

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-AUG-1999 16:59:38.00

SUBJECT: Re: Clinton to 'come home' to ANGLE

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Yes, I've come around. How grown up of me!

Minyon Moore

08/11/99 04:58:50 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP@EOP

cc:

Subject: Clinton to 'come home' to ANGLE

well, well, well....

----- Forwarded by Minyon Moore/WHO/EOP on 08/11/99 04:58

PM -----

Richard Socarides 08/11/99 04:52:21 PM

Record Type: Record

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

cc:

Subject: Clinton to 'come home' to ANGLE

This is a nice story.

----- Forwarded by Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP on 08/11/99

04:49 PM -----

Doug.Case@sdsu.edu

08/11/99 04:47:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Richard Socarides@EOP

cc:

Subject: Clinton to 'come home' to ANGLE

Well Connected

David Mixner Hooks Commander in Chief for ANGLE Fund-raising Event

by Karen Ocamb

On Oct. 2, almost exactly eight years to the week after Bill Clinton first met with Access Now for Gay and Lesbian Equality (ANGLE) at the Beverly Hilton Hotel, the president is set to return again for a "Take Back Congress" fund-raiser to benefit Democratic congressional candidates.

"I think this night promises to be another historical milestone in this community's distinguished history," political consultant David Mixner said about Clinton's scheduled appearance. When he first met with ANGLE back in 1991, Clinton was a relatively unknown Arkansas governor mounting an unheralded campaign for president.

The group's endorsement gave Clinton much-needed money and momentum, eventually funneling some \$3.2 million into his campaign. It's an effort that Clinton has not forgotten.

"He was thrilled-as he said-to be coming home to the place where it began," said Mixner. "It's an anniversary."

Once a close adviser to the president, Mixner and Clinton parted ways after a public falling out over the "don't ask, don't tell" policy on gays in the military. But Mixner said that, over the past few years, "the president and I have maintained good relationships," despite some continuing policy differences. "I supported his reelection and I would support him if he ran for a third term," Mixner said. "I think he has done more for this community than all the presidents of the United States combined. He's not perfect, but neither am I perfect. I have faults.

"I wrote the president and said, 'Come home. Come celebrate the anniversary. It's been an extraordinary eight-year journey with some ups and some downs. But I think it's time to celebrate all that has been good about it, as you enter your last year in office,'" Mixner told Frontiers. "So it'll be a combination of thanks and nostalgia and looking to the future. I'm sure he'll talk about Al Core. I think it will be that kind of evening."

But, said Mixner, a Gore-supporter, 100 percent of the money raised will go to a specially earmarked gay and lesbian fund within the Democratic Congressional Campaign (DCC) called "House Cleaning 2000." With guidance from and accountability to ANGLE and national LGBT groups, the DCC will use the money to help elect targeted anti-gay Republicans or elect pro-gay Democrats in difficult races for seats in the House of Representatives. With a 40-person dinner committee, headed by Christopher Price, selling \$25,000 to \$50,000 tables, the event has already raised \$600,000 before invitations have even gone out. Organizers expect to raise at least \$800,000, making it "one of the largest events of any group in the DCC's history. It will be an illustration of the dramatic power of the Los Angeles gay and lesbian political community, which has been a source of political power since the late 1970s."

That the evening is about House races and not the presidential contest is underscored by ANGLE's Bill Melamed, a Bill Bradley supporter and dinner co-chair.

"Whether Gore or Bradley becomes president-it's the idea of a Democratic president and a Democratic House at the same time that's all too exciting to stand," said Melamed. "It's the idea that they can proactively work together positively to help not only this community, but also a lot of other disenfranchised groups, too. And I think it's do-able. We're talking about a margin of five seats. That's 1 percent and in any business or any equation, that's a moveable number. And there's been an amazing outpouring of support-even without an invitation and even without the president. This is a group of us getting on the phone and that so many are being so generous is meaningfully indicative of the depth of commitment. And if we're feeling it here, we know others are feeling it too."

In addition to Clinton, appearances are expected from House Minority Leader Richard Gephardt, California Gov. Gray Davis, and more than two dozen members of Congress, including Patrick Kennedy, Maxine Waters, Xavier Becerra, Henry Waxman, Howard Berman and Tammy Baldwin, as well as supporters from Hollywood. Openly gay Congressman Barney Frank will not attend because of his recent heart surgery.

"There is no question in our minds that the political base of power for the extreme right wing in this country is in the House of Representatives," said Mixner. "People like Tom DeLay, Dick Armey, Bob Barr, Henry Hyde, Steve Largent all hold committee posts and leadership posts and they're all virulently anti-gay. They have consistently, as a priority in their agenda, submitted amendments to do serious damage to this community. We have decided to go right to the heart of their power base and remove it. And to do that it takes money, and it takes us voting."

For ticket information on the event, call Judy Levy at 310/201-5033.

-----

-----

The item above is being distributed as a free, non-profit informational service to a limited number of individuals who have expressed interest in this topic for educational and research purposes only. Please do not redistribute or post copyrighted material anywhere on the Internet accessible to the public without attribution and permission from the author. Please note that distribution of this item does not necessarily constitute endorsement of the content; in fact, often items are distributed as "opposition research."

Message Sent

To:

Minyon Moore/WHO/EOP@EOP

Linda L. Moore/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Simeona F. Pasquil/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Marsha Scott/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Sean P. Maloney/WHO/EOP@EOP  
ATobias@aol.com  
spengler@dnc democrats.org  
Philip G Dufour/OVP@OVP  
Elizabeth J. Potter/OVP@OVP  
jtrammel@hillandknowlton.com  
Monica M. Dixon/OVP@OVP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-AUG-1999 16:48:16.00

SUBJECT: Clinton to 'come home' to ANGLE

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Well Connected

David Mixner Hooks Commander in Chief for ANGLE Fund-raising Event

by Karen Ocamb

On Oct. 2, almost exactly eight years to the week after Bill Clinton first met with Access Now for Gay and Lesbian Equality (ANGLE) at the Beverly Hilton Hotel, the president is set to return again for a "Take Back Congress" fund-raiser to benefit Democratic congressional candidates.

"I think this night promises to be another historical milestone in this community's distinguished history," political consultant David Mixner said about Clinton's scheduled appearance. When he first met with ANGLE back in 1991, Clinton was a relatively unknown Arkansas governor mounting an unheralded campaign for president.

The group's endorsement gave Clinton much-needed money and momentum, eventually funneling some \$3.2 million into his campaign. It's an effort that Clinton has not forgotten.

"He was thrilled-as he said-to be coming home to the place where it began," said Mixner. "It's an anniversary."

Once a close adviser to the president, Mixner and Clinton parted ways after a public falling out over the "don't ask, don't tell" policy on gays in the military. But Mixner said that, over the past few years, "the president and I have maintained good relationships," despite some continuing policy differences. "I supported his reelection and I would support him if he ran for a third term," Mixner said. "I think he has done more for this community than all the presidents of the United States combined. He's not perfect, but neither am I perfect. I have faults.

"I wrote the president and said, 'Come home. Come celebrate the anniversary. It's been an extraordinary eight-year journey with some ups and some downs. But I think it's time to celebrate all that has been good about it, as you enter your last year in office,'" Mixner told Frontiers. "So it'll be a combination of thanks and nostalgia and looking to the future. I'm sure he'll talk about Al Core. I think it will be that kind of evening."

But, said Mixner, a Gore-supporter, 100 percent of the money raised will go

to a specially earmarked gay and lesbian fund within the Democratic Congressional Campaign (DCC) called "House Cleaning 2000." With guidance from and accountability to ANGLE and national LGBT groups, the DCC will use the money to help evict targeted anti-gay Republicans or elect pro-gay Democrats in difficult races for seats in the House of Representatives. With a 40-person dinner committee, headed by Christopher Price, selling \$25,000 to \$50,000 tables, the event has already raised \$600,000 before invitations have even gone out. Organizers expect to raise at least \$800,000, making it "one of the largest events of any group in the DCC's history. It will be an illustration of the dramatic power of the Los Angeles gay and lesbian political community, which has been a source of political power since the late 1970s."

That the evening is about House races and not the presidential contest is underscored by ANGLE's Bill Melamed, a Bill Bradley supporter and dinner co-chair.

"Whether Gore or Bradley becomes president-it's the idea of a Democratic president and a Democratic House at the same time that's all too exciting to stand," said Melamed. "It's the idea that they can proactively work together positively to help not only this community, but also a lot of other disenfranchised groups, too. And I think it's do-able. We're talking about a margin of five seats. That's 1 percent and in any business or any equation, that's a moveable number. And there's been an amazing outpouring of support-even without an invitation and even without the president. This is a group of us getting on the phone and that so many are being so generous is meaningfully indicative of the depth of commitment. And if we're feeling it here, we know others are feeling it too."

In addition to Clinton, appearances are expected from House Minority Leader Richard Gephardt, California Gov. Gray Davis, and more than two dozen members of Congress, including Patrick Kennedy, Maxine Waters, Xavier Becerra, Henry Waxman, Howard Berman and Tammy Baldwin, as well as supporters from Hollywood. Openly gay Congressman Barney Frank will not attend because of his recent heart surgery.

"There is no question in our minds that the political base of power for the extreme right wing in this country is in the House of Representatives," said Mixner. "People like Tom DeLay, Dick Armey, Bob Barr, Henry Hyde, Steve Largent all hold committee posts and leadership posts and they're all virulently anti-gay. They have consistently, as a priority in their agenda, submitted amendments to do serious damage to this community. We have decided to go right to the heart of their power base and remove it. And to do that it takes money, and it takes us voting."

For ticket information on the event, call Judy Levy at 310/201-5033.

-----  
-----  
The item above is being distributed as a free, non-profit informational service to a limited number of individuals who have expressed interest in this topic for educational and research purposes only. Please do not redistribute or post copyrighted material anywhere on the Internet accessible to the public without attribution and permission from the author. Please note that distribution of this item does not necessarily

constitute endorsement of the content; in fact, often items are distributed as "opposition research."

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-AUG-1999 11:52:08.00

SUBJECT: Hate May Have Triggered Fatal Barracks Beating

TO: Hildy Kuryk ( CN=Hildy Kuryk/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Hate May Have Triggered Fatal Barracks Beating

By Sue Anne Pressley Washington Post Staff Writer Wednesday, August 11, 1999; Page A01

FORT CAMPBELL, Ky., Aug. 10 Pfc. Barry Winchell enjoyed being a soldier.

He studied military manuals, relished the physical training. He was so accurate at firing a .50-caliber machine gun that he was named best in his company, and someday, he vowed, he would be one of the best helicopter pilots in the Army.

But Winchell, 21, also had a secret that was becoming known among the other soldiers in his unit: He was gay.

That realization may have cost the young soldier his life, gay rights groups believe.

During the early-morning hours of July 5, Winchell was brutally beaten with a baseball bat in his barracks here at one of the nation's largest Army bases, allegedly by another soldier in his unit while his own roommate encouraged the attack. The next day, Winchell, his face swollen beyond recognition, died at a civilian hospital.

Although Army officials have not disclosed a motive for the attack -- Winchell had gotten the best of the soldier in a fight a few days before the killing -- local and national gay rights groups contend there is mounting evidence that Winchell was the victim of a hate crime. If true, they said, this would be the first known case of a soldier being killed at a U.S. military base because of his sexual orientation in the five years



since a new federal policy was adopted toward gays in the military. In the era of "Don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue" -- the law passed by Congress that took effect in 1994 and allows gay service members to serve as long as their sexual orientation is not discovered -- the Winchell case illustrates the deep-seated prejudices that continue to plague gays in the military. It also has placed the Army and Fort Campbell, home of the celebrated 101st Airborne Division, the Screaming Eagles, in an uncomfortable spotlight.

Officials at Fort Campbell, which sprawls across the Kentucky-Tennessee border and has nearly 24,000 military personnel, have had little comment about the slaying. Maj. Pamela Hart, a spokeswoman for the base, said the probe is ongoing, with investigators "looking into all rumors and reports."

But during the last six months of his life, Winchell apparently was taunted frequently by fellow soldiers and superiors who had learned of his homosexuality, according to service members who testified this week at a court hearing and his friends. Lawyers and potential witnesses in the case are under a gag order forbidding them to speak to reporters, but a picture began to emerge nonetheless of an environment where a macho image is still highly valued and where a slur for a male homosexual was used freely as an insult. Alcohol in excessive amounts also apparently played a large role in the tragedy.

"Pretty much everybody in the company called him derogatory names," said Sgt. Michael Kleifgen, Winchell's section leader, in sworn testimony today. "Basically, they called him a 'faggot' and stuff like that. I would say on a daily basis. . . . A lot of times, he was walking around, down in the dumps."

Pvt. Calvin N. Glover, of Sulphur, Okla., has been charged with premeditated murder in Winchell's slaying. This week's Article 32 hearing, comparable to a grand jury hearing in civilian court but open to the public, was held to determine whether enough evidence exists to court-martial Glover.

