exactly the same place he launched his first campaign ever for Congress in 1976 -- Carthage, Tennessee. He made a point of showing us the town, population 2,500.

As the son of a senator, he used to split his time between the farm here and a Washington hotel just blocks from the Capitol. After college and Vietnam, he and his wife, Tipper, bought a home on the hill just across the river from his mom and dad. And he went to law school, became a Tennessee congressman and then senator, serving in Congress for 16 years.

But his political opponents always insist his Tennessee roots aren't authentic, that this son of the South is really just a boy from the Beltway.

(on camera) Here we are in Carthage. Are you really a country boy?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: I grew up in two places. I grew up in Washington, D.C., and I grew up here. My summers were here. Christmas was here. My happiest, most vivid memories were here. And, I mean, put yourself in my position. You've got a choice. Where are your memories going to be? Of the top floor of a hotel in Washington, D.C., playing...

DIANE SAWYER: Room service?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: No room service. Playing on the roof. Or in these hills riding a horse here, swimming and fishing in the river.

TIPPER GORE: When we first met and before we married, he said to me that first year, "I want you to come to my home." And he showed me all over his farm and told me about growing up here.

DIANE SAWYER: You mucked pigpens?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: I cleaned out the pigpens. Yes, I did. And raised cattle and showed them in the fairs around here, and planted, and plowed, and harvested and took in hay.

DIANE SAWYER: All right. My cousins are all tobacco farmers and cattle farmers. So I have a test for you. Ready for a pop quiz?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: All right.

DIANE SAWYER: How many plants of tobacco can you have per acre?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: Oh, I don't know. I don't know. I don't know. I'll flunk that test.

DIANE SAWYER: What is brucellosis?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: I know that there are five to seven on a stick when you put them in the -- in the barn.

DIANE SAWYER: And what are cattle prices roughly now?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: Too low.

(Laughter)

DIANE SAWYER: What was the other thing? Brucellosis?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: Oh, that's hoof and mouth disease.

TIPPER GORE: Not confined to cattle.

(Laughter)

DIANE SAWYER: And this is my mother's question. My mother says when a fence separates two farms, how can you tell which farm owns the fence?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: Well, the...

(Laughter)

DIANE SAWYER: I can't believe...

Vice Pres. AL GORE: It depends on what kind of fence it is. I mean, which -- if the poles are on the inside, that's the -- the side where the farm is.

DIANE SAWYER: (voice-over) So he got two out of four. Not bad.

(on camera) Because the Republicans, as you know, have begun to say, you know, "He wants you to think that he's overalls and Jethro playing the jug," I think is what one of them said. But in fact, you know, he's a privileged kid who went to St. Alban's, went to Harvard and had a very, very privileged Washington life.

Vice Pres. AL GORE: I did have a lot of privileges. I did. I got to see my father work in the Capitol. I was very proud of him. But a lot of the experiences I had were ones that he insisted that I have here, because he and my mother both grew up in very poor families on farms.

And my father was determined that I would have the same experiences growing up that he had, even if it was only a few months out of the year. He's a hero to me.

DIANE SAWYER: (voice-over) A hero when he opposed the Vietnam War, and it led to a crushing political defeat in 1972, even though his loyal son had enlisted in the Army and gone to Vietnam as a journalist in part to try to help his dad's campaign.

Four years later, the young Gore followed his dad into politics, bringing along with him, he says, his dad's, well, straight-laced and formal style.

DAVID LETTERMAN, Host (Clip from "Late Night"): Of course, Tennessee is famous for three things. You've got the country music. You got the Jack Daniels. You have Al Gore. Of course, any of those three things can put you to sleep.

DIANE SAWYER: (voice-over) It's now a national joke. Al Gore the stiff? Al Gore the wooden?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: I will be introducing legislation aimed at reducing CO2 emissions.

DIANE SAWYER: Serious polls taken recently say 56 percent of Americans find him boring, while only 23 percent say that about his chief Republican rival, George W. Bush. His fellow Democrats openly fret that the Vice President is not built for the age of personality politics.

(on camera) I think George W. Bush has said he had wild man periods in his life, and he learned a lot from it. Did you have a wild man day?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: A minute. Well, I'm not -- I'm not known for that. But, you know, we -- we went to college in the same city, and we -- we did some -- once we -- I had a motorcycle.

JAY LENO, Host (Clip from "The Tonight Show"): And scientists in Australia say they've developed a new tranquilizer that is effective on turtles. A turtle on tranquilizers? Boy, that sounds like the perfect pet for Al Gore, doesn't it?

DIANE SAWYER: Can you really laugh at the jokes about stiffness?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: Oh, yeah.

TIPPER GORE: Oh, yeah.

Vice Pres. AL GORE: Sure.

TIPPER GORE: Oh, sure.

DIANE SAWYER: At some point, do you feel a little besieged by them?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: Not really. Not really. I mean, you know, they're going to talk about something. Why not that? It doesn't bother me -- seriously.

DIANE SAWYER: But do you think this is serious? Do you think it could be the difference in your getting elected or not?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: You know, I think the press sometimes in the television age focuses a little bit more on style and a little bit less on substance than the American people would actually like.

I am who I am. And I'm old enough now to know that there are some things that are not -- not going to change. There are a lot of things I just don't want to change. And I'm just going to be who I am. And that's -- that's all I can do.

This campaign is not about the -- the gestures I make in an interview. The campaign is about how we bring about revolutionary change to our schools, how we keep our prosperity going, how we make it easier for families to be strong and together. That's really what this is about. Not style -- substance.

TIPPER GORE: Well, I guess this won't come as much of a surprise to any of you, but I came here to endorse Al, too.

DIANE SAWYER: (voice-over) Even so, his best campaign weapon is his spirited wife, Tipper, who repeatedly proclaims him sexy and fun, and helps his campaign draw a distinction between their marriage and the couple in the White House.

The Gores met at his high school prom, and by all accounts, the 29-year relationship is so solid, such a perfect picture of mutual support, even they laugh about it.

TIPPER GORE: When he went to law school, I supported that, and the time taken away, and he was working a newspaper at the same time.

Vice Pres. AL GORE: When she went to work as a photographer.

TIPPER GORE: When I went to work as a photographer.

Vice Pres. AL GORE: When she went to graduate school in psychology.

TIPPER GORE: Right. He was supportive of that. And, you know, just one thing led to another. He decided to run for Congress. And I decided to support that.

Vice Pres. AL GORE: When she launched the campaign against the record industry...

TIPPER GORE: Yeah. And he was very supportive.

DIANE SAWYER: (on camera) .the two of you, I'm watching these.

TIPPER GORE: No, not at all. But, I mean, in that sense, we have always bound together...

Vice Pres. AL GORE: We've had to support each other a lot.

TIPPER GORE: Exactly. And we've done it because we love -- I wanted to. I loved you. I wanted to do that. And I...

Vice Pres. AL GORE: Me, too.

TIPPER GORE: Yes.

DIANE SAWYER: (voice-over) It was only recently that we got even a glimpse behind the sunny photograph. The woman who has long been an advocate for destigmatizing mental illness has been all over the news talking about her mother's long battle with depression and an episode of

depression all her own.

TIPPER GORE: And I was diagnosed with clinical depression. I received treatment with medication.

DIANE SAWYER: (on camera) Could you tell something was different, something was wrong?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: Sure. Sure.

DIANE SAWYER: In what ways?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: Well, I respect her privacy, and I don't think it's for me to go into details like that.

DIANE SAWYER: She refuses to give details, dates, duration or the particulars of medication, saying only that it was a delayed response after their son was hit by a car while walking with his dad 10 years ago.

(on camera) Some people have written that in reluctance to go into detail, you might be contributing still to the idea that there's stigma attached to the detail.

TIPPER GORE: I think we're talking about a personal medical condition, a medical illness. And I think that -- all Americans would understand that no matter what that illness is that one might have, it's a personal, private thing, and it's up to -- you know, each individual to decide when and where they want to talk about it, whether it's in their family or whether it's publicly.

DIANE SAWYER: April 3, 1989. You're walking out of a baseball game with your son.

(voice-over) Albert III, 6 years old, pulled his hand out of his father's, dashed away and, after the car hit him, flew 30 feet in the air before landing on a curb, near death.

(on camera) Time magazine quotes a friend of yours as saying that, in the aftermath of this, for you, Mr. Vice President, it was guilt, and for you, it was anger.

TIPPER GORE: The aftermath of it? First of all, there was a lot of healing that took place and a long recovery period for Albert. I think we all pulled together as a family.

Vice Pres. AL GORE: There wasn't guilt and anger. That's not what...

TIPPER GORE: Right. That wasn't our experience.

Vice Pres. AL GORE: It was grief and concern, and in the process, I had to re-examine all of the other ways I was spending my time and living my life.

DIANE SAWYER: (voice-over) One immediate difference - more time with his children. Their married daughter, Karennia, is about to have a baby. Kristen and Sarah are at Harvard. Albert III is a junior at Sidwell Friends, a private school.

Back in 1992, it surprised a lot of people that this reserved and private man would speak about his son's accident at the Democratic convention.

Vice Pres. AL GORE: I ran to his side and held him and called his name, but he was limp and still without breath or pulse.

DIANE SAWYER: (voice-over) Four years later, at another convention, he recounted in painful detail his sister's long battle with lung cancer.

Vice Pres. AL GORE: And in a very short time, her breathing became labored, and then she breathed her last breath.

DIANE SAWYER: (voice-over) And most recently, has become very public about his personal religious life. In our second interview at his home in Washington, we asked about what the skeptics say. (on camera) Are you uncomfortable with the fact that -- speaking about

your sister and your son at the conventions, speaking about your religion now -- people say this is using private life for political gain?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: You know, it's -- it may be hard for anyone to just be himself or be herself. In public life, there is no way to be authentic and to be who you really are without being willing to -- to talk about the things that are most important to you.

I am who I am, and faith and family are at the center of my life. And if you ask me who I am, I'm going to tell you. If you ask me whether or not I believe in God, I'm going to tell you, "Yes, I do." And it's important to me. And if you believe that by answering truthfully, I'm trying to manipulate you, then I can't help that. That -- that's who I am.

DIANE SAWYER: And when we come back, Al Gore on the Clintons and the issues that may be decisive in this race. Stay with us.

ANNOUNCER: Next, what does Al Gore think about the other Clinton grabbing the spotlight now?

DIANE SAWYER: We call it bigfooting in our business, bigfooting your campaign.

ANNOUNCER: And later...

DIANE SAWYER: An intern in the White House, in the Oval Office. Did it outrage you?

ANNOUNCER: More of Al Gore, speaking for himself, when 20/20 returns.
(Commercial Break)

CHARLES GIBSON: We continue now Diane's interview with the Vice President and Mrs. Gore. An ABC News/Washington Post poll released today is an early barometer of how the race for the presidency is shaping up.

(voice-over) The good news for Al Gore is that he holds a huge lead over Bill Bradley for the Democratic nomination. The bad news is Gore lags behind Republican hopeful Texas governor George W. Bush.

(on camera) And he may have other problems. The First Lady has diverted publicity with an expected Senate race. And recently, President Clinton called the New York Times to say he was trying to get Al Gore to loosen up.

DIANE SAWYER: When you got up in the morning and opened the newspaper on Friday, May 14, and read, "Clinton admits to concerns as Gore campaign stumbles"...

Vice Pres. AL GORE: Yes. Yes. He was trying to help. He was trying to help. And listen, after seven years in this job, all four of us have had so many occasions where headlines come out in a way that we wouldn't want them to come out.

DIANE SAWYER: Mr. Vice President, you want me to believe you opened that, read that and said, "He's trying to help"?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: I knew that he was trying to help.

DIANE SAWYER: Is there a family friendly word that you used when you read this?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: Well, you know, I think that he probably had the same reaction. That didn't come out just exactly right.

DIANE SAWYER: You were mad?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: Well, I'm -- I don't have to tell you when I'm mad.

DIANE SAWYER: How do you really feel now, really feel about...

Vice Pres. AL GORE: Well, that's the signal to just tell you what we really feel.

DIANE SAWYER: (voice-over) Our question was about Hillary Clinton's Senate campaign. Some on his staff have said it drains attention from his race.

(on camera) We call it bigfooting in our business. Bigfooting your

campaign?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: I don't feel that's happening. I certainly don't feel that way. And you asked me how I really feel about her campaign? I'm happy for her, if she decides to run. I'm supportive of whatever decision she makes. I think she's going to run.

And, you know, for 25 years and more, this very talented, competent, effective woman has helped her husband in his political career, and she's put what may have been her own ambitions to run for office many years ago on hold.

Is she supposed to defer her ambitions yet again, not for her husband this time, but for another man, for whom she feels some derivative obligation? I don't think so. She's a good friend to us, and she will make a wonderful public servant.

DIANE SAWYER: Mrs. Gore, would you ever run for political office from the White House?

TIPPER GORE: I've never been in the position to even make that decision, but I...

DIANE SAWYER: Would you ever do it?

TIPPER GORE: But people have asked me throughout the years, you know, would I ever want to run for political office? And I've always said no. I mean, I don't see myself as a politician.

DIANE SAWYER: You were a journalist once. Write me a headline for the difference between President Clinton and President Gore.

Vice Pres. AL GORE: OK. Here's the headline. ``New Era, New Leadership."

DIANE SAWYER: (voice-over) He says he now wants revolutionary change, which begs the question -- what was he doing for the past seven years?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: The role of vice president is completely different from the role of president. And, you know, I think you pay a price for that, because you're -- you're always trying to -- to help the country by helping the president. But it's the honorable thing to do.

But, of course, one of the ways the job of president is so different is that, you know, other people are helping you, and you're setting the priorities. And you're saying, ``OK, here's what I think we need to do," and, ``Come on, Congress," try to rally them and rally the country. ``Let's -- let's get moving."

I want to hear from some young people.

DIANE SAWYER: (voice-over) Priority number one, he says -- education. He's unveiled a plan that includes funding preschool for every American child, smaller class sizes and tax-free savings accounts for education.