A second soldier, Spec. Justin R. Fisher, 25, of Lincoln, Neb., was later charged with being a principal to premeditated murder and acting as an accessory after the fact, among other charges. Fisher was Winchell's roommate in Delta Company, 2nd Battalion, 502nd Infantry regiment. Several soldiers testified this week that Glover and Fisher were heavy drinkers, perhaps alcoholics. Pfc. Arthur Hoffman said that Glover, in particular, who at 18 cannot drink legally, became unpleasant and "aggressive" when he had been drinking.

Winchell, a native of Kansas City, Mo., was described by friends as a quiet young man with a masculine demeanor and down-to-earth attitudes. Although he had dated women exclusively in the past, he confided to friends that he had long questioned his sexuality and had been curious about gay life. His mother and stepfather, Patricia and Wally Kutteles, told the Louisville Courier-Journal that they were stunned to learn only after his death that he was gay.

Rumors about Winchell began to circulate widely through his platoon some six months ago after Fisher informed Sgt. Kleifgen that he had seen a soldier, whom he did not identify, at the Connection, a nightclub 60 miles away in Nashville that has a large gay clientele. Kleifgen told investigators today that he and a staff sergeant immediately went through a list of their soldiers and "asked every Pfc. in the company where they were that weekend."

"We figured out it was Winchell. I asked Winchell if he was gay. He said no," Kleifgen said, as gay rights activists in the audience gasped at the apparent flouting of the "don't ask, don't tell" law.

At first lauded as an advancement in relations between gays and the military, the law instead has received mixed reviews as many gay rights groups say that hostilities have only increased since its adoption. In this case, gay rights groups fear, soldiers who come forward with information could be subjecting themselves to questions about their own sexuality.

Incidents of gay harassment have increased every year since 1994, according to the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, a Washington-based group that assists gays in the military. Last year alone, reported incidents increased 120 percent over 1997, according to an annual report released by the group.

Although much of the compiled evidence that a hate crime occurred in the Winchell case has been "anecdotal," according to Clarence Patton of the New York City Gay and Lesbian Anti-Violence Project, "our antenna always goes up when someone known to be gay or lesbian is the victim of a violent crime."

"In hate crimes," he said, "there are certain indicators -- an element of overkill. . . . I do not believe this was an ordinary fight. That does not ring true."

Gay rights advocates say they want the military to more vigorously investigate soldiers harassed because of sexual orientation. They say doing so can prevent it from escalating to physical violence.

Since March, Winchell had been involved in a relationship with a performer at the Connection, a self-described preoperative transsexual named Cal "Calpernia" Addams, who attended this week's hearings dressed as a woman. "When I heard what had happened, I thought, 'Oh God, they've killed him because he was dating me,'" said Addams, a former Navy medic who served in the Persian Gulf War.

Hostilities in Winchell's unit apparently began to reach a peak on the evening of July 3 when he and Glover, who had been drinking, got into a fistfight, which Winchell won handily. Hoffman said that Glover had been bragging about his exploits when he was challenged by a disbelieving Winchell.

"He [Glover] was trying to make himself sound like a bad [guy]," Hoffman said. "The stories were pretty out there. . . . Winchell kicked Glover's [butt]. It was a long time coming."

Later, Glover may have been teased by other soldiers about his defeat, said Kathi Westcott, a staff lawyer with the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network. Several soldiers reported to the group, she said, that "Glover was taunted basically for getting his [butt] kicked by a [gay man]."

Chief Warrant Officer Alfred Brown, a special agent for Fort Campbell's Criminal Investigation Division, testified that soldiers told him that Glover had vowed to "get even, kill him."

The next day, July 4, alcohol was flowing freely in the barracks, as many of the soldiers in the company emptied a keg of beer. Winchell, Glover and Fisher were drinking heavily, other soldiers reported. Several said they last saw Fisher and Winchell at about 2 a.m. on July 5, sitting at a picnic table outside the barracks.

By 3 a.m., the fire alarm in the barracks was clanging and men were piling out of their rooms, stunned to learn that Winchell was gravely injured. Fisher raced into the room shared by Pfc. Jonathon Joyce and Pfc. Nikita

Sanarov, yelling that "Winchell's dying."

The two men said they saw a blood-splattered Winchell lying unresponsive in a second-floor hallway. Sanarov, who ran outside to get his car at Fisher's request, said he first saw Glover running from Winchell's barracks toward his own barracks. A few minutes later, Sanarov said he saw Glover sprinting toward a trash bin with what appeared to be an armful of clothing.

Investigators later found Glover in his room, along with a bloodstained shirt and blood smears on the door.

After Glover's arrest, Pfc. Ryan Futch, who guarded the soldier, said he overheard Glover and another prisoner exchanging epithets against blacks and homosexuals. Futch said Glover told him that he had beaten Winchell with a bat.

If Glover is court-martialed and found guilty, he will face life in prison.

In death, it seems, Pfc. Barry Winchell's secret was finally and fully exposed. At a memorial service in Nashville last month, Cal Addams spoke about what "a kind, calm gentleman" Winchell had been. Behind him, four people in civilian dress held aloft an American flag -- while four others held the rainbow banner, a symbol of the gay rights movement.

, 1999 The Washington Post Company

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-AUG-1999 11:55:17.00

SUBJECT: Re: Hate May Have Triggered Fatal Barracks Beating

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:  
no kidding

Mary L. Smith  
08/11/99 11:53:44 AM  
Record Type: Record

To: Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP@EOP  
cc:  
bcc:  
Subject: Re: Hate May Have Triggered Fatal Barracks Beating

That was really outrageous

Richard Socarides 08/11/99 11:51:59 AM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message  
cc:  
Subject: Hate May Have Triggered Fatal Barracks Beating

Hate May Have Triggered Fatal Barracks Beating  
By Sue Anne Pressley Washington Post Staff Writer Wednesday, August 11, 1999; Page A01  
FORT CAMPBELL, Ky., Aug. 10 Pfc. Barry Winchell enjoyed being a soldier. He studied military manuals, relished the physical training. He was so accurate at firing a .50-caliber machine gun that he was named best in his company, and someday, he vowed, he would be one of the best helicopter pilots in the Army.  
But Winchell, 21, also had a secret that was becoming known among the other soldiers in his unit: He was gay.  
That realization may have cost the young soldier his life, gay rights groups believe.

During the early-morning hours of July 5, Winchell was brutally beaten with a baseball bat in his barracks here at one of the nation's largest Army bases, allegedly by another soldier in his unit while his own roommate encouraged the attack. The next day, Winchell, his face swollen beyond recognition, died at a civilian hospital.

Although Army officials have not disclosed a motive for the attack -- Winchell had gotten the best of the soldier in a fight a few days before the killing -- local and national gay rights groups contend there is mounting evidence that Winchell was the victim of a hate crime. If true, they said, this would be the first known case of a soldier being killed at a U.S. military base because of his sexual orientation in the five years since a new federal policy was adopted toward gays in the military. In the era of "Don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue" -- the law passed by Congress that took effect in 1994 and allows gay service members to serve as long as their sexual orientation is not discovered -- the Winchell case illustrates the deep-seated prejudices that continue to plague gays in the military. It also has placed the Army and Fort Campbell, home of the celebrated 101st Airborne Division, the Screaming Eagles, in an uncomfortable spotlight.

Officials at Fort Campbell, which sprawls across the Kentucky-Tennessee border and has nearly 24,000 military personnel, have had little comment about the slaying. Maj. Pamela Hart, a spokeswoman for the base, said the probe is ongoing, with investigators "looking into all rumors and reports."

But during the last six months of his life, Winchell apparently was taunted frequently by fellow soldiers and superiors who had learned of his homosexuality, according to service members who testified this week at a court hearing and his friends. Lawyers and potential witnesses in the case are under a gag order forbidding them to speak to reporters, but a picture began to emerge nonetheless of an environment where a macho image is still highly valued and where a slur for a male homosexual was used freely as an insult. Alcohol in excessive amounts also apparently played a large role in the tragedy.

"Pretty much everybody in the company called him derogatory names," said Sgt. Michael Kleifgen, Winchell's section leader, in sworn testimony today. "Basically, they called him a 'faggot' and stuff like that. I would say on a daily basis. . . . A lot of times, he was walking around, down in the dumps."

Pvt. Calvin N. Glover, of Sulphur, Okla., has been charged with premeditated murder in Winchell's slaying. This week's Article 32 hearing, comparable to a grand jury hearing in civilian court but open to the public, was held to determine whether enough evidence exists to court-martial Glover.

A second soldier, Spec. Justin R. Fisher, 25, of Lincoln, Neb., was later charged with being a principal to premeditated murder and acting as an accessory after the fact, among other charges. Fisher was Winchell's roommate in Delta Company, 2nd Battalion, 502nd Infantry regiment. Several soldiers testified this week that Glover and Fisher were heavy drinkers, perhaps alcoholics. Pfc. Arthur Hoffman said that Glover, in particular, who at 18 cannot drink legally, became unpleasant and "aggressive" when he had been drinking.

Winchell, a native of Kansas City, Mo., was described by friends as a quiet young man with a masculine demeanor and down-to-earth attitudes. Although he had dated women exclusively in the past, he confided to

friends that he had long questioned his sexuality and had been curious about gay life. His mother and stepfather, Patricia and Wally Kutteles, told the Louisville Courier-Journal that they were stunned to learn only after his death that he was gay.

Rumors about Winchell began to circulate widely through his platoon some six months ago after Fisher informed Sgt. Kleifgen that he had seen a soldier, whom he did not identify, at the Connection, a nightclub 60 miles away in Nashville that has a large gay clientele. Kleifgen told investigators today that he and a staff sergeant immediately went through a list of their soldiers and "asked every Pfc. in the company where they were that weekend."

"We figured out it was Winchell. I asked Winchell if he was gay. He said no," Kleifgen said, as gay rights activists in the audience gasped at the apparent flouting of the "don't ask, don't tell" law.

At first lauded as an advancement in relations between gays and the military, the law instead has received mixed reviews as many gay rights groups say that hostilities have only increased since its adoption. In this case, gay rights groups fear, soldiers who come forward with information could be subjecting themselves to questions about their own sexuality.

Incidents of gay harassment have increased every year since 1994, according to the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, a Washington-based group that assists gays in the military. Last year alone, reported incidents increased 120 percent over 1997, according to an annual report released by the group.

Although much of the compiled evidence that a hate crime occurred in the Winchell case has been "anecdotal," according to Clarence Patton of the New York City Gay and Lesbian Anti-Violence Project, "our antenna always goes up when someone known to be gay or lesbian is the victim of a violent crime."

"In hate crimes," he said, "there are certain indicators -- an element of overkill. . . . I do not believe this was an ordinary fight. That does not ring true."

Gay rights advocates say they want the military to more vigorously investigate soldiers harassed because of sexual orientation. They say doing so can prevent it from escalating to physical violence.

Since March, Winchell had been involved in a relationship with a performer at the Connection, a self-described preoperative transsexual named Cal "Calpernia" Addams, who attended this week's hearings dressed as a woman. "When I heard what had happened, I thought, 'Oh God, they've killed him because he was dating me,'" said Addams, a former Navy medic who served in the Persian Gulf War.

Hostilities in Winchell's unit apparently began to reach a peak on the evening of July 3 when he and Glover, who had been drinking, got into a fistfight, which Winchell won handily. Hoffman said that Glover had been bragging about his exploits when he was challenged by a disbelieving Winchell.

"He [Glover] was trying to make himself sound like a bad [guy]," Hoffman said. "The stories were pretty out there. . . . Winchell kicked Glover's [butt]. It was a long time coming."

Later, Glover may have been teased by other soldiers about his defeat, said Kathi Westcott, a staff lawyer with the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network. Several soldiers reported to the group, she said, that "Glover was taunted basically for getting his [butt] kicked by a [gay man]."

Chief Warrant Officer Alfred Brown, a special agent for Fort Campbell's Criminal Investigation Division, testified that soldiers told him that Glover had vowed to "get even, kill him."

The next day, July 4, alcohol was flowing freely in the barracks, as many of the soldiers in the company emptied a keg of beer. Winchell, Glover and Fisher were drinking heavily, other soldiers reported. Several said they last saw Fisher and Winchell at about 2 a.m. on July 5, sitting at a picnic table outside the barracks.

By 3 a.m., the fire alarm in the barracks was clanging and men were piling out of their rooms, stunned to learn that Winchell was gravely injured.

Fisher raced into the room shared by Pfc. Jonathon Joyce and Pfc. Nikita Sanarov, yelling that "Winchell's dying."

The two men said they saw a blood-splattered Winchell lying unresponsive in a second-floor hallway. Sanarov, who ran outside to get his car at Fisher's request, said he first saw Glover running from Winchell's barracks toward his own barracks. A few minutes later, Sanarov said he saw Glover sprinting toward a trash bin with what appeared to be an armful of clothing.

Investigators later found Glover in his room, along with a bloodstained shirt and blood smears on the door.

After Glover's arrest, Pfc. Ryan Futch, who guarded the soldier, said he overheard Glover and another prisoner exchanging epithets against blacks and homosexuals. Futch said Glover told him that he had beaten Winchell with a bat.

If Glover is court-martialed and found guilty, he will face life in prison.

In death, it seems, Pfc. Barry Winchell's secret was finally and fully exposed. At a memorial service in Nashville last month, Cal Addams spoke about what "a kind, calm gentleman" Winchell had been. Behind him, four people in civilian dress held aloft an American flag -- while four others held the rainbow banner, a symbol of the gay rights movement.

, 1999 The Washington Post Company

Message Sent

To:

---

Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Thomas L. Freedman/OPD/EOP@EOP  
Caroline R. Fredrickson/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Mary E. Cahill/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Mary L. Smith/OPD/EOP@EOP  
Hildy Kuryk/WHO/EOP@EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-AUG-1999 11:53:54.00

SUBJECT: Re: Hate May Have Triggered Fatal Barracks Beating

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

That was really outrageous

Richard Socarides 08/11/99 11:51:59 AM

Record Type: Record

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

cc:

Subject: Hate May Have Triggered Fatal Barracks Beating

Hate May Have Triggered Fatal Barracks Beating

By Sue Anne Pressley Washington Post Staff Writer Wednesday, August 11, 1999; Page A01

FORT CAMPBELL, Ky., Aug. 10 Pfc. Barry Winchell enjoyed being a soldier. He studied military manuals, relished the physical training. He was so accurate at firing a .50-caliber machine gun that he was named best in his company, and someday, he vowed, he would be one of the best helicopter pilots in the Army.

But Winchell, 21, also had a secret that was becoming known among the other soldiers in his unit: He was gay.

That realization may have cost the young soldier his life, gay rights groups believe.

During the early-morning hours of July 5, Winchell was brutally beaten with a baseball bat in his barracks here at one of the nation's largest Army bases, allegedly by another soldier in his unit while his own roommate encouraged the attack. The next day, Winchell, his face swollen beyond recognition, died at a civilian hospital.

Although Army officials have not disclosed a motive for the attack -- Winchell had gotten the best of the soldier in a fight a few days before the killing -- local and national gay rights groups contend there is mounting evidence that Winchell was the victim of a hate crime. If true, they said, this would be the first known case of a soldier being killed at a U.S. military base because of his sexual orientation in the five years since a new federal policy was adopted toward gays in the military.

In the era of "Don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue" -- the law passed by Congress that took effect in 1994 and allows gay service members to serve as long as their sexual orientation is not discovered -- the Winchell case illustrates the deep-seated prejudices that continue to plague gays in the



military. It also has placed the Army and Fort Campbell, home of the celebrated 101st Airborne Division, the Screaming Eagles, in an uncomfortable spotlight.

Officials at Fort Campbell, which sprawls across the Kentucky-Tennessee border and has nearly 24,000 military personnel, have had little comment about the slaying. Maj. Pamela Hart, a spokeswoman for the base, said the probe is ongoing, with investigators "looking into all rumors and reports."

But during the last six months of his life, Winchell apparently was taunted frequently by fellow soldiers and superiors who had learned of his homosexuality, according to service members who testified this week at a court hearing and his friends. Lawyers and potential witnesses in the case are under a gag order forbidding them to speak to reporters, but a picture began to emerge nonetheless of an environment where a macho image is still highly valued and where a slur for a male homosexual was used freely as an insult. Alcohol in excessive amounts also apparently played a large role in the tragedy.

"Pretty much everybody in the company called him derogatory names," said Sgt. Michael Kleifgen, Winchell's section leader, in sworn testimony today. "Basically, they called him a 'faggot' and stuff like that. I would say on a daily basis. . . . A lot of times, he was walking around, down in the dumps."

Pvt. Calvin N. Glover, of Sulphur, Okla., has been charged with premeditated murder in Winchell's slaying. This week's Article 32 hearing, comparable to a grand jury hearing in civilian court but open to the public, was held to determine whether enough evidence exists to court-martial Glover.

A second soldier, Spec. Justin R. Fisher, 25, of Lincoln, Neb., was later charged with being a principal to premeditated murder and acting as an accessory after the fact, among other charges. Fisher was Winchell's roommate in Delta Company, 2nd Battalion, 502nd Infantry regiment. Several soldiers testified this week that Glover and Fisher were heavy drinkers, perhaps alcoholics. Pfc. Arthur Hoffman said that Glover, in particular, who at 18 cannot drink legally, became unpleasant and "aggressive" when he had been drinking.

Winchell, a native of Kansas City, Mo., was described by friends as a quiet young man with a masculine demeanor and down-to-earth attitudes. Although he had dated women exclusively in the past, he confided to friends that he had long questioned his sexuality and had been curious about gay life. His mother and stepfather, Patricia and Wally Kutteles, told the Louisville Courier-Journal that they were stunned to learn only after his death that he was gay.

Rumors about Winchell began to circulate widely through his platoon some six months ago after Fisher informed Sgt. Kleifgen that he had seen a soldier, whom he did not identify, at the Connection, a nightclub 60 miles away in Nashville that has a large gay clientele. Kleifgen told investigators today that he and a staff sergeant immediately went through a list of their soldiers and "asked every Pfc. in the company where they were that weekend."

"We figured out it was Winchell. I asked Winchell if he was gay. He said no," Kleifgen said, as gay rights activists in the audience gasped at the apparent flouting of the "don't ask, don't tell" law.

At first lauded as an advancement in relations between gays and the military, the law instead has received mixed reviews as many gay rights

groups say that hostilities have only increased since its adoption. In this case, gay rights groups fear, soldiers who come forward with information could be subjecting themselves to questions about their own sexuality.

Incidents of gay harassment have increased every year since 1994, according to the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, a Washington-based group that assists gays in the military. Last year alone, reported incidents increased 120 percent over 1997, according to an annual report released by the group.

Although much of the compiled evidence that a hate crime occurred in the Winchell case has been "anecdotal," according to Clarence Patton of the New York City Gay and Lesbian Anti-Violence Project, "our antenna always goes up when someone known to be gay or lesbian is the victim of a violent crime."

"In hate crimes," he said, "there are certain indicators -- an element of overkill. . . . I do not believe this was an ordinary fight. That does not ring true."

Gay rights advocates say they want the military to more vigorously investigate soldiers harassed because of sexual orientation. They say doing so can prevent it from escalating to physical violence.

Since March, Winchell had been involved in a relationship with a performer at the Connection, a self-described preoperative transsexual named Cal "Calpernia" Addams, who attended this week's hearings dressed as a woman. "When I heard what had happened, I thought, 'Oh God, they've killed him because he was dating me,'" said Addams, a former Navy medic who served in the Persian Gulf War.

Hostilities in Winchell's unit apparently began to reach a peak on the evening of July 3 when he and Glover, who had been drinking, got into a fistfight, which Winchell won handily. Hoffman said that Glover had been bragging about his exploits when he was challenged by a disbelieving Winchell.

"He [Glover] was trying to make himself sound like a bad [guy]," Hoffman said. "The stories were pretty out there. . . . Winchell kicked Glover's [butt]. It was a long time coming."

Later, Glover may have been teased by other soldiers about his defeat, said Kathi Westcott, a staff lawyer with the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network. Several soldiers reported to the group, she said, that "Glover was taunted basically for getting his [butt] kicked by a [gay man]."

Chief Warrant Officer Alfred Brown, a special agent for Fort Campbell's Criminal Investigation Division, testified that soldiers told him that Glover had vowed to "get even, kill him."

The next day, July 4, alcohol was flowing freely in the barracks, as many of the soldiers in the company emptied a keg of beer. Winchell, Glover and Fisher were drinking heavily, other soldiers reported. Several said they last saw Fisher and Winchell at about 2 a.m. on July 5, sitting at a picnic table outside the barracks.

By 3 a.m., the fire alarm in the barracks was clanging and men were piling out of their rooms, stunned to learn that Winchell was gravely injured. Fisher raced into the room shared by Pfc. Jonathon Joyce and Pfc. Nikita Sanarov, yelling that "Winchell's dying."

The two men said they saw a blood-splattered Winchell lying unresponsive in a second-floor hallway. Sanarov, who ran outside to get his car at Fisher's request, said he first saw Glover running from Winchell's barracks toward his own barracks. A few minutes later, Sanarov said he saw

Glover sprinting toward a trash bin with what appeared to be an armful of clothing.

Investigators later found Glover in his room, along with a bloodstained shirt and blood smears on the door.

After Glover's arrest, Pfc. Ryan Futch, who guarded the soldier, said he overheard Glover and another prisoner exchanging epithets against blacks and homosexuals. Futch said Glover told him that he had beaten Winchell with a bat.

If Glover is court-martialed and found guilty, he will face life in prison.

In death, it seems, Pfc. Barry Winchell's secret was finally and fully exposed. At a memorial service in Nashville last month, Cal Addams spoke about what "a kind, calm gentleman" Winchell had been. Behind him, four people in civilian dress held aloft an American flag -- while four others held the rainbow banner, a symbol of the gay rights movement.

, 1999 The Washington Post Company

#### Message Sent

To:

---

Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP@EOP

Thomas L. Freedman/OPD/EOP@EOP

Caroline R. Fredrickson/WHO/EOP@EOP

Mary E. Cahill/WHO/EOP@EOP

Mary L. Smith/OPD/EOP@EOP

Hildy Kuryk/WHO/EOP@EOP

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

**SUBJECT: NC10836: Tumult at Scout camp**

TEXT:  
 ~~~~~  
 Do not publish this item 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 less than 300 recipients.  
 ~~~~~

<http://www.projo.com>

## R.I., national Scouts reach an agreement on gay teen

Also, in a tumultuous day for Camp Yawgoog, a troop leader is arraigned on a charge of molestation.

By JENNIFER LEVITZ and ELIZABETH ABBOTT, Journal Staff Writers

**HOPKINTON -- One of the nation's premier getaways for Boy Scouts -- Rhode Island's own Camp Yawgoog -- was swept into turmoil once again yesterday over issues surrounding sexual orientation and an alleged sexual assault at the pristine, private camp. Three separate, but related, developments conspired to keep the spotlight on Yawgoog:**

In an effort to clarify their position on homosexuals, national and state Boy Scout officials released a joint statement saying gays can't be Boy Scouts, but that it's also Boy Scout policy not to ask members about their sexual orientation. In other words, don't ask, don't tell -- similar to the military's stand under the Clinton administration.

A 37-year-old troop leader from Pawtucket was held without bail on a felony molestation charge for allegedly assaulting a 13-year-old Scout while he was sleeping in his tent at Yawgoog on the night of Aug. 1. Police escorted Michael Chalk, a Riverside troop leader, out of the camp, and the Boy Scouts presented him with a letter severing his ties to the organization.

Sources said another troop leader was asked to leave the camp last week after using the photograph of a gay Boy Scout as a target on the firing range. The Scout, James Dale, had recently won a New Jersey Supreme

Court ruling that struck down the Boy Scouts' ban on homosexuals in that state.

OFFICIALS RELEASED the joint statement last night, ending a week in which a 16-year-old Eagle Scout was asked whether he was gay and then told he couldn't return to a summer job he'd left a month earlier.

The statement came after several days of conflicting statements from the boy, the Narragansett Council and the national organization: On Sunday, Boy Scout leaders, facing a legal challenge, apologized to the avowed homosexual teen for invading his privacy and offered him his job back.

The next day, however, national officials said known homosexuals can't be Scouts.

Yesterday's statement, said, however: "As a matter of policy, the Boy Scouts of America do not inquire into the sexual orientation of any member or prospective members," the statement said. "If any questions were put to the youth, it's a departure from BSA policy and should not have occurred."

But that doesn't mean his acknowledgement that he is gay was okay.

In their statement, the Scouts reaffirmed their position of not allowing gays, a policy that's based on a clause in the Scout oath, which was written in 1910, and on Scout law.

The oath says a Scout must be "morally straight," and Scout law requires the young men to be "clean in thought, word and deed."

Since Scouts and leaders are expected to be "role models" of the Boy Scout oath, yesterday's statement said, the organization doesn't accept "those who openly self-identify as homosexuals, or known or avowed homosexuals, as Scouts or Scout leaders."

Boy Scout officials wouldn't comment beyond the statement, but said they "consider the matter closed."

The Eagle Scout's parents said they received a copy of the statement and feel the same way.

The Scout, from South Kingstown, returned to his job answering phones and filing in the business office of Camp Yawgoog yesterday.

"We're happy he's still a Scout, happy that he's still working at the camp, and we consider it over," the teen's mother said yesterday.

THE ISSUE exploded at the normally tranquil camp last week, when the Eagle Scout returned to a full-time job after cutting back his hours in July to part-time on Sundays.

At the end of one day last week, however, camp director Gary Savignano called the Scout into his office and told him he'd heard rumors that the teen was gay. He wanted to know if they were true.

The teen said yes.

Savignano reportedly told the teen that, because of allegations the night before that a visiting East Providence Scout leader had molested a camper, Camp Yawgoog leaders needed to "take precautions."

The Eagle Scout, Savignano reportedly said, couldn't work at the camp at all.

Boy Scout officials admit that they asked the teen if he was gay, but say it was part of a casual conversation that came after -- and was unrelated to -- their decision to keep him off the staff.