Vice Pres. AL GORE: At a time when we have the largest generation of school children in the entire history of America, we have to do more.

DIANE SAWYER: (voice-over) He talks about a global Marshall Plan to protect the environment, which could be expensive. But he plans to use the budget surplus to protect Social Security.

(on camera) So you're saying you will never reduce benefits or raise Social Security taxes?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: I have no intention of doing either of those things, especially not in a way that would hurt the quality of life for seniors. Every time there has been a need for course adjustments in Social Security, there have been some changes in the way the program operates, and I'm not ruling out those kinds of changes.

But the idea that there have to be benefit cuts or raise the retirement age in a way that really harms the quality of life for seniors, if I am

president of the United States, forget about it. That is not going to happen.

DIANE SAWYER: We're talking a lot of expensive proposals here, aren't we? A global Marshall Plan. Social Security, taking the surplus. Preschool for every...

Vice Pres. AL GORE: All within a balanced budget. All within a balanced budget. And I know how to do that. I know how to keep our prosperity going and use that prosperity to bring about dramatic changes that are essential to prepare our country for the 21st century.

DIANE SAWYER: (voice-over) By contrast, his Republican rival, George W. Bush, says he'll have prosperity and a tax cut.

(on camera) Do you admire George W. Bush?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: I don't really know him. I have met him casually, in passing, a couple of times, and I really don't know very much about him.

Gov. GEORGE W. BUSH, (R) Texas: I'm running for president of the United States.

DIANE SAWYER: (voice-over) The other differences we know are that Bush is pro-life. Gore, like Clinton, affirms full abortion rights. And on gays in the military, Gore might go even further than his boss if he can, saying, "don't ask, don't tell" isn't enough. (on camera) Would you like to see that changed, and basically free expression take place? Would you make that a priority?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: I'd like to see the policy implemented differently. I don't think there's been enough compassion in that policy.

DIANE SAWYER: So not taking a stand yet on pushing for full disclosure?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: Well, I would want to work with the military on the issue, but I would want to bring about changes in the way it's being implemented.

DIANE SAWYER: (voice-over) But the campaign issue with the fuse already burning has to be the weariness of scandal, starting with campaign finance. Gore says he's going to champion reform, even though his aggressive fund-raising in 1996 was branded part of the problem. One example -- raising money by telephone from his vice presidential office and then defending it with stilted legalisms.

Vice Pres. AL GORE: My counsel tells me there is no controlling legal authority that says there was any violation of any law.

Well, obviously, all of that could have been handled better. If I had it to do over again, I'd do it differently.

DIANE SAWYER: (on camera) Did you always do right?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: Yes, I think I did. I believed then and believe now in the cause for which I was fighting.

DIANE SAWYER: (voice-over) But the scandal that drags like a stone at the center of his campaign is that other scandal -- will he distance himself from a president who misled the public and got caught?

Pres. BILL CLINTON: I did not have sexual relations with that woman.

DIANE SAWYER: (on camera) You were standing there in the room when he waved his finger at all of us and with indignation said that he did not do something that it turned out he did.

Vice Pres. AL GORE: Well, I think you can imagine what I felt.

DIANE SAWYER: (voice-over) He tells us what he felt, and so does Mrs. Gore, when we return.

ANNOUNCER: He stood by the President through his darkest time. But what was Al Gore really thinking?

DIANE SAWYER: Did Bill Clinton compromise the dignity of the presidency

with what he did with Monica Lewinsky?

ANNOUNCER: A difficult time remembered, when 20/20 returns.

(Commercial Break)

ANNOUNCER: Blunt words about the Clinton sex scandal.

Vice Pres. AL GORE: What he did was inexcusable.

ANNOUNCER: More of Al Gore, speaking for himself. Then, a battery of information about batteries. Which lasts longest? Should you pay more?

Arnold Diaz with the rundown, when 20/20 continues after this from our ABC stations.

(Station Break)

DIANE SAWYER: Politics has always posed tough choices between loyalty and survival. None tougher, perhaps, than the one President Clinton presented his loyal vice president by handing him a year-long national ordeal over Monica Lewinsky.

We remembered sitting with the Gores back in 1992, just after the Gennifer Flowers headlines, and asking them, what if then-candidate Clinton had more embarrassing revelations waiting in the wings?

(on camera) Did you ask him about it?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: No, I did not.

DIANE SAWYER: Just don't think it's anybody's business?

TIPPER GORE: Right, right.

Vice Pres. AL GORE: I am very impressed with Bill Clinton. And with Hillary, for that matter. And I believe that he ought to be president of this country. If you're asking me, do I trust him? I do.

DIANE SAWYER: (voice-over) That was 1992. It's now 1999, after another Clinton scandal. The nation is exhausted from the process, and Republican George W. Bush is gearing up to make sure Al Gore pays the price.

GEORGE W. BUSH: When we put our hand on the Bible, that we swear not only to uphold the laws of the land, but that we swear in to uphold the dignity of the office to which we have been elected...

DIANE SAWYER: (on camera) Yes or no, did Bill Clinton compromise the dignity of the presidency with what he did with Monica Lewinsky?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: Yes, but I think he recovered from it. I think that it was a horrible, difficult year for the country to go through. For those of us who are his friends, we were disappointed. He suffered. Unfortunately, his family also did and others involved with that whole matter.

Should the country have had to go through that experience? No. I've said, and I'll say again, what he did was inexcusable, and particularly as a father, I felt that it was terribly wrong, obviously. But I do believe that with the good grace and good sense of the American people, we have been able to get through it.

DIANE SAWYER: But I think there's an emotional mystery at the center of it about you, people feel. An intern in the White House, in the Oval Office. Did it outrage you?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: I've said previously, and I'll repeat to you, I think that what he did was inexcusable. If you've ever had a friend who disappointed you, and you worked with that person, and you rebuilt the relationship, and moved forward from the disappointment, that's exactly what that was like for me.

DIANE SAWYER: Why do you choose the word "disappointed" instead of "horrified?"

Vice Pres. AL GORE: Well, I use the word "inexcusable," I use the word "awful, terrible, horrible." You know, the man is a friend of mine, and I

am -- we have a close working relationship, and he has -- he's gone through a lot in this. His family has gone through a lot.

I do believe that it should be placed in a larger context, within which it is balanced against the good things he has done as president.

Pres. BILL CLINTON: I did not have sexual relations with that woman.

DIANE SAWYER: Did you believe him that the point?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: I didn't like that moment at all. But in -- in addressing what you call a mystery about what my feelings were, I want you to understand that there shouldn't be any mystery.

I thought it was awful. I thought it was inexcusable. But I made a commitment to serve this country as vice president. I have a commitment to help him be the best president he's capable of being, number one.

And more importantly than that, a commitment to the country to do what I can in my role to make sure the ship of states steers a straight course, to make sure there's a stability and continuity. And I'm not going to turn my back on that commitment.

DIANE SAWYER: Did you know he wasn't telling the truth?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: No, I didn't. No, of course not.

DIANE SAWYER: Not until when?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: Not until he acknowledged it in his statement to the American people, much later in that terrible year.