Boy Scout officials say someone didn't go through the proper channels to bring the teen back full-time, and that they believed it looked bad to give him his old job back after he'd quit, Lyle Antonides, director of the Narragansett Council of the Boy Scouts of America, said Friday.

The incident sparked a protest by staff members who overwhelmingly supported the teen. They staged a sit-in on Wednesday morning that shut down activities at the camp for the first time in 84 years.

But over the weekend, after the teen filed a complaint with the state's Human Rights Commission, Antonides called the boy's family and said it had all been a misunderstanding.

While national officials first reacted by contradicting the state council's position, they must have taken a good look at Rhode Island's antidiscrimination laws, Steven Brown, executive director of the Rhode Island Affiliate of the American Civil Liberties Union, said yesterday.

Legislators updated the state's Fair Employment Practices Act in 1995, making it one of the toughest in the nation.

Under the law, an employer can't ask an applicant about sexual orientation. While the employer can discuss the issue after the person is hired, a company can't use that information to take action -- such as firing.

"I think the national office recognized that they were on thin ice, because the question asked of the Scout was totally inappropriate under state law," Brown said.

Legal experts say the decision to let the youth remain in scouting may have been influenced by last Wednesday's New Jersey Supreme Court decision, which ruled that the Boy Scout's ban on gays is illegal under that state's antidiscrimination law.

While Boy Scout officials say theirs is a private organization, the New Jersey ruling said the group is a "public accommodation," like a park or a restaurant, and can't arbitrarily exclude groups of people.

Some also believe the organization has public ties, because, among other things, many troops are sponsored by schools and take part in training programs at police and fire stations.

The case of the South Kingstown Eagle Scout drew national attention because it represented a split, if only temporarily, between state Boy Scout officials and the national leadership.

YESTERDAY MORNING, a construction worker turned himself in to answer the charge of molesting a Scout at the camp. Michael B. Chalk, a scoutmaster from Riverside for the past five years, was then taken to District Court, South Kingstown, where he was arraigned on one count of first-degree child molestation.

Chalk did not enter a plea, as is customary with felony cases in District Court. But his lawyer said yesterday he is outraged by the youth's allegation.

"He is absolutely, vehemently denying these charges," John P. Laroche said.

According to Hopkinton Police Chief John Scuncio, the youth said he was molested sometime after 11 p.m. while he was sleeping in a tent with seven other Scouts. The Hopkinton police learned of the alleged incident the next day, from the Narragansett Council.

"When an allegation of this nature is made, we take it very seriously," Anthony D. Gibbs, director of field service for the Narragansett Council, said yesterday.

The Boy Scouts not only notified the police of the boy's accusation, but also contacted the state's Department of Children, Youth and Families, Gibbs said.

The Hopkinton police escorted Chalk out of the camp Aug. 2, Gibbs said. At the same time, Boy Scout officials handed him a letter telling

him his ties to the organization were severed and he should separate himself from any matters having to do with Boy Scouts. Gibbs said Chalk can apply to be reinstated to the organization if he is proven not guilty, but for the time being the Boy Scouts would rather ``err on the side of caution."

Gibbs said that, to his knowledge, the allegation against Chalk is an isolated incident; the Boy Scouts have not received any other complaints about him, he said.

District Court Judge Robert J. Rahill ordered Chalk held without bail at the Adult Correctional Institutions pending a bail hearing set for Aug. 18. At that time, the state must outline its case against Chalk, a proceeding Larochelle said his client welcomes.

``Everything will come out a week from tomorrow," Larochelle said.

AND YET ANOTHER incident shook Camp Yawgoog, a tradition-filled retreat on 1,800 acres forested with towering pine trees.

On Thursday, the day after the New Jersey ruling, a scoutmaster showed his disdain for James Dale and the Supreme Court decision by pinning up a photograph of Dale's face at the camp's rifle range, according to two high-ranking staff members at the camp.

The man used a picture, torn from a newspaper, for target practice. Camp officials kicked the scoutmaster out of camp, saying that they follow strict National Rifle Association guidelines not to use the image of a person as target practice.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-AUG-1999 12:51:27.00

SUBJECT: Gay Voters Finding G.O.P. Newly Receptive to Support

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Let me see if I get this right. Bush is opposed to hate crimes legislation. Bush is opposed to anti-discrimination laws that include sexual orientation. Bush is opposed to gay and lesbian couples adopting. Bush opposes repeal of the Texas sodomy law. Bush is anti-choice. Bush is has never supported to domestic partnership legislation. Bush is opposed to same sex marriage. And the Log Cabin folks are enthusiastic because he's not antagonistic and is is apparently willing to accept money from gay Republicans. Just proves once again that they are just grovelling for crumbs.

NEW YORK TIMES, August 11, 1999  
( <http://www.nytimes.com> )

Gay Voters Finding G.O.P. Newly Receptive to Support  
By KATHARINE Q. SEELYE

WASHINGTON -- Prominent Republican candidates for President are creating an atmosphere that is subtly but fundamentally more inviting to gay and lesbian voters than party leaders have been in recent memory.

Gov. George W. Bush of Texas, Senator John McCain of Arizona and Elizabeth Dole, former president of the American Red Cross -- who combined have the lion's share of support among Republicans in early polls -- have all signaled an openness to gay supporters, including a willingness to appoint them to positions like ambassadorships in their Administrations.

The new receptivity toward gay voters follows a similar nonantagonist approach by leading Republicans on abortion. While they still oppose abortion and are by no means converts on other gay rights issues like same-sex marriage, the most prominent candidates are offering a lower-key, more inclusive approach designed to appeal beyond the conservative base of the party to independent and Democratic voters. It also reflects the continued growing political influence of gay donors and gay voters across party lines.

The new message on gay supporters is a far cry from 1996, when Bob Dole, the Republican nominee, returned a \$1,000 donation from the Log Cabin Republicans, a group of gay party members, and from 1992, when the dominant voice on the issue from Republicans was that of Patrick J. Buchanan, whose declaration of a "culture war" was aimed squarely at homosexuals.

Many of the more conservative candidates have not changed their views,



and even Bush, Senator McCain and Mrs. Dole have not embraced a broader agenda that includes adoptions by gay people and a less punitive approach toward homosexuals in the military. But gay political leaders say the difference in attitude is striking nonetheless.

"The tone has totally changed," said Rich Tafel, executive director of the Log Cabin Republicans. "What I hear is gay Republicans enthusiastic about the tone being set by the leading candidates. It looks like Republicans for the first time are saying, 'This is a community I'm not going to alienate and maybe I want to reach out to it.' That's kind of a shocking revelation."

Democrats, of course, have courted gay voters for years, and this year both Vice President Al Gore and former Senator Bill Bradley, the two rivals for the Democratic nomination, are competing for their support. Both campaigns have fund-raisers working expressly with gay donors, who tend to be generous financially and active politically.

On the Republican side, though, this rapprochement is new. Bush, so far the run-away favorite in the Republican field, has said he would have no qualms about hiring homosexuals. "If someone can do a job, and a job that he's qualified for, that person ought to be allowed to do his job," he said earlier this year.

Senator McCain, who has appointed Representative Jim Kolbe of Arizona, the only openly gay Republican in the House, to his national steering committee, has similarly said he would hire on merit alone. He has supported anti-hate-crimes legislation that would protect victims of crime not only because of their race but their "sexual orientation." He has said that someday he could envision a gay President.

Mrs. Dole has said she would appoint to her Administration anyone who was qualified, emphasizing in an NBC interview last month that "all people are welcome" and adding: "I'm inclusive." Of the contribution her husband spurned in 1996, Mrs. Dole said that if she received a check from the same group, "I would not turn it away."

William Kristol, who was chief of staff to Vice President Dan Quayle and now is editor of the conservative Weekly Standard, said that the mainstream Republican candidates this year were unhappy under the banner of strident, anti-gay language.

"The Republican establishment does not want to fight the conservative culture war," Kristol said, "partly because they think it's a losing fight but more importantly, they don't believe in it."

Outside the party establishment, some conservatives remain adamantly opposed to gay rights.

Gary Bauer and Alan Keyes, make their rejection of homosexuality a major plank of their platforms. Bauer said recently that when he heard Senator McCain say the party should be "a big tent that admits everybody," the phrase sounded to him "like fingernails on a chalkboard."

Steve Forbes, the wealthy publisher and candidate, flatly opposes any

concessions to gay voters. He frequently says he wants "equal rights for all, special rights for none." Asked if Forbes would appoint an openly gay person to his Administration, his campaign manager, Bill Dal Col, said: "If the person is qualified for the job, that's fine as long as it is not a statement on a life style or promoting a life style." As for gay adoptions, Dal Col said: "There are plenty of heterosexual couples out there," and existing laws against hate crimes are enough.

The Rev. Louis P. Sheldon, a staunch conservative who heads a national group called the Traditional Values Coalition and who has denounced homosexuals often in his career, denied that there was an effort among Republicans to reach out to gay voters.

Noting that the Republican Presidential candidates oppose homosexuals in the military and same-sex marriages, Sheldon said that "there aren't that many Log Cabin voters out there." He added: "There is nothing immutable about sexual behavior -- it is chosen."

Still, anti-gay sentiment is less strident this year. Many Republicans avoid the matter. Brian Kennedy, the national political director for former Gov. Lamar Alexander of Tennessee, said: "He neither brings up those issues in his stump speech nor do we ever recall him being asked about it. It doesn't seem to be on the radar screen for the '99 cycle."

Bob Adams, spokesman for Buchanan, said that although the candidate "has certainly not abandoned the culture war," the anti-gay sentiment of past campaigns had changed. "It hasn't come up, and we haven't been making it an issue," he said.

Even Quayle, a social conservative who has aggressively promoted "family values," has shown moderation toward homosexuals. Asked on a radio program last month what he would do if one of his children were homosexual, he said he would support them "whatever they are."

While he avoided answering specific questions about homosexuals in the military and gay adoptions, Quayle also said: "Life-style orientation really makes no difference to me at all. Believe me, I don't inquire what one's sexual preference may or may not be." He repeated his view that homosexuality is a choice but did not say, as he did in 1992, that it was "a wrong choice."

Kristol said most Republicans were still being careful in their statements because they did not want to alienate the grass-roots conservatives who believe homosexuality is a sin. But the candidates' tempered tone, he said, poses a dilemma for conservative voters. "The question is, Do conservatives want to win so badly that they will accept this kind of establishment leadership?" he asked. "Or have they, too, given up on the culture war? Do they want a political champion for their views?"

Since gay voters emerged several years ago as a significant voting bloc, Republicans ceded them to the Democrats. About 5 percent of voters in 1996 identified themselves in polls of people leaving voting booths as homosexual

-- "about the same percentage as Hispanics and larger than the Jewish vote,"

said Elizabeth Birch, executive director of the Human Rights Campaign, the nation's largest gay and lesbian lobbying group.

Tafel, who is organizing gay Republican voters to participate in the Iowa

straw poll on Saturday and is seeking a slot for an openly gay speaker at the

Republican national convention next year, said that the party was finally recognizing the influence of the gay electorate. "It's the first time we haven't been taken for granted" as likely Democrats, he said. His group has yet to make an endorsement or give any money to any candidate, but it plans to do so closer to next year's convention.

Also making the gay vote more available to Republicans this year is the fact that liberal Democrats have not been entirely happy with the Clinton Administration's record on gay issues. They have complained about the level of financing for the treatment of AIDS, the opposition to gay marriage and the murky "don't ask, don't tell" policy that has allowed a record number of

discharges of homosexuals from the military. Such discharges increased 86 percent over the last five years.

Alert to the potential appeal of Republicans who refrain from broad cultural attacks, Democrats are warning that the Republicans are not as tolerant as they may appear. Pat Ewing, a senior adviser at the Democratic National Committee, said of Bush: "He is purposefully vague, not moderate. Bush denied Texans protection from hate crimes and let it be known that he opposed any provision to protect gays and lesbians from these crimes. His platitudes are meant to obscure."

Karen Hughes, a spokeswoman for Bush, said he objected to the hate-crimes

legislation because "all violent crime is motivated by hate" and Texas already has a law that covers such crimes. But, she said, he also did not believe that sexual orientation should be singled out for special rights.

"He doesn't believe in granting legal rights based on sexual orientation," she said.

Gore has made an extra effort to appeal to homosexuals. In one of his rare departures from Clinton orthodoxy, he has called for a more "compassionate" -- though unspecific -- approach to homosexuals in the military.

In California, which is likely to have a ballot initiative next year to outlaw same-sex marriage, Gore said he favored legal protections for same-sex

partners, like health benefits and hospital visitation rights, but he opposed

"a change in the institution of marriage as we now know it between men and women."

The Vice President would leave gay adoptions up to adoption professionals

on an individual basis, his spokesman, Chris Lahane, said.

Democrats acknowledge that Gore and Bradley have virtually identical records on gay issues. Eric Hauser, a spokesman for Bradley, said he supported a review of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy on gays in the military. He also supports gay adoptions and extending legal rights, including health benefits and hospital visitation, to same-sex partners as "common sense" measures.