DIANE SAWYER: You had no idea? You really believed him?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: I did.

DIANE SAWYER: Did he lie to you?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: You know, I felt, at the time, that the matter was so painful for him, that he was concealing things that would have given a different impression if he had been totally candid. And so, I worried that that was going on.

And certainly, the impression that he gave me and the others that he worked with was not the truth. But he acknowledged that. He asked for forgiveness.

DIANE SAWYER: At the celebration, after he has been impeached, you are there saying...

Vice Pres. AL GORE: What happened as a result does a great disservice to a man I believe will be regarded in the history books as one of our greatest presidents. DIANE SAWYER: I think people remember seeing you in that moment and thinking, is this what he wants us to feel?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: Do you think that it was an offense for which he should have been removed from office and that the country should have to go through that because of that?

DIANE SAWYER: My opinion, first of all, doesn't matter. And second of all, I don't - I keep detachment.

Vice Pres. AL GORE: But, see, your answer...

DIANE SAWYER: I'm asking the question.

Vice Pres. AL GORE: I understand. But your opinion on that is important to put this whole matter in context, because I'll tell you what the opinion of the American people is on that question. Overwhelmingly, Republicans, Democrats, independents -- they felt what he did was awful, but they felt that it was not something for which he should be removed from office.

DIANE SAWYER: (voice-over) But what about Mrs. Gore, who did not attend the post impeachment celebration? A brand-new book by journalist Bob Woodward reports she was furious at what the President had done.

(on camera) Did you believe the President, all the way through until...

TIPPER GORE: I did. I believed him until he made his statement in

August.

DIANE SAWYER: And what is the word that characterizes your reaction?

TIPPER GORE: Well, I was -- I was very surprised and shocked, and I was very disappointed. I was very disappointed.

DIANE SAWYER: Recently Mrs. Clinton was asked -- or I guess it was expressed to her that a number of people wanted to say to her, why don't you just throw him out? Just leave him.

TIPPER GORE: I think that people can understand this in the context of their family, their community, their neighbors, people they know that have troubles in their marriages, and people that they know who work on it, no matter what comes up, to work it out. And I respect Mrs. Clinton's decision to stay and to work it out.

DIANE SAWYER: What would you do if it were you?

TIPPER GORE: I would -- I don't -- I can't imagine it being me. But in

general, we have always worked things out in our family, no matter what it was. I think that it's important to know that the way I feel is, you know, from my faith. Again, you can hate the sin but love the sinner. I believe in the power of forgiveness and faith.

He said he was sorry. He asked for forgiveness from me, and I said, ``Yes, OK. I forgive you." I think he went through that with all of his friends.

DIANE SAWYER: He asked you personally?

TIPPER GORE: Yes.

DIANE SAWYER: (voice-over) But presidential politics is not forgiving, and every vice president in history has learned that, sooner or later, survival may depend on making a stand on your own.

(on camera) You said that misleading statements are very different from lying. Is that the article of faith that you want to run your presidential campaign on?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: Well, no, of course not. That's -- that's in the context of the effort by -- a partisan effort, what I felt was a partisan effort in the Congress to remove him from office.

DIANE SAWYER: And the assurance you give the American people about a Gore administration on issues like these?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: Well, you mean being candid with the American people?

DIANE SAWYER: And issues of, I guess, personal behavior?

Vice Pres. AL GORE: Well, they should be assured.

DIANE SAWYER: And so, it's begun. And the question is, has he gained a foothold now against the Republican front-runner, George W. Bush?

CHARLES GIBSON: George Bush is out there saying foreign policy, particularly the issues of dealing with Russia and China are going to be the major issues of this campaign.

It's strange that he says that, because here's Vice President Gore with enormous experience in government and particularly in foreign policy. And then, you have this sustained economic growth in the country for, what, seven years now straight, and the polls indicate that George W. Bush would beat Al Gore today.

It seems strange. Maybe long experience in government works against you now?

DIANE SAWYER: Well, it's true that foreign policy could be the sleeper advantage for Gore, but one of the problems has been he simply is not known, except for the comedians' jokes about him night after night after

night.

CHARLES GIBSON: I'm not sure that Jay Leno and David Letterman aren't the people now, and Bill Maher, who form the public's opinions of the personalities of candidates because, as you say, they do those jokes over and over and over again, and that's what sets into our minds.

DIANE SAWYER: And the irony is that it's true. That when you are with him, he is funny and fast and spontaneous.

CHARLES GIBSON: And the comedians haven't started yet on George W. Bush.

DIANE SAWYER: That's true.

CHARLES GIBSON: They will.

DIANE SAWYER: That's true.

And we'll be back.

END OF SEGMENT

Message Sent

To:

Douglas B. Sosnik/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anthony R. Bernal/OVP@OVP
Melissa G. Green/OPD/EOP@EOP
Leslie Bernstein/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin M. Roland/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dominique L. Cano/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dag Vega/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brenda M. Anders/WHO/EOP@EOP
gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jordan Tamagni/WHO/EOP@EOP
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP@EOP
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julianne B. Corbett/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey M. Smith/OSTP/EOP@EOP
Lowell A. Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan A. Kaplan/OPD/EOP@EOP
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer Ferguson/OMB/EOP@EOP
Mark D. Neschis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lisa J. Levin/WHO/EOP@EOP
Peter A. Weissman/OPD/EOP@EOP
William A. Halter/OMB/EOP@EOP
Eli G. Attie/OVP@OVP
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP@EOP

Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael Waldman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gene B. Sperling/OPD/EOP@EOP
Paul K. Engskov/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julie E. Mason/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP@EOP
Alison Muscatine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gordon Li/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP@EOP
June Shih/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey A. Shesol/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rochester M. Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rachael E. Sullivan/OVP@OVP
Julie B. Goldberg/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah E. Gegenheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steve Ricchetti/WHO/EOP@EOP
Edward F. Hughes/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa J. Prober/WHO/EOP@EOP
Clara J. Shin/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan M. Prince/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Alejandro G. Cabrera/OVP@OVP
Rebecca L. Walldorff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP@EOP
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP
Laura J. Lewis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Toby C. Graff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. O'Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin J. Bachman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Saladbar 23 <saladbar23 @ hotmail.com> @ inet
Kimberly S. Anderson/OA/EOP@EOP
Erica S. Lepping/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steven Reich/WHO/EOP@EOP
Ann C. Hertelendy/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lindsey E. Huff/NSC/EOP@EOP
Jenni R. Engebretsen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Aprill N. Springfield/WHO/EOP@EOP
David Vandivier/OMB/EOP@EOP
Ruby Shamir/OPD/EOP@EOP
Dawn M. Chirwa/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michele Ballantyne/WHO/EOP@EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Doug.Case@sdsu.edu@INET@LNGTWY (Doug.Case@sdsu.edu@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:25-JUN-1999 13:08:54.00

SUBJECT: Gore campaigns in California, courts gay voters

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

CNN/allpolitics.com

<http://cnn.com/ALLPOLITICS/>

June 24, 1999

Gore campaigns in California, courts gay voters

SAN FRANCISCO (June 24) - Vice President Al Gore Thursday continued his two-day campaign swing through the important electoral state of California, courting gay and lesbian voters while staying completely focused on his message of economic prosperity and gun control.