When Bradley was in the Senate, he voted for the so-called defense of marriage act, which said no state had to recognize the same-sex laws of another state. Likewise, President Clinton signed the bill into law, and Gore "stood beside him" in supporting it, Ms. Birch said.

Although Gore has been outspoken in favor of gay issues, he has also been subjected to gay demonstrators. AIDS activists have turned up, noisily, at several campaign events, accusing him of siding with drug companies and trying to block South Africa's access to cheaper generic drugs to fight H.I.V. His staff says this is an international patent issue and he is trying to work it out.

-----  
-----  
The item above is being distributed as a free, non-profit informational service to a limited number of individuals who have expressed interest in this topic for educational and research purposes only. Please do not redistribute or post copyrighted material anywhere on the Internet accessible to the public without attribution and permission from the author. Please note that distribution of this item does not necessarily constitute endorsement of the content; in fact, often items are distributed as "opposition research."

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Todd A. Summers ( CN=Todd A. Summers/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-AUG-1999 10:45:43.00

SUBJECT: Gay Voters Finding G.O.P. Newly Receptive to Support

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

NYTimes

August 11, 1999

Gay Voters Finding G.O.P. Newly Receptive to Support

By KATHARINE Q. SEELYE

WASHINGTON -- Prominent Republican candidates for President are creating an atmosphere that is subtly but fundamentally more inviting to gay and lesbian voters than party leaders have been in recent memory.

Gov. George W. Bush of Texas, Senator John McCain of Arizona and Elizabeth Dole, former president of the American Red Cross -- who combined have the lion's share of support among Republicans in early polls -- have all signaled an openness to gay supporters, including a willingness to appoint them to positions like ambassadorships in their Administrations.

The new receptivity toward gay voters follows a similar nonantagonist approach by leading Republicans on abortion. While they still oppose abortion and are by no means converts on other gay rights issues like same-sex marriage, the most prominent candidates are offering a lower-key, more inclusive approach designed to appeal beyond the conservative base of the party to independent and Democratic voters. It also reflects the continued growing political influence of gay donors and gay voters across party lines.

The new message on gay supporters is a far cry from 1996, when Bob Dole, the Republican nominee, returned a \$1,000 donation from the Log Cabin Republicans, a group of gay party members, and from 1992, when the dominant voice on the issue from Republicans was that of Patrick J. Buchanan, whose declaration of a "culture war" was aimed squarely at homosexuals.

Many of the more conservative candidates have not changed their views, and even Bush, Senator McCain and Mrs. Dole have not embraced a broader agenda that includes adoptions by gay people and a less punitive approach toward homosexuals in the military. But gay political leaders say the difference in attitude is striking nonetheless.

"The tone has totally changed," said Rich Tafel, executive director of the Log Cabin Republicans. "What I hear is gay Republicans enthusiastic about the tone being set by the leading candidates. It looks like Republicans for the first time are saying, 'This is a community I'm not going to alienate and maybe I want to reach out to it.' That's kind of a shocking

revelation."

Democrats, of course, have courted gay voters for years, and this year both Vice President Al Gore and former Senator Bill Bradley, the two rivals for the Democratic nomination, are competing for their support. Both campaigns have fund-raisers working expressly with gay donors, who tend to be generous financially and active politically.

On the Republican side, though, this rapprochement is new. Bush, so far the run-away favorite in the Republican field, has said he would have no qualms about hiring homosexuals. "If someone can do a job, and a job that he's qualified for, that person ought to be allowed to do his job," he said earlier this year.

Senator McCain, who has appointed Representative Jim Kolbe of Arizona, the only openly gay Republican in the House, to his national steering committee, has similarly said he would hire on merit alone. He has supported anti-hate-crimes legislation that would protect victims of crime not only because of their race but their "sexual orientation." He has said that someday he could envision a gay President.

Mrs. Dole has said she would appoint to her Administration anyone who was qualified, emphasizing in an NBC interview last month that "all people are welcome" and adding: "I'm inclusive." Of the contribution her husband spurned in 1996, Mrs. Dole said that if she received a check from the same group, "I would not turn it away."

William Kristol, who was chief of staff to Vice President Dan Quayle and now is editor of the conservative Weekly Standard, said that the mainstream Republican candidates this year were unhappy under the banner of strident, anti-gay language.

"The Republican establishment does not want to fight the conservative culture war," Kristol said, "partly because they think it's a losing fight but more importantly, they don't believe in it."

Outside the party establishment, some conservatives remain adamantly opposed to gay rights.

Gary Bauer and Alan Keyes, make their rejection of homosexuality a major plank of their platforms. Bauer said recently that when he heard Senator McCain say the party should be "a big tent that admits everybody," the phrase sounded to him "like fingernails on a chalkboard."

Steve Forbes, the wealthy publisher and candidate, flatly opposes any concessions to gay voters. He frequently says he wants "equal rights for all, special rights for none." Asked if Forbes would appoint an openly gay person to his Administration, his campaign manager, Bill Dal Col, said: "If the person is qualified for the job, that's fine as long as it is not a statement on a life style or promoting a life style." As for gay adoptions, Dal Col said: "There are plenty of heterosexual couples out there," and existing laws against hate crimes are enough.

The Rev. Louis P. Sheldon, a staunch conservative who heads a national group called the Traditional Values Coalition and who has denounced homosexuals often in his career, denied that there was an effort among Republicans to reach out to gay voters.

Noting that the Republican Presidential candidates oppose homosexuals in the military and same-sex marriages, Sheldon said that "there aren't that many Log Cabin voters out there." He added: "There is nothing immutable about sexual behavior -- it is chosen."

Still, anti-gay sentiment is less strident this year. Many Republicans avoid the matter. Brian Kennedy, the national political director for former Gov. Lamar Alexander of Tennessee, said: "He neither brings up

those issues in his stump speech nor do we ever recall him being asked about it. It doesn't seem to be on the radar screen for the '99 cycle."

Bob Adams, spokesman for Buchanan, said that although the candidate "has certainly not abandoned the culture war," the anti-gay sentiment of past campaigns had changed. "It hasn't come up, and we haven't been making it an issue," he said.

Even Quayle, a social conservative who has aggressively promoted "family values," has shown moderation toward homosexuals. Asked on a radio program last month what he would do if one of his children were homosexual, he said he would support them "whatever they are."

While he avoided answering specific questions about homosexuals in the military and gay adoptions, Quayle also said: "Life-style orientation really makes no difference to me at all. Believe me, I don't inquire what one's sexual preference may or may not be." He repeated his view that homosexuality is a choice but did not say, as he did in 1992, that it was "a wrong choice."

Kristol said most Republicans were still being careful in their statements because they did not want to alienate the grass-roots conservatives who believe homosexuality is a sin. But the candidates' tempered tone, he said, poses a dilemma for conservative voters. "The question is, Do conservatives want to win so badly that they will accept this kind of establishment leadership?" he asked. "Or have they, too, given up on the culture war? Do they want a political champion for their views?"

Since gay voters emerged several years ago as a significant voting bloc, Republicans ceded them to the Democrats. About 5 percent of voters in 1996 identified themselves in polls of people leaving voting booths as homosexual -- "about the same percentage as Hispanics and larger than the Jewish vote," said Elizabeth Birch, executive director of the Human Rights Campaign, the nation's largest gay and lesbian lobbying group.

Tafel, who is organizing gay Republican voters to participate in the Iowa straw poll on Saturday and is seeking a slot for an openly gay speaker at the Republican national convention next year, said that the party was finally recognizing the influence of the gay electorate. "It's the first time we haven't been taken for granted" as likely Democrats, he said. His group has yet to make an endorsement or give any money to any candidate, but it plans to do so closer to next year's convention.

Also making the gay vote more available to Republicans this year is the fact that liberal Democrats have not been entirely happy with the Clinton Administration's record on gay issues. They have complained about the level of financing for the treatment of AIDS, the opposition to gay marriage and the murky "don't ask, don't tell" policy that has allowed a record number of discharges of homosexuals from the military. Such discharges increased 86 percent over the last five years.

Alert to the potential appeal of Republicans who refrain from broad cultural attacks, Democrats are warning that the Republicans are not as tolerant as they may appear. Pat Ewing, a senior adviser at the Democratic National Committee, said of Bush: "He is purposefully vague, not moderate. Bush denied Texans protection from hate crimes and let it be known that he opposed any provision to protect gays and lesbians from these crimes. His platitudes are meant to obscure."

Karen Hughes, a spokeswoman for Bush, said he objected to the hate-crimes legislation because "all violent crime is motivated by hate" and Texas already has a law that covers such crimes. But, she said, he also did not believe that sexual orientation should be singled out for special rights.

"He doesn't believe in granting legal rights based on sexual orientation," she said.

Gore has made an extra effort to appeal to homosexuals. In one of his rare departures from Clinton orthodoxy, he has called for a more "compassionate" -- though unspecific -- approach to homosexuals in the military.

In California, which is likely to have a ballot initiative next year to outlaw same-sex marriage, Gore said he favored legal protections for same-sex partners, like health benefits and hospital visitation rights, but he opposed "a change in the institution of marriage as we now know it between men and women."

The Vice President would leave gay adoptions up to adoption professionals on an individual basis, his spokesman, Chris Lahane, said.

Democrats acknowledge that Gore and Bradley have virtually identical records on gay issues. Eric Hauser, a spokesman for Bradley, said he supported a review of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy on gays in the military. He also supports gay adoptions and extending legal rights, including health benefits and hospital visitation, to same-sex partners as "common sense" measures.

When Bradley was in the Senate, he voted for the so-called defense of marriage act, which said no state had to recognize the same-sex laws of another state. Likewise, President Clinton signed the bill into law, and Gore "stood beside him" in supporting it, Ms. Birch said.

Although Gore has been outspoken in favor of gay issues, he has also been subjected to gay demonstrators. AIDS activists have turned up, noisily, at several campaign events, accusing him of siding with drug companies and trying to block South Africa's access to cheaper generic drugs to fight H.I.V. His staff says this is an international patent issue and he is trying to work it out.



RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:12-AUG-1999 13:32:08.00

SUBJECT: NC10841: New Northrop

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

TEXT:  
Reprint rights:

Ann Northrop <annnorth@earthlink.net>

I HATE THIS

The Log Cabin Republicans will be meeting here this month, with Rudy Giuliani as a keynote speaker. In October, the Empire State Pride Agenda will hold its big annual dinner, with Bill Clinton headlining. The fight for our vote in next year's Senate race is going public.

I was hoping to ignore all this for a while longer, but with The New York Times featuring gays and the Republican party on the front page and identifying lesbian fundraisers for Clinton inside, we, like everyone else, are part of the speeded-up political schedule that currently obtains. So herewith some preliminary thoughts on Rudy vs. Hillary.

My temptation is to be a contrarian. I've begun saying to my friends--ducking so they can't hit me--that my twisted mind is fomenting a scenario in which we might actually be happy to have Rudy in the Senate. Bear with me here. What I'm beginning to realize is how much Hillary is likely to be a supporter of the status quo, particularly the status quo constructed by her husband and the centrist powers of the Democratic party. To her, this is a chess game. She's never really been in a position to have to get into the trenches with or for regular people. She's been a corporate lawyer and the wife of a mostly successful politician, in fact a politician who has held chief executive positions. Hillary has been the queen for a long time. I don't see her tightly choreographed "listening tours" as anything but a positioning device. It's all so bloodless, cold and deliberate. Gives me the shivers.

I've been trying to figure out who this reminds me of. I knew it felt familiar, but it took a few minutes to call up the analogy. And then I got it. James Baker. Remember him? Chief of staff for Ronald Reagan and Treasury Secretary. Baker was seen, during his chief of staff days, as the guy who really ran the White House and the Presidency. With a president who was whispered about as senile, Baker was treated as the real power. So then, for about thirty seconds, Baker thought he might run for president, because, after all, he'd already proved he could do the job, right? Except, of course, that was ridiculous. He had no constituency, no one with whom he was involved, except investment bankers, to provide a context. His campaign disappeared before it began because there was no

there there.

Hillary's a little better than that. She can talk sympathetically about the plights of real people, thereby pulling the wool over some people's eyes. But let's never forget that the national health plan Hillary proposed was the very same managed care system we have today. She wanted everything in the hands of the insurance companies. Could this have anything to do with her days as a corporate lawyer? The hell with Whitewater. This was the far bigger ripoff. Her plan was emphatically NOT a plan for universal health care for all at reasonable rates. Her plan was NOT a plan to take the profit motive out of health care. Oh, no. Hillary's the one who proposed creating this superfluous bureaucracy that is now growing fat off our exorbitant premiums, while denying us access to needed care. Excuse me if I don't trust Hillary as the savior of the common people. And, of course, she's never said anything at all about her husband signing the Defense of Marriage Act or imposing the horrendous "don't ask, don't tell" military policy. Can we expect her to support those and similar policies? Will she endorse the firing of a Surgeon General who dares mention masturbation?