A tour of a gay and lesbian center and several fund-raisers in Los Angeles topped the vice president's schedule.

One week ago on July 17, former Senator Bill Bradley, Gore's only announce Democratic contender, visited the same gay and lesbian Center.

"You are an integral part of America," Bradley said during his visit.

While no hard data exists, the Human Rights Campaign - the largest national gay and lesbian political group - estimates somewhere between \$3-6 million in campaign contributions came from gay and lesbian PACs in 1996.

Last week in Hollywood, Bradley raised \$800,000 at a dinner hosted by openly-gay movie mogul, Barry Diller.

Gore aides have said they hope the two-day tour of California will raise more than \$1.1 million for the vice president's campaign.

CNN exit polls after the 1996 presidential election showed five percent of all voters who responded identified themselves as gay, lesbian or bisexual. Couple that with contributions and it is an important constituency.

"Gay and lesbians want to know where they are at when it comes to gay marriage; when it comes to æ equal opportunity in the workspace," says Judy Wieder, editor-in-chief for "The Advocate," the nation's largest gay, news magazine.

While Gore has been dogged by gay activists upset with the Clinton Administration's policy over access to AIDS fighting drugs and on Wednesday said he opposes "a change in the institution of marriage as we now know it

between men and women," the vice president has often shown support for gay and lesbian issues.

The vice president recently was moved to console a lesbian teenager in Los Angeles who spoke of abuse, at the hands of her classmates.

"I hope that you will seek safety for the gay youth," the young woman said holding back tears.

"How can anyone not be moved by the sincere appeal of her heart?" Gore responded, hugging the young lady.

Some analysts wonder if the open support is Gore's attempt to further distance himself from President Bill Clinton's 1993 foible involving gays in the military.

"The whole debacle with 'don't ask, don't tell' æ I think that people want to know - 'let's not get fooled again.'" Wieder says.

Gore traveled Wednesday from San Diego to San Francisco for four television interviews and two speeches, consistently repeating and steering the subject back to his mantra of "I know how to keep the prosperity going."

The vice president also hammered the issue of gun control, hitting his top Republican rival Texas Gov. George W. Bush's recent approval of a bill making it more difficult for municipalities in Texas to sue gun manufacturers.

"Instead of shielding gun manufacturers against being held responsible for their activities, we should be shielding children and families against violence," Gore said.

Gore returned to that theme when asked if a Bush-Gore race would be dull. "If that's how it turns out, you'll see a major debate about whether or not we should shield children and families from gun violence, or shield gun manufacturers with special protection," Gore said.

With his campaign little more than a week old and the general election more than 17 months away, Gore did tell one interviewer he understood "a lot of people aren't ready" for the 2000 presidential race.

"Most people don't have time to worry about this right now because they know the election's a long way off," he said. "As we get closer to it, you'll see a lot more attention paid to it."

CNN's Jennifer Auther and The Associated Press contributed to this report.

This message has been distributed as a free, nonprofit informational service, to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving this information for non-profit research and educational purposes only. 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."

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Alejandro G. Cabrera (CN=Alejandro G. Cabrera/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:25-JUN-1999 09:26:51.00

SUBJECT: CNN Piece on Gore Visit

TO: Elizabeth J. Potter (CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Philip G Dufour (CN=Philip G Dufour/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Gore campaigns in California, courts gay voters

June 24, 1999

Web posted at: 5:47 p.m. EDT (2147 GMT)

SAN FRANCISCO (June 24) -- Vice President Al Gore Thursday continued his two-day campaign swing through the important electoral state of California, courting gay and lesbian voters while staying completely focused on his message of economic prosperity and gun control.

A tour of a gay and lesbian center and several fund-raisers in Los Angeles topped the vice president's schedule.

One week ago
on July 17,
former Senator
Bill Bradley,
Gore's only
announce
Democratic
contender,
visited the same
gay and lesbian
Center.

"You are an integral part of America," Bradley said during his visit.

While no hard data exists, the Human Rights Campaign -- the largest national gay and lesbian political group -- estimates somewhere between \$3-6 million in campaign contributions came from

gay and lesbian PACs in 1996.

Last week in Hollywood, Bradley raised \$800,000 at a dinner hosted by openly-gay movie mogul, Barry Diller.

Gore aides have said they hope the two-day tour of California will raise more than \$1.1 million for the vice president's campaign.

CNN exit polls after the 1996 presidential election showed five percent of all voters who responded identified themselves as gay, lesbian or bisexual. Couple that with contributions and it is an important constituency.

"Gay and lesbians want to know where they are at when it comes to gay marriage; when it comes to ... equal opportunity in the workspace," says Judy Wieder, editor-in-chief for "The Advocate," the nation's largest gay, news magazine.

While Gore has been dogged by gay activists upset with the Clinton Administration's policy over access to AIDS fighting drugs and on Wednesday said he opposes "a change in the institution of marriage as we now know it between men and women," the vice president has often shown support for gay and lesbian issues.

%The vice president recently was moved to console a lesbian teenager in Los Angeles who spoke of abuse, at the hands of her classmates.

"I hope that you will seek safety for the gay youth," the young woman said holding back tears.

"How can anyone not be moved by the sincere appeal of her heart?" Gore responded, hugging the young lady.

Some analysts wonder if the open support is Gore's attempt to further distance himself from President Bill Clinton's 1993 foible involving gays in the military.

"The whole debacle with 'don't ask, don't tell' ... I think that people want to know -- 'let's not get fooled again.'" Wieder says.

Gore traveled Wednesday from San Diego to San Francisco for four television interviews and two speeches, consistently repeating and steering the subject back to his mantra of "I know how to keep the prosperity going."

The vice president also hammered the issue of gun control, hitting his top Republican rival Texas Gov. George W. Bush's recent approval of a bill making it more difficult for municipalities in Texas to sue gun manufacturers.

"Instead of shielding gun manufacturers against being held responsible for their activities, we should be shielding children and families against violence," Gore said.

Gore returned to that theme when asked if a Bush-Gore race would be dull. "If that's how it turns out, you'll see a major debate about whether or not we should shield children and families from gun violence, or shield gun manufacturers with special protection," Gore said.

With his campaign little more than a week old and the general election more than 17 months away, Gore did tell one interviewer he understood "a lot of people aren't ready" for the 2000 presidential race.

"Most people don't have time to worry about this right now because they know the election's a long way off," he said. "As we get closer to it, you'll see a lot more attention paid to it."

CNN's Jennifer Auther and The Associated Press contributed to this report.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Doug.Case@sdsu.edu@INET@LNGTWY (Doug.Case@sdsu.edu@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:25-JUN-1999 13:08:54.00

SUBJECT: Gore campaigns in California, courts gay voters

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

CNN/allpolitics.com

<http://cnn.com/ALLPOLITICS/>

June 24, 1999

Gore campaigns in California, courts gay voters

SAN FRANCISCO (June 24) - Vice President Al Gore Thursday continued his two-day campaign swing through the important electoral state of California, courting gay and lesbian voters while staying completely focused on his message of economic prosperity and gun control.

A tour of a gay and lesbian center and several fund-raisers in Los Angeles topped the vice president's schedule.

One week ago on July 17, former Senator Bill Bradley, Gore's only announce Democratic contender, visited the same gay and lesbian Center.

"You are an integral part of America," Bradley said during his visit.

While no hard data exists, the Human Rights Campaign - the largest national gay and lesbian political group - estimates somewhere between \$3-6 million in campaign contributions came from gay and lesbian PACs in 1996.

Last week in Hollywood, Bradley raised \$800,000 at a dinner hosted by openly-gay movie mogul, Barry Diller.

Gore aides have said they hope the two-day tour of California will raise more than \$1.1 million for the vice president's campaign.

CNN exit polls after the 1996 presidential election showed five percent of all voters who responded identified themselves as gay, lesbian or bisexual. Couple that with contributions and it is an important constituency.

"Gay and lesbians want to know where they are at when it comes to gay marriage; when it comes to æ equal opportunity in the workspace," says Judy Wieder, editor-in-chief for "The Advocate," the nation's largest gay, news magazine.

While Gore has been dogged by gay activists upset with the Clinton Administration's policy over access to AIDS fighting drugs and on Wednesday said he opposes "a change in the institution of marriage as we now know it

between men and women," the vice president has often shown support for gay and lesbian issues.

The vice president recently was moved to console a lesbian teenager in Los Angeles who spoke of abuse, at the hands of her classmates.

"I hope that you will seek safety for the gay youth," the young woman said holding back tears.

"How can anyone not be moved by the sincere appeal of her heart?" Gore responded, hugging the young lady.

Some analysts wonder if the open support is Gore's attempt to further distance himself from President Bill Clinton's 1993 foible involving gays in the military.

"The whole debacle with 'don't ask, don't tell' æ I think that people want to know - 'let's not get fooled again.'" Wieder says.

Gore traveled Wednesday from San Diego to San Francisco for four television interviews and two speeches, consistently repeating and steering the subject back to his mantra of "I know how to keep the prosperity going."

The vice president also hammered the issue of gun control, hitting his top Republican rival Texas Gov. George W. Bush's recent approval of a bill making it more difficult for municipalities in Texas to sue gun manufacturers.

"Instead of shielding gun manufacturers against being held responsible for their activities, we should be shielding children and families against violence," Gore said.

Gore returned to that theme when asked if a Bush-Gore race would be dull. "If that's how it turns out, you'll see a major debate about whether or not we should shield children and families from gun violence, or shield gun manufacturers with special protection," Gore said.

With his campaign little more than a week old and the general election more than 17 months away, Gore did tell one interviewer he understood "a lot of people aren't ready" for the 2000 presidential race.

"Most people don't have time to worry about this right now because they know the election's a long way off," he said. "As we get closer to it, you'll see a lot more attention paid to it."

CNN's Jennifer Auther and The Associated Press contributed to this report.

This message has been distributed as a free, nonprofit informational service, to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving this information for non-profit research and educational purposes only. 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."

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-JUN-1999 17:38:07.00

SUBJECT: Re: Don't Ask, Don't Tell

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

TEXT:

great. can we try to do this Friday, b/s I think I'll be away the following week.

Edward W. Correia

06/28/99 04:29:38 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Charles F. Ruff/WHO/EOP@EOP, Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP@EOP
cc:
Subject: Don't Ask, Don't Tell

Rudy DeLeon says he would like Richard and me to come over to DOD for lunch to talk over our recommendations with the "legal guys" and others there. OK? Should we proceed some other way?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-JUN-1999 17:13:24.00

SUBJECT: Another piece on Calif trip and gays, AIDS drugs

TO: Christopher S. Lehane (CN=Christopher S. Lehane/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Philip G Dufour (CN=Philip G Dufour/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael B. Feldman (CN=Michael B. Feldman/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Clark E. Ray (CN=Clark E. Ray/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth J. Potter (CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ansley Jones (CN=Ansley Jones/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Ron Klain (CN=Ron Klain/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

On the Gore Campaign
Trail

NewsPlanet Staff

Friday, June 25, 1999 / 10:28 PM

SUMMARY: In his bid to become No. 1, the

U.S. Vice President speaks against hate crimes and makes "family values" (except marriage) more inclusive, but says "don't ask" could work and faces AIDS drug protests.

As the reintroduction of the Employment Non-Discrimination Act was announced in Washington, DC on June 24, Vice President Al Gore (D) stated his support for ENDA while visiting the Los Angeles Gay and Lesbian Center's youth shelter. When a skeptical young gay man asked him why he was there, Gore said, "I'm here to learn and to pay honor to this place," and praised the Center for "helping to change attitudes and abolish some irrational discrimination that is all too common." Gore also restated his support for hate crimes legislation, saying those crimes are "based on a fear of differences." He allowed only one private interview, to the venerable gay and lesbian national magazine "The Advocate," believed to be the first time any major Presidential candidate ever met with a national gay publication.

Democratic Presidential hopeful Bill Bradley had already visited the Center's youth shelter on June 17. While there, he expressed his support for tougher laws against hate crimes. One young lesbian who had been present for both the Bradley and Gore visits told the Associated Press that she found them equally unimpressive.

All Kinds of Family Values

Nonetheless, Gore taking the step of visiting the Center -- something his Republican opponents for the Presidency in 2000 are not too likely to do -- was of some importance to demonstrate the inclusion of gays and lesbians in his recent rhetoric about families and family values (long understood as a euphemism for anti-gay), particularly given his recent suggestions for government funding for church-run services. For example, among the sentiments he's repeated while criss-crossing the country are, "I want to take my own values of faith and family to the Presidency," and "I believe that in contrast to the deficit crisis we had six or seven years ago, we now have a family crisis in America." So it was notable that at

the Center, Gore carefully referred to "families of all kinds." His visit there was the only one of five scheduled appearances that day which was not a fund-raising event.

Before coming to Los Angeles, Gore was in San Francisco, where reporters asked him about California's upcoming ballot initiative to deny legal recognition to same-gender marriages another state may someday perform. He said that he supported some legal status for domestic partners, but opposes "a change in the institution of marriage as we now know it between men and women."

Hug for a Lesbian Teen

In Los Angeles on June 18, Gore visited with several hundred students at Fairfax High School (where the pioneering Project 10 program for lesbian and questioning youth began). One lesbian senior described the homophobic verbal abuse she'd experienced at another school and how those taunts were seen as acceptable behavior there. When she began to cry at recalling her pain, Gore crossed the gym to hug her, to the applause of the other students. "How can anyone not be moved by such a sincere opening of her heart?" he asked rhetorically. He affirmed that, "I believe very strongly that we should have laws to protect young people like her from hate crimes," although most of his discussions of school safety have been more in reference to the massacre at Columbine and gun control. He went on to say, "I believe that in the history of our nation, we have grown in our understanding of what it is to be human. Now we have to expand the human circle of dignity to include lesbians and gays."