I am horrified to tell you I was slightly impressed by something Andrew Sullivan wrote recently about Hillary (well, even a stopped clock is right twice a day, as they say). Arguing with the image of Hillary as the poor, suffering victim of her philandering husband, Sullivan explains that her anger at Bill is not about her feeling humiliated. No, "Hillary's anger...is the anger of an operator whose accomplice has recklessly bungled the job." Yes! Exactly right. Hillary is the ruthless one. Which, of course, is what they said about that other New York carpetbagger, Bobby Kennedy, and he turned into a softie.

Then there's Rudy. A hateful, hateful man whose vicious cops and poverty police are punishing people every day. A man who doesn't believe in free speech or kindness. So what's the rationale for sending him to the Senate, aside from the considerable gain of getting him out of the mayor's chair? Well, how about this. How about thinking what he would do to Trent Lott, Jesse Helms, Orrin Hatch, James Inhofe and every other right-wing Republican Senator. Wouldn't we like to hear him talk to them the way he talks to us now? Sending Rudy to the Senate would be our version of dropping an atomic bomb on them. They'd never know what hit them. I can just hear him now on the subject of rules for the sake of rules. The image is delicious.

Of course, I have no plans to support Rudy for anything but retirement. And I suppose any Democrat, even Hillary, is better than reinforcing the Republican majority. So you shouldn't think I'm ready to dump her. It's just that I don't really like her at all. I may just end up doing what I did in last year's governor's race--voting for Al "Grandpa Munster" Lewis. He's now trying for the Green Party nomination for the Senate seat. Hey, if we start now, maybe we could really elect him. Now that would be a worthwhile effort.

#####

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:12-AUG-1999 10:35:57.00

SUBJECT: Asking, Abuse Pre Army Murder

TO: Leon S. Fuerth ( CN=Leon S. Fuerth/O=OVP@OVP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: LEAVY\_D@A1@CD@VAXGTWY@EOP ( LEAVY\_D@A1@CD@VAXGTWY@EOP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
(NSC)  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Thomas L. Freedman ( CN=Thomas L. Freedman/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mara E. Rudman ( CN=Mara E. Rudman/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [ NSC ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

Asking, Abuse Pre  
Army Murder  
NewsPlanet Staff  
Wednesday, August 11, 1999 / 09:55  
PM

SUMMARY: Officers in charge of the slain soldier admit that they did ask (but they thought that was ok) and didn't try to stop the anti-gay taunts (because "everybody was having fun").

Defense attorneys for Private First Class (PFC) Calvin Glover believe that insufficient evidence has been presented for him to face court-martial in the July bashing death of PFC Barry Winchell -- but testimony at a hearing at Fort Campbell, Kentucky on August 10 left no doubt that Winchell was the object of anti-gay abuse, and that his superiors not only made no effort to stop it, they clearly violated the so-called "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" military policy on homosexuality.

The "Article 32" hearing combines some elements of civilian grand jury and preliminary hearings; both sides can present evidence and question witnesses. Winchell's section leader Sergeant Michael Kleifgen said on the witness stand, "Pretty much everybody in the company called him [Winchell] derogatory names. Basically, they called him a 'faggot' and stuff like that. I would say on a daily basis.... A lot of times, he was walking around down in the dumps." Kleifgen testified that even an unidentified first sergeant on one occasion said he was going to "get that little faggot" for an infraction.

Winchell's roommate, Specialist Justin Fisher, who will face a hearing on August 14 as an accomplice to Winchell's murder, appears to have been the root of the rumors that Winchell was gay. That's a particularly interesting revelation since it was Fisher himself who introduced Winchell to Nashville's The Connection gay bar and to pre-operative transsexual drag entertainer Calpernia Addams, who dated Winchell beginning in March. Addams has speculated

that Fisher may have been jealous of the special relationship she developed with Winchell. One soldier testified specifically to Fisher making wisecracks about Winchell being gay, and another soldier's wife testified that Fisher "was just straight-up mean about it. He [Fisher] was just torturing him [Winchell]."

Fisher told Kleifgen in late 1998 that he'd seen a soldier at The Connection. Kleifgen said on the stand, "We figured out it was Winchell. I asked Winchell if he was gay. He said no." Kleifgen went on to say, "I left it at that. The military had a policy of 'don't ask, don't tell'," a policy which Kleifgen didn't seem to see that he had violated.

Staff Sergeant Eric Dubielak also testified that he had asked Winchell if he were gay. He justified his violation of the policy because the rumors "seemed to be affecting the platoon."

Both sergeants testified that no one ordered soldiers to stop the harassment. Kleifgen testified that he didn't intervene himself because soldiers are accustomed to such taunting and "everybody was having fun."

Gay and lesbian activists praised the military for allowing this testimony and the sergeants for their "courage" in providing it.

Investigating officer Major Delbert Hall presided at the hearing and will make a written recommendation within two weeks to Colonel Robert Caslen, 2nd Brigade commander and the Army's special court-martial convening authority. Caslen and Fort Campbell's commanding general, Major General Robert Clark, can decide to dismiss the charges, recommend administrative action or convene a court martial, either on the charges as presented or the charges as they may modify them. A conviction for Glover on the charge of pre-meditated murder could mean a life sentence or even the death penalty.

Despite the defense contention that there were no eyewitnesses to the beating and that the main source connecting Glover to the crime was Fisher, the evidence presented appears damaging to Glover. Two soldiers

saw him running shortly after the attack, apparently to throw clothes in the dumpsters. He was found in his room with a bloodstained shirt and blood smeared on his door. Army investigators reported that he had sworn to others that he would get back at Winchell for having bested him in a fight two days before the assault, reportedly including the statement, "I won't let a faggot kick my ass." A soldier who guarded him while he was initially detained at Fort Campbell testified that Glover had told him that he'd hit Winchell with a baseball bat, and that Glover made anti-gay remarks in conversation with another inmate. Defense attorneys also said the decision whether or not to hold a court-martial should be delayed until lab work on some 60 pieces of evidence is completed.

The defense stated that Fisher could not be trusted, and seemed even to be suggesting that Fisher might be an alternative suspect. There was testimony that Fisher and Winchell were seen sitting together within an hour of the time Winchell was found battered. It was Fisher who told investigators that on the night of the beating, Glover saw Winchell sleeping on a cot in the hall and asked, "What is that faggot doing sleeping there?" (Winchell was looking after the dog who served as area mascot.) It was Fisher who then described Glover as grabbing Fisher's bat and spending several minutes swinging it with a "psychotic" look on his face, leaving for as much as a half-hour, returning with blood on the bat, and telling Fisher that he'd hit Winchell with it. It was Fisher who, hysterical, later roused other soldiers to come help Winchell, eventually pulling a fire alarm. (Fisher did not testify in person at the hearing, but investigators reported on what he had told them.)

Captain Gregg Engler, serving in the role of "trial counsel" or prosecutor, gave a confident summation, saying, "Private Glover murdered Private First Class Barry Winchell and there's no doubt about it."

Attorneys and potential witnesses have been barred by the military from talking with reporters about the case.

Winchell sought to excel at his work, and often did. He was his company's best shot

with a .50-caliber machine gun and was known as "Top Gun" for his prowess with a helicopter, which he hoped to improve still further. While bearing the anti-gay abuse fairly stoically, he feared that it might lose him his job. He was described by friends as quiet, down-to-earth and masculine. He was discovered early July 5 with severe head trauma and was transported to Vanderbilt University Medical Center in Nashville, where he died of his injuries on July 6. An Army investigator who observed the autopsy testified that his skull was cracked "similar to an eggshell."

According to sources cited by the "Washington Post," Winchell's could be the first case of a homophobic murder in the military since the 1994 adoption of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" -- despite a steady increase in instances of anti-gay harassment recorded by the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-AUG-1999 13:58:06.00

SUBJECT: 1999-8/13 toiv, leavy briefing

TO: chris.dancy@nbc.com ( chris.dancy@nbc.com @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

August 13, 1999

PRESS BRIEFING  
BY  
BARRY TOIV AND DAVID LEAVY

The Briefing Room

12:30 P.M. EDT

MR. TOIV: Good afternoon, everybody. Happy Friday.

Q I don't think everybody's here, Barry.

MR. TOIV: Come on in. We can wait.

Q This is not a comment on your --

MR. TOIV: Well, I'm happy today. I expect all the tough questions to go to David.

Just as I mentioned earlier today, we're going to have a briefing at 2:30 p.m. on the radio address. The subject has to do with clean water, and we'll have Carol Browner here again, making an encore appearance, as well as Elgie Holstein, who is the Associate Director for Natural Resources at OMB. This will take place at 2:30 p.m., but it will be on camera. It will be embargoed until 10:06 a.m. tomorrow, as usual.

Any questions?



MR. LEAVY: All right, thank you very much. Appreciate your coming in.

MR. TOIV: Well, thank you.

Q Well, a couple of them. One about the Pentagon, new policy for "don't ask, don't tell." Any comments on that?

MR. TOIV: Well, as you know, Secretary Cohen has been committed to implementing the "don't ask, don't tell" policy fairly. And the President agrees with him on that. The Pentagon, a little over a year ago, issued a report that said that "don't ask, don't tell" was working, but that there were a couple of areas where improvements needed to be made. I think today, the guidelines that they are issuing today are intended to address those issues. I would suggest you check over there for details of what they are announcing today.

Q I understand that China has not conveyed any explicit threats to the United States in regards to Taiwan. But can you characterize what has changed? Has there been any ratcheting up of the rhetoric of the implied threats, of the indications that you're getting that they may be more bellicose towards Taiwan?

MR. LEAVY: Let me just say, Bill, a couple of things generally. One, the peace and stability in East Asia and the Pacific is a fundamental national interest to the United States. We are certainly watching developments closely, have been in contact with both sides about our concerns and about reiterating our policy of resuming peaceful dialogue.

Just specifically on your question, it is my understanding that the intelligence community has not seen any extraordinary developments or signs that the PRC is mobilizing for military action in the Taiwan Strait.

Q Would you say that there has been a ratcheting up of the rhetoric in diplomatic channels? Are they trying to send signals?

MR. LEAVY: Well, I don't want to characterize, Kevin, other people's rhetoric, other people's statements. I think there has obviously been some increased tension in the Strait over the last several weeks. That comes as no surprise to any of us or anybody in this room. We've talked about that. But I think what we have to do is look forward, and we have communicated to both sides that there is a danger of escalating tensions, that we have to resume a dialog based on a One China formula. And we're going to continue to do that.

Q Specifically, there was one report that the embassy

here had been saying that they are going to take action.

MR. LEAVY: I would steer you away from that report. As I said earlier today, we have not received any threats or ultimatums from the PRC. I checked about that again this afternoon, earlier this afternoon, and that was confirmed. So, I would steer you away from that report.

I would just say, though, generally, that there is nothing new in China's long-standing position. They have made clear that from their point of view Taiwan is an internal matter, and they hope that there is peaceful reunification, but they don't rule out military means. We have a long-standing disagreement on that. So I don't think any -- the context is not new.

Q Does the United States still have a commitment to go to the defense of Taiwan, should there be an unprovoked attack from the mainland?

MR. LEAVY: Our long-standing position -- this goes back many years, both Republican and Democratic administrations -- is that any effort to resolve the issue of Taiwan by other than peaceful means would be considered of grave concern to the United States. That position hasn't changed today.

Q How would you view a Chinese seizure of a small Taiwan-controlled island, or some smaller military action?

MR. LEAVY: See, that's the kind of hypothetical question that I want to avoid getting into. Again, the Taiwan Relations Act has been in place for many years. It has guided our relationship on this issue, our policy on this issue. And I don't want to change, or speculate on hypotheticals today.

Q David, is there concern that the U.S. might get drawn into something because of this rhetoric?

MR. LEAVY: Oh, I think there's concern that the interests of both sides won't be advanced. The One China policy that the President has advocated -- and that has been the foundation of our approach to this issue for many, many years -- has been successful for all sides. Both China and Taiwan have benefited economically. Taiwan's the sixth-largest economy in the world. Chinese economic growth has grown vastly over the last 20 years.

So the formula is a successful one. We don't see the need to change that, and we have no intention of changing that.

Q Let me follow, too. You said no one had contacted the United States with a threat. Has anyone from either side, Taiwan or China, contacted the United States with a concern over the rhetoric, a concern over the threat?

MR. LEAVY: Well, we've had a number of discussions, both at

the State Department and with officials in China. As you remember, the State Department sent Assistant Secretary Stanley Roth and Ken Lieberthal from the National Security Council, several weeks ago, to Beijing to discuss our concern about the rising rhetoric, and a need to get back to a dialogue and to get back to the two parties talking about the issues. And so we have been engaged on this issue. And certainly, there is a concern that this kind of thing leads to accidents, leads to misunderstandings, and that we want to focus both parties on getting back to the table.

Q You said -- you made a point of saying that there were no extraordinary signs coming into the intelligence community of --

MR. LEAVY: Extraordinary developments or signs.

Q Right. Does that mean that there is something less than extraordinary -- or you're telling us what hasn't happened. Can you tell us what has happened?

MR. LEAVY: Well, I want to stay away from commenting on intelligence capabilities and what we do and don't know. I think that's a line we haven't crossed, and appropriately so. But, as I said earlier, it's our judgment, the United States government's judgment, that there aren't any extraordinary developments or signs that there is a mobilization on the PRC's part.

Q David, can you clarify just the conversations between the administration and the Taiwan and Chinese government? Have those conversations been stepped up in recent days? And at what level, if you can clarify, have these conversations been going?

MR. LEAVY: I don't think there has been a stepping up over recent days. Since this issue came to the forefront several weeks ago, we've had a number of discussions with the PRC and with people on Taiwan. There is nothing new in the last several days that I'm aware of.

Our general approach hasn't changed, though, and let me just repeat it again. The United States has a One-China policy. Our approach is based on dialogue between the two sides and a peaceful resolution of any differences. We've communicated that and we will continue to do so.

Q Let's put the intelligence community issue aside for a minute. If you look in the newspaper this morning, there are several people quoted on the record saying Chinese government representatives came to speak with them and made bellicose statements that there was some sort of imminent military action likely against Taiwan. Is that troubling -- those facts, which are known facts, are they troubling to the administration?

MR. LEAVY: Well, again, I don't think there is anything new

in what we are hearing. China has a longstanding position that any -- that Taiwan is an internal matter, that they want to see it resolved peacefully, but they don't rule out the use of force. We have a disagreement with that. We don't think that's the way to go. We think there has to be a peaceful resolution to this issue. It has to come through dialogue. And so there is nothing new in that articulation of those themes. I don't think anyone from the United States government was quoted in those stories, and as I said earlier, no one from the administration has been approached about any particular threat or ultimatum.

Q But the analysts -- just to follow up -- these analysts who were quoted, who are respected China analysts, say that they did feel that there was something imminent, or that there was something new. The U.S. government just doesn't agree with that?

MR. LEAVY: No, I can't speak to that. As I said, we haven't been approached with any specific threat or any specific warning. And just the general notion that this is a new policy I would just push back on, because this is something that President Jiang and other Chinese leaders have articulated for some time. So the Chinese have not ruled out the use of military force. We disagree with them. We've made that clear. Our policy is peaceful dialogue.

Q The question goes, though, David to whether this is imminent or not. We know that that is their policy, but there seem to be signals that something may happen sooner rather than later.

MR. LEAVY: Well, I don't have any indication of that. And as I said earlier, it's our intelligence community's best judgment that there aren't any signs that there is PRC military activity underway.

Q What kind of activities, if any, is the President himself engaged in relative to this topic?

MR. LEAVY: Well, he hasn't been engaged over the last 24 hours. As you know, we will be seeing President Jiang at APEC in Auckland, New Zealand, the first week of September. That's going to be an important time for the two leaders to engage on this issue and a number of issues, including trade, human rights, non-proliferation, I believe that will be on the margins of the APEC Summit. So I think that will be the next opportunity for the President to sit down with President Jiang and go over the wide range of bilateral issues.

Q But he hasn't been consulting in recent days with his own advisors and what to do about this?

MR. LEAVY: Well Mr. Berger has kept him up to date. I believe he briefed him this morning, or he will early this afternoon. But he hasn't been engaged personally.

Q David, as far as the policy, how do you respond to Republican allegations that when it comes time to pressuring China and Taiwan on this issue, the Clinton administration has only been putting pressure on Taiwan to ratchet down tensions?

MR. LEAVY: I would reject that. The United States takes actions based on our own interests. We have had a formula that has managed this issue for some time that's been both Republican and Democratic administrations. As I said earlier, it has benefited all the parties -- Taiwan, the PRC, the United States. We're going to continue to do that. I think it's not for us to pressure anybody, but to make clear that both sides -- their agendas can be advanced, their prosperity, their security can be advanced by peaceful dialogue.

Q Last night the President told the Jewish leaders that he agreed that we should do more to start monitoring, if not infiltrating, some hate groups. Do you -- is there anything today? Any directive? Any review of how that would be done? Any stepping up?

MR. TOIV: I don't have any additional information for you on that, no. The Justice Department seeks to do an effective job of dealing with hate crimes, certainly, and they also monitor hate groups. But I don't have any information on additional work that's being done.

Q But Clinton said he would look into it personally, and said that he would do more.

MR. TOIV: And if he said that, he will.

Q Barry, it was a year ago that the President was preparing for his grand jury testimony. Any reflections about the atmosphere then, and how things have changed since then around here, and at the White House?

MR. TOIV: Nope.

Q Barry, I want to go back real quick to David about Ethiopia and Eritrea. What is the new development on the White House side in that conflict?

MR. TOIV: Okay. As you know, the United States has actively worked for a peaceful resolution of the dispute between Ethiopia and Eritrea over the past year, and continues to work in cooperation with the OAU to bring about a peaceful resolution to the conflict.

As you know, Tony Lake was appointed as the President's special envoy to this conflict over a year ago. He has traveled there, I think, close to six times. There has been encouraging

movement on the peace process over the last few weeks. At the Organization of African Unity's summit in Algiers in early July, the OAU proposed -- excuse me, the modalities for implementation of the OAU's framework agreement, both Ethiopia and Eritrea have now accepted the framework agreement, and the modalities for its implementation. We will continue to engage to move this process forward.

Q A follow-up. Jesse Jackson has been very pivotal in breaking tensions with other factional peoples on that continent. Is the White House thinking at all of bringing Reverend Jackson into this situation, or is he involved at all?

MR. LEAVY: I don't think so. As you know, Reverend Jackson did extraordinary work to bring about a resolution of the conflict in Sierra Leone. He deserves great credit for that. He saved a lot of lives and prevented a lot more violence. I think Tony Lake has the portfolio on Ethiopia and Eritrea. He as well has spent a considerable amount of his own time traveling there, I think, close to half a dozen times.

So I think between Tony Lake, our team at the State Department, Susan Rice and our team here, led by Gail Smith, have been quite engaged and quite successful. So I don't see any need for Reverend Jackson to come in.

All right. Have a great weekend, everybody.

Q Barry?

Q Hold on.

MR. LEAVY: Oh, Barry, I'm sorry.

Q Week ahead?

Q Barry, I've got one question for you before you go away. Black Navy veterans have asked the President to dismiss mutiny charges against black sailors who refused to load ammo on the ships after the 1944 Port Chicago disaster in California. Does the request have merit and, if so, what is the President doing about it?

MR. TOIV: Well, until recently, there had not been a request for pardons for any of these individuals. Now, a few months ago, a request -- such a request was made. It's being considered under the usual process at the Justice Department, and obviously the President will give careful consideration to that.

Q Is the President well aware of the situation?

MR. TOIV: I believe he is.

Q Any time frame?

MR. TOIV: I don't have a time frame for you, no.

Q Barry, back on the gays in the military; as a candidate, the President said that he would end discrimination against gays in the military, "don't ask, don't tell" falls far short of that. Has the President given up hope that during his term in office he'll end discrimination against gays?

MR. TOIV: Well the President believes that the "don't ask, don't tell" policy has worked effectively. And I expect that that will be the policy throughout his administration.

Q But you concede it doesn't end discrimination -- that if you admit you're a homosexual in the military, you get thrown out?

MR. TOIV: Well, I will concede that it is a policy that has worked, and is the best policy that can be workable at this time.

Q Yes, but if it's worked, why are they changing it?

MR. TOIV: Well, no, it has worked. As I said before -- I'm not sure if you heard what I had to say about it before, but there have been a couple of areas that improvements were needed. And in fact, that's the work that's been going on that has led to the guidelines that are being issued today. And so -- I said it worked. I didn't say it was working perfectly.

Q Barry, the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette reported this morning that during a fundraiser on Saturday, several members of the Secret Service lined up to obstruct camera view of the President as he greeted Mrs. Arkansas in the ropeline, and that they later apologized for doing that. Do you know if that happened, or if it's common for the Secret Service to be used in that way, to interfere with press coverage of the President?

MR. TOIV: The answer to the second question, which is the fairer question of the two questions to be asking me up here, is I don't believe so.

Q Well, what's the answer to the first one?

MR. TOIV: The answer to the first question, of course, as you know, I've no idea, since that's the first time I'm hearing of that.

Week ahead?

Q Yes.

MR. TOIV: Let's see. I have to do this one by heart. Monday, the President is traveling to Kansas City, where he will address the annual convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

And he will speak about foreign policy issues there, and I think I'll need to leave it at that for now.

MR. LEAVY: I can do a little bit more, but that's fine. I mean, if folks want, I can talk afterward.

MR. TOIV: Yes, David will fill you in a little bit more. I think he's going to focus to some degree on our obligations overseas. And that's the only event planned for that trip. He'll be back late afternoon, I believe, or maybe early evening at the latest.

On Tuesday, the President will announce some new PSAs relating to school violence. With kids starting to come back to school, obviously, this is a subject that is on a lot of people's minds, particularly with the incidents that occurred during the last school year. And there are going to be some new PSAs that are unveiled at that time.

Also on Tuesday, we have the visit from the NCAA champion Tennessee Vols, the football champions. They'll be here on Tuesday.

Wednesday, the President is down. And then Thursday, he heads to Martha's Vineyard for a well-deserved vacation.

Any questions?

Q Is he going to say anything on the way out today?

MR. TOIV: Is he going to say -- no.

Okay, thank you. Have a good weekend, everybody.

END

12:50 P.M. EDT



RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Mail Delivery Subsystem <MAILER-DAEMON@aol.com> ( Mail Delivery Subsystem <MAILER-DAEMON@aol.com> [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-AUG-1999 14:56:11.00

SUBJECT: Returned mail: User unknown

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

TEXT:

The original message was received at Fri, 13 Aug 1999 14:48:22 -0400 (EDT)  
from gatekeeper.eop.gov [198.137.241.3]

\*\*\* ATTENTION \*\*\*

Your e-mail is being returned to you because there was a problem with its delivery. The AOL address which was undeliverable is listed in the section labeled: "----- The following addresses had permanent fatal errors -----".

The reason your mail is being returned to you is listed in the section labeled: "----- Transcript of Session Follows -----".

The line beginning with "<<<" describes the specific reason your e-mail could not be delivered. The next line contains a second error message which is a general translation for other e-mail servers.

Please direct further questions regarding this message to your e-mail administrator.

--AOL Postmaster

----- The following addresses had permanent fatal errors -----  
<rmikkelsen@aol.com>

----- Transcript of session follows -----  
... while talking to air-yd02.mail.aol.com.:  
>>> RCPT To:<rmikkelsen@aol.com>  
<<< 550 rmikkelsen IS NOT ACCEPTING MAIL FROM THIS SENDER  
550 <rmikkelsen@aol.com>... User unknown  
- att1.unkReceived: from gatekeeper.eop.gov (gatekeeper.eop.gov [198.137.241.3]) by  
rly-yd02.mx.aol.com (v60.25) with ESMTP; Fri, 13 Aug 1999 14:48:21 -0400  
Received: from e2.eop.gov by gatekeeper.eop.gov;  
(5.65v3.2/1.1.8.2/17Oct95-0424PM) id AA21297; Fri, 13 Aug 1999 14:48:21  
-0400  
Received: from lngate3.eop.gov by relay1.eop.gov with SMTP; Fri, 13 Aug  
1999 14:46:35 -0400

Received: by lngate3.eop.gov(Lotus SMTP MTA SMTP v4.6 (462.2 9-3-1997))  
id 852567CC.00670296 ; Fri, 13 Aug 1999 14:45:08 -0400  
Date: Fri, 13 Aug 1999 14:40:04 -0400  
From: Nanda\_Chitre@who.eop.gov  
Subject: 1999-8/13 toiv, leavy briefing  
To: lorisantos@netscape.net, ken.bazinet@pressroom.com,  
Arshad.Mohammed@reuters.com, larry.mcquillan@reuters.com,  
Randall.Mikkelsen@reuters.com, antoine.sanfuentes@nbc.com,  
kstrickl@nbc.com, kgalvin@ap.org, sross@ap.org, terence\_hunt@ap.org,  
jbroder@nytimes.com, steve.holland@reuters.com, sarah.ruth@turner.com,  
danielle.whelton@turner.com, mkx@cbsnews.com, marc.sklar@turner.com,  
john.c.king@cnn.com, babingtonc@washpost.com, bobdeans@coxnews.com,  
rmikkelsen@aol.com, hagan@foxnews.com, Tom Seem <TSX@cbsnews.com>,  
mcm@cbsnews.com, add@cbsnews.com, jrc@cbsnews.com, shott@foxnews.com  
Message-id: <852567CC.00668AE1.00@lngate3.eop.gov>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: MULTIPART/MIXED;  
BOUNDARY="Boundary\_(ID\_Q+KS4fYH6oxEf8c6Sf2mhw)"  
X-Lotus-FromDomain: EOP  
----- Forwarded by Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP on 08/13/99 02:40  
PM -----

(Embedded  
image moved OLCOTT\_E@a1.eop.gov  
to file: 08/13/99 01:44:20 PM  
PIC20734.PCX)

Record Type: Record

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

cc:

Subject: 1999-8/13 toiv, leavy briefing

Note: Some recipients have been dropped due to syntax errors.  
Please refer to the "\$AdditionalHeaders" item for the complete headers.