AIDS Drug Controversy

For what a couple of pundits have identified as the first actual issue of the campaign, Gore's tour has been dogged by protesters from the coalition group AIDS Drugs for Africa, which includes members of the direct action group ACT UP (AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power). A handful of those demonstrators have used whistles and chanting to disrupt his appearances in Carthage, Tennessee, where he formally

announced his candidacy on June 16, and on June 17 in Manchester, New Hampshire and in New York City. The first group were physically attacked by others attending the speech until law enforcement intervened; two of the Manchester group were able to come within two feet of Gore for about a minute until bodyguards intervened.

The protesters contend that Gore (in his capacity as Co-Chair of the Bi-National Trade Commission on South Africa) has personally threatened trade sanctions against South Africa should it legally manufacture its own AIDS drugs at prices that would make them accessible to its impoverished population; they also say he resurrected AGOA, the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act, another means to the same end. Pointing to a number of current and past drug industry lobbyists with important positions in the Gore campaign, they charge that Gore has acted out of greed for drug industry contributions, at the expense of Africans' lives.

Astonished at the first protest, Gore was barely able to come up with a statement that he supports free speech, but later he offered to meet with demonstrators afterwards. That hasn't happened, but on June 24, Gore issued a statement promising to work with South Africa's new President Thabo Mbeki to develop ways to prevent and combat AIDS, and saying that he is encouraging the U.S. Trade Representative, the South African government and the pharmaceutical industry to explore solutions to settle disputes over getting patented drugs to people with AIDS and HIV. None of the protesters particularly want to see leading Republican Presidential hopeful George W. Bush elected, but they do want a reversal of US drug policy, and they've promised to demonstrate at every Gore campaign stop. A large demonstration is planned for Gore's Philadelphia appearance on June 28.

"Don't Ask," But Differently

Gore was asked about his position on the so-called "don't ask, don't tell" policy on gays and lesbians serving in the military by Diane Sawyer of ABC's "20/20" for an edition which aired the day Gore announced

his candidacy, June 16. Gore said, "I don't think there's been enough compassion in that policy" and that he'd "like to see the policy implemented differently." While he did appear to be indicating support for making it easier for gays and lesbians to serve, he gave no indication as to whether or not he's aware of the dramatic increase in military discharges for homosexuality in the years since the so-called compromise policy was adopted.

"Worth Fighting Gore"

Republican Presidential hopeful Dan Quayle's new book "Worth Fighting For" charges that Gore and President Bill Clinton have "embraced those who, since the 1960's, have ceaselessly pounded away at honor, duty, country and the rule of law" and describes "deep, if not irreconcilable differences between left and right on the issue of the country's core values." Quayle denounces a "new aristocracy" of "elite news media, the Hollywood crowd, the tenured faculty of elite institutions of higher education, the federal judiciary and the radical feminist movement," claiming that, "Their numbers are small, but their influence is staggering."

As an example of the influence of this "opinion elite" Quayle cites Gore's praise for the 1997 coming out episode of the now-defunct ABC sitcom "Ellen," which Gore described as "forcing" Americans to view a positive portrayal of lesbian life. Quayle also slams the 1960's for "the rejection of traditional sexual morality ... [that] robbed an army of children of the chance to live in two-parent households ... even as it unleashed a plague of sexually transmitted diseases from herpes to AIDS to hepatitis B." The former Vice President proposes to counter that "elite" by putting "cultural critics of ability and intellect" in charge of the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Endowment for the Arts, a somewhat different approach from that of the Republican Party, which has been promising for several years now to eliminate both.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-JUN-1999 16:47:11.00

SUBJECT: Re: Don't Ask, Don't Tell

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

FYI

----- Forwarded by Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP on 06/28/99

04:46 PM -----

Charles F. Ruff

06/28/99 04:35:07 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP@EOP

cc:

Subject: Re: Don't Ask, Don't Tell

Sounds fine.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Charles F. Ruff (CN=Charles F. Ruff/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-JUN-1999 16:35:13.00

SUBJECT: Re: Don't Ask, Don't Tell

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Sounds fine.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-JUN-1999 16:29:41.00

SUBJECT: Don't Ask, Don't Tell

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles F. Ruff (CN=Charles F. Ruff/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Rudy DeLeon says he would like Richard and me to come over to DOD for lunch to talk over our recommendations with the "legal guys" and others there. OK? Should we proceed some other way?

CREATOR: rwockner@netcom.com@INET@LNGTWY (rwockner@netcom.com@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

SUBJECT: NC10507: Wash Post front page: Gay youth

READ:UNKNOWN

This item is copyrighted. Do not print it without permission from the originating media operation. Do not post this item in a public online forum. Items on this mailing list that are not copyrighted will not contain this message. This free mailing list is open only to people with whom I am acquainted. It has 242 recipients.

OUT OF THE CLOSET, BUT NOT OUT OF MIDDLE SCHOOL

Gay Youths Say They're Aware of Sexuality Earlier

On the last day of seventh grade, Dave Grossman mounted some cardboard boxes down the street from his junior high school and held a one-boy rally.

I'm gay.

Still, there was Dave with his loudspeaker and his conviction. Like a soap opera character haunted by a secret past, he had been living two lives. In school, he was a straight kid with straight A's. After classes, he rode the Metro downtown and hung with gay friends past dinner time. He says few people could believe that at 13, he was so certain he was gay.

In the national debate about gay and bisexual identity, age is a volatile

fault line along which schools are being forced to pick sides. Gay-youth advocacy groups say the average age of kids who "come out" has decreased substantially in recent years. Whereas once a teenager might have come out in senior year with a burn-your-bridges disinhibition, now that same teenager is making his homosexuality public in middle school or ninth grade.

Puberty is a roulette wheel of biding time and spurting growth. One preteen is sexually active while her classmate is still collecting stickers. American girls are hitting puberty far earlier than they were a century ago, and there's growing awareness of a disconnection between physical and mental maturity. Add the perennial dilemmas of sex education -- how much kids should learn, how soon, from whom -- and you have a recipe for controversy.

What happens when a middle school student -- in braces, in a training bra, inexperienced -- announces that she's gay?

It's happening. Ritch Savin-Williams, a developmental psychologist at Cornell University, used data from nine independent studies conducted over the last 20 years to conclude that the average age at which young men label their same-sex attractions as gay dropped from almost 20 in 1979 to just 13 in 1998. They may not, however, definitively call themselves gay until a few years later.

"Every time we sample these kids, the average age is getting younger," says Savin-Williams. "What's different is that now gay kids are becoming like straight kids -- they know that they're gay before they have sex."

At Longfellow Middle School in Falls Church, Dave Grossman forced the issue that advocacy groups, educators and mental health providers have been debating for several years: Should the nation's struggle over sex and morality play out inside schools, involving kids in a debate that can be loudspeaker loud? Or should such issues be fought at the ballot box, from church pulpits and at home?

Longfellow's principal, Gail Womble, respected Dave's desire to come out, if not his venue. In the end, she was relieved that Dave said his piece without causing an uproar.

"I did have concerns about how middle school students would meet that kind of disclosure," says Womble, who has since moved to Rachel Carson Middle School in Fairfax. "At this age, we have kids who are old enough to be exploring those feelings and other kids who are still playing with Barbie dolls."