THE WHITE HOUSE  
Office of the Press Secretary  
For Immediate Release August 13, 1999

PRESS BRIEFING  
BY  
BARRY TOIV AND DAVID LEAVY

The Briefing Room

12:30 P.M. EDT

MR. TOIV: Good afternoon, everybody. Happy Friday.

Q I don't think everybody's here, Barry.

MR. TOIV: Come on in. We can wait.

Q This is not a comment on your --

MR. TOIV: Well, I'm happy today. I expect all the tough questions to go to David.

Just as I mentioned earlier today, we're going to have a briefing at 2:30 p.m. on the radio address. The subject has to do with clean water, and we'll have Carol Browner here again, making an encore appearance, as well as Elgie Holstein, who is the Associate Director for Natural Resources at OMB. This will take place at 2:30 p.m., but it will be on camera. It will be embargoed until 10:06 a.m. tomorrow, as usual.

Any questions?

MR. LEAVY: All right, thank you very much. Appreciate your coming in.

MR. TOIV: Well, thank you.

Q Well, a couple of them. One about the Pentagon, new policy for "don't ask, don't tell." Any comments on that?

MR. TOIV: Well, as you know, Secretary Cohen has been committed to implementing the "don't ask, don't tell" policy fairly. And the President agrees with him on that. The Pentagon, a little over a year ago, issued a report that said that "don't ask, don't tell" was working, but that there were a couple of areas where improvements needed to be made. I think today, the guidelines that they are issuing today are intended to address those issues. I would suggest you check over there for details of what they are announcing today.

Q I understand that China has not conveyed any explicit threats to the United States in regards to Taiwan. But can you characterize what has changed? Has there been any ratcheting up of the rhetoric of the implied threats, of the indications that you're getting that they may be more bellicose towards Taiwan?

MR. LEAVY: Let me just say, Bill, a couple of things generally. One, the peace and stability in East Asia and the Pacific is a fundamental national interest to the United States. We are certainly watching developments closely, have been in contact with both sides about our concerns and about reiterating our policy of resuming peaceful dialogue.

Just specifically on your question, it is my understanding that the intelligence community has not seen any extraordinary developments or signs that the PRC is mobilizing for military action in the Taiwan Strait.

Q Would you say that there has been a ratcheting up of

the rhetoric in diplomatic channels? Are they trying to send signals?

MR. LEAVY: Well, I don't want to characterize, Kevin, other people's rhetoric, other people's statements. I think there has obviously been some increased tension in the Strait over the last several weeks. That comes as no surprise to any of us or anybody in this room. We've talked about that. But I think what we have to do is look forward, and we have communicated to both sides that there is a danger of escalating tensions, that we have to resume a dialog based on a One China formula. And we're going to continue to do that.

Q Specifically, there was one report that the embassy here had been saying that they are going to take action.

MR. LEAVY: I would steer you away from that report. As I said earlier today, we have not received any threats or ultimatums from the PRC. I checked about that again this afternoon, earlier this afternoon, and that was confirmed. So, I would steer you away from that report.

I would just say, though, generally, that there is nothing new in China's long-standing position. They have made clear that from their point of view Taiwan is an internal matter, and they hope that there is peaceful reunification, but they don't rule out military means. We have a long-standing disagreement on that. So I don't think any -- the context is not new.

Q Does the United States still have a commitment to go to the defense of Taiwan, should there be an unprovoked attack from the mainland?

MR. LEAVY: Our long-standing position -- this goes back many years, both Republican and Democratic administrations -- is that any effort to resolve the issue of Taiwan by other than peaceful means would be considered of grave concern to the United States. That position hasn't changed today.

Q How would you view a Chinese seizure of a small Taiwan-controlled island, or some smaller military action?

MR. LEAVY: See, that's the kind of hypothetical question that I want to avoid getting into. Again, the Taiwan Relations Act has been in place for many years. It has guided our relationship on this issue, our policy on this issue. And I don't want to change, or speculate on hypotheticals today.

Q David, is there concern that the U.S. might get drawn into something because of this rhetoric?

MR. LEAVY: Oh, I think there's concern that the interests of both sides won't be advanced. The One China policy that the President has advocated -- and that has been the foundation of our approach to this issue for many, many years -- has been successful for all sides. Both China and Taiwan have benefited economically. Taiwan's the sixth-largest economy in the world. Chinese economic growth has grown vastly over the last 20 years.

So the formula is a successful one. We don't see the need to change that, and we have no intention of changing that.

Q Let me follow, too. You said no one had contacted the United States with a threat. Has anyone from either side, Taiwan or China, contacted the United States with a concern over the rhetoric, a concern over the threat?

MR. LEAVY: Well, we've had a number of discussions, both at the State Department and with officials in China. As you remember, the State Department sent Assistant Secretary Stanley Roth and Ken Lieberthal from the National Security Council, several weeks ago, to Beijing to discuss our concern about the rising rhetoric, and a need to get back to a dialogue and to get back to the two parties talking about the issues. And so we have been engaged on this issue. And certainly, there is a concern that this kind of thing leads to accidents, leads to misunderstandings, and that we want to focus both parties on getting back to the table.

Q You said -- you made a point of saying that there were no extraordinary signs coming into the intelligence community of

--

MR. LEAVY: Extraordinary developments or signs.

Q Right. Does that mean that there is something less than extraordinary -- or you're telling us what hasn't happened. Can you tell us what has happened?

MR. LEAVY: Well, I want to stay away from commenting on intelligence capabilities and what we do and don't know. I think that's a line we haven't crossed, and appropriately so. But, as I said earlier, it's our judgment, the United States government's judgment, that there aren't any extraordinary developments or signs that there is a mobilization on the PRC's part.

Q David, can you clarify just the conversations between the administration and the Taiwan and Chinese government? Have those conversations been stepped up in recent days? And at what level, if you can clarify, have these conversations been going?

MR. LEAVY: I don't think there has been a stepping up over recent days. Since this issue came to the forefront several weeks ago, we've had a number of discussions with the PRC and with people on Taiwan. There is nothing new in the last several days that I'm aware of.

Our general approach hasn't changed, though, and let me just repeat it again. The United States has a One-China policy. Our approach is based on dialogue between the two sides and a peaceful resolution of any differences. We've communicated that and we will continue to do so.

Q Let's put the intelligence community issue aside for a minute. If you look in the newspaper this morning, there are several people quoted on the record saying Chinese government representatives came to speak with them and made bellicose statements that there was some sort of imminent military action likely against Taiwan. Is that troubling -- those facts, which are known facts, are they troubling to the administration?

MR. LEAVY: Well, again, I don't think there is anything new in what we are hearing. China has a longstanding position that any -- that Taiwan is an internal matter, that they want to see it resolved peacefully, but they don't rule out the use of force. We have a disagreement with that. We don't think that's the way to go. We think there has to be a peaceful resolution to this issue. It has to come through dialogue. And so there is nothing new in that articulation of those themes. I don't think anyone from the United States government was quoted in those stories,

and as I said earlier, no one from the administration has been approached about any particular threat or ultimatum.

Q But the analysts -- just to follow up -- these analysts who were quoted, who are respected China analysts, say that they did feel that there was something imminent, or that there was something new. The U.S. government just doesn't agree with that?

MR. LEAVY: No, I can't speak to that. As I said, we haven't been approached with any specific threat or any specific warning. And just the general notion that this is a new policy I would just push back on, because this is something that President Jiang and other Chinese leaders have articulated for some time. So the Chinese have not ruled out the use of military force. We disagree with them. We've made that clear. Our policy is peaceful dialogue.

Q The question goes, though, David to whether this is imminent or not. We know that that is their policy, but there seem to be signals that something may happen sooner rather than later.

MR. LEAVY: Well, I don't have any indication of that. And as I said earlier, it's our intelligence community's best judgment that there aren't any signs that there is PRC military activity underway.

Q What kind of activities, if any, is the President himself engaged in relative to this topic?

MR. LEAVY: Well, he hasn't been engaged over the last 24 hours. As you know, we will be seeing President Jiang at APEC in Auckland, New Zealand, the first week of September. That's going to be an important time for the two leaders to engage on this issue and a number of issues, including trade, human rights, non-proliferation, I believe that will be on the margins of the APEC Summit. So I think that will be the next opportunity for the President to sit down with President Jiang and go over the wide range of bilateral issues.

Q But he hasn't been consulting in recent days with his own advisors and what to do about this?

MR. LEAVY: Well Mr. Berger has kept him up to date. I believe he briefed him this morning, or he will early this afternoon. But he hasn't been engaged personally.

Q David, as far as the policy, how do you respond to Republican allegations that when it comes time to pressuring China and Taiwan on this issue, the Clinton administration has only been putting pressure on Taiwan to ratchet down tensions?

MR. LEAVY: I would reject that. The United States takes actions based on our own interests. We have had a formula that has managed this issue for some time that's been both Republican and Democratic administrations. As I said earlier, it has benefited all the parties -- Taiwan, the PRC, the United States. We're going to continue to do that. I think it's not for us to pressure anybody, but to make clear that both sides -- their agendas can be advanced, their prosperity, their security can be advanced by peaceful dialogue.

Q Last night the President told the Jewish leaders that he agreed that we should do more to start monitoring, if not infiltrating, some hate groups. Do you -- is there anything

today? Any directive? Any review of how that would be done?  
Any stepping up?

MR. TOIV: I don't have any additional information for you on that, no. The Justice Department seeks to do an effective job of dealing with hate crimes, certainly, and they also monitor hate groups. But I don't have any information on additional work that's being done.

Q But Clinton said he would look into it personally, and said that he would do more.

MR. TOIV: And if he said that, he will.

Q Barry, it was a year ago that the President was preparing for his grand jury testimony. Any reflections about the atmosphere then, and how things have changed since then around here, and at the White House?

MR. TOIV: Nope.

Q Barry, I want to go back real quick to David about Ethiopia and Eritrea. What is the new development on the White House side in that conflict?

MR. TOIV: Okay. As you know, the United States has actively worked for a peaceful resolution of the dispute between Ethiopia and Eritrea over the past year, and continues to work in cooperation with the OAU to bring about a peaceful resolution to the conflict.

As you know, Tony Lake was appointed as the President's special envoy to this conflict over a year ago. He has traveled there, I think, close to six times. There has been encouraging movement on the peace process over the last few weeks. At the Organization of African Unity's summit in Algiers in early July, the OAU proposed -- excuse me, the modalities for implementation of the OAU's framework agreement, both Ethiopia and Eritrea have now accepted the framework agreement, and the modalities for its implementation. We will continue to engage to move this process forward.

Q A follow-up. Jesse Jackson has been very pivotal in breaking tensions with other factional peoples on that continent. Is the White House thinking at all of bringing Reverend Jackson into this situation, or is he involved at all?

MR. LEAVY: I don't think so. As you know, Reverend Jackson did extraordinary work to bring about a resolution of the conflict in Sierra Leone. He deserves great credit for that. He saved a lot of lives and prevented a lot more violence. I think Tony Lake has the portfolio on Ethiopia and Eritrea. He as well has spent a considerable amount of his own time traveling there, I think, close to half a dozen times.

So I think between Tony Lake, our team at the State Department, Susan Rice and our team here, led by Gail Smith, have been quite engaged and quite successful. So I don't see any need for Reverend Jackson to come in.

All right. Have a great weekend, everybody.

Q Barry?

Q Hold on.

MR. LEAVY: Oh, Barry, I'm sorry.

Q Week ahead?

Q Barry, I've got one question for you before you go away. Black Navy veterans have asked the President to dismiss mutiny charges against black sailors who refused to load ammo on the ships after the 1944 Port Chicago disaster in California. Does the request have merit and, if so, what is the President doing about it?

MR. TOIV: Well, until recently, there had not been a request for pardons for any of these individuals. Now, a few months ago, a request -- such a request was made. It's being considered under the usual process at the Justice Department, and obviously the President will give careful consideration to that.

Q Is the President well aware of the situation?

MR. TOIV: I believe he is.

Q Any time frame?

MR. TOIV: I don't have a time frame for you, no.

Q Barry, back on the gays in the military; as a candidate, the President said that he would end discrimination against gays in the military, "don't ask, don't tell" falls far short of that. Has the President given up hope that during his term in office he'll end discrimination against gays?

MR. TOIV: Well the President believes that the "don't ask, don't tell" policy has worked effectively. And I expect that that will be the policy throughout his administration.

Q But you concede it doesn't end discrimination -- that if you admit you're a homosexual in the military, you get thrown out?

MR. TOIV: Well, I will concede that it is a policy that has worked, and is the best policy that can be workable at this time.

Q Yes, but if it's worked, why are they changing it?

MR. TOIV: Well, no, it has worked. As I said before -- I'm not sure if you heard what I had to say about it before, but there have been a couple of areas that improvements were needed. And in fact, that's the work that's been going on that has led to the guidelines that are being issued today. And so -- I said it worked. I didn't say it was working perfectly.

Q Barry, the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette reported this morning that during a fundraiser on Saturday, several members of the Secret Service lined up to obstruct camera view of the President as he greeted Mrs. Arkansas in the ropeline, and that they later apologized for doing