Dave's mother was disgusted by what she felt were "outrageous" banishing dictums imposed on her son, like making Dave move his stage across the street. Donna Brown Grossman says Womble also asked Dave to cover a T-shirt reading "Nobody Knows I'm Gay," and would not let him pass out homemade pamphlets promoting his rally.

"Her reaction was one thing that made me feel that I had to take my child out of the public school system," says Grossman, 48, who subsequently

transferred her son to Thornton Friends, a private Quaker school.

As school systems debate whether to allow gay support groups, or pass anti-harassment policies on behalf of gays, or show their faculty the controversial documentary "It's Elementary: Talking About Gay Issues in School," proponents on both sides point to the tender age of the youngsters as evidence of the rectitude of their positions.

Gay-rights advocacy groups and much of the mental health community cite 12-year-old gay youngsters as proof that being homosexual is "natural." Christian conservative groups argue that young adolescents bombarded by hormones and pop images of sexuality are especially susceptible to gay "recruiting."

"Those kids are incredibly impressionable, and I think certainly the younger the age, the more they can be swayed," says Peter LaBarbera, editor of the Lambda Report on Homosexuality, which argues that the declining age at which youngsters are coming out is largely the product of gay propaganda inside schools.

"There's different gradations. Love, sexuality: It's a very tangled web."

This is Ellen Sweeney, 18, an assured young woman who was co-leader of the gay discussion group at Sidwell Friends, a private school in Northwest Washington, during this, her senior year. She began to question her own sexuality in seventh grade, joined the discussion group in high school, and recently, has taught workshops to middle school students on gay issues.

Incidentally, Sweeney is straight. But, she says, "I question myself up until this day."

This open attitude toward sexuality is a splinter in the skin of many who oppose gay discussion groups. They ask, what if youngsters who would otherwise be straight are encouraged to question, and ultimately, to declare themselves gay?

In the last few years in the Washington area, at least 15 gay discussion groups have cropped up in high schools and one middle school. The majority of the groups are in Montgomery County, where, amid a storm of controversy three years ago, the school board added gay students and teachers to the list of people protected from discrimination. The groups, which range from sanctioned clubs to informal lunch gatherings, serve as sounding boards -- to examine homophobia, for example, or the feelings of a member who says she has been "questioning."

The problem with such discussions, opponents say, is that they don't offer an alternative to open-armed acceptance of homosexuality. Janet Folger, national director of the Center for Reclaiming America, an arm of Coral Ridge Ministries, says if gay issues must be part of the school climate, youngsters should at least be exposed to "ex-gays" and told of the health risks of homosexuality.

As things stand, "there is no balance," Folger says. "There is no message

of hope . . . that you can walk away from it."

Like many area private schools, Edmund Burke School in the District doesn't see it that way. When a gay-issues discussion group was created there this year, middle school students were included in the weekly lunch meetings. Hugh Taft-Morales, the group's faculty adviser, said the group has "no agenda."

"They are already talking about this," he says. "What we're doing is taking responsibility as adults to raise the level of the discussion."

Although no exhaustive data can be found on discussion groups in schools, the New York-based Gay, Lesbian and Straight Educational Network keeps tabs on clubs that register with it. Its national list has blossomed from roughly 150 high school "Gay/Straight Alliances" last year to about 400 this year, concentrated mainly in Massachusetts, California and the New York City area. In Maryland and Virginia, there are seven registered high school alliances.

"Some people feel it's not our job," says Pamela Latt, principal of Centreville High School, which is on track to become the third high school in Virginia with a registered gay/straight alliance. Centreville has had a gay counseling group for two years, but a few students have been pushing for more.

"Having a counseling group sort of sends the wrong message," says Caroline Zuscheck, 17, a straight student involved in the effort. "It's like if you have an eating disorder or a problem with depression."

But although the principal supports starting an alliance next year, she also has reservations. On one hand, she says, it will contribute to a healthier environment for gay teenagers, a high-risk group. But Latt knows she is treading on important toes in conservative Centreville, where some School Board and community members have already voiced discomfort with a school-sanctioned club. "I don't blame people for being very cautious and careful," she says.

Latt is conflicted for other reasons. She is Catholic and has puzzled over whether homosexuality is wrong (she doesn't think so) and what causes it (she doesn't know). At any rate, she says, the alliance is about "saving lives," not promoting homosexuality. But perhaps in an ideal world, this messy moral stew wouldn't fall into the principal's lap.

"This really shouldn't be a part of my job," Latt says finally. "But I don't think I have a choice."

Amy Levy and her son remember the moment differently. The way Will tells it, his mom was nagging him, Why don't you have a girlfriend? The way Levy tells it, Will's confession came straight out of the clear blue sky.

Never mind why. That moment changed everything. One minute, the mother is dropping her son off in the car. The next, he tells her, "I'm gay," and hops out.

He is 14.

For Levy, 50, that belly-flop into reality challenged a lot of rules. Will was the first openly gay student at his tiny Bethesda private school, which has no specific policies on the issue. In an attempt to carve a comfortable space for himself, Will, now 16, met with teachers. Levy met with teachers. Teachers met with other teachers.

Levy says Will's coming out made them all dissect their feelings about homosexuality. "Do you really believe in what you thought you believed in when it becomes part of your life?" she wonders. (To protect her son, Levy asked that Will's last name, which is different from hers, not be published.)

Gay-rights advocates say this type of discussion is a door slowly creaking open, a departure from past decades when an unofficial "don't ask, don't tell" policy reigned in high schools and middle schools.

At a recent meeting for gay Montgomery County youths, two adults leading the session reminisced about how different it once was: one man, one woman, both in their forties or fifties, both of whom married at 23, both of whom divorced, both of whom realized only in adulthood that they were, in fact, gay.

They listened to the teenagers and then ticked off each belated milestone in their own closeted lives, as if to say, All those years lost.

Dave Grossman is a slight, blue-eyed youth with an energy and intelligence that sometimes gets the better of him. He skipped eighth grade, and, after ninth, went to Simon's Rock, a college in Great Barrington, Mass., designed for kids of high school age. Now he's transferring to American University, entering his second year of college at 15.

While he was growing up, Dave says, instinct told him he liked other boys. He just knew, natural as corn. In fourth grade, he says, "I came to my senses. I was just staring benignly at the boy across from me."

At 11, Dave found online chat rooms and located the gay bulletin board in short order.

At 12, he told his parents, because there was no reason not to, because now he knew for sure, and the knowledge pressed in on him. It was after synagogue on a late summer night. The date sticks in his mind -- Aug. 30, 1996. He recalls his mother crying with the shock and the strangeness.

"She was like, 'Wow, I didn't even know you had a sexuality.' "

And Dave started his journey, because he saw himself as a young man with a sexuality and an image to build, and he shed his baby fat, his glasses and his gawky hair and hatched a plan to let people know that he had found himself. A stage, a loudspeaker, a grand announcement.

"I was going to do something," he says. "Something that was extravagant."

A showdown of sorts -- even if there were few people around to watch. A showdown, at the very least, with the person who mattered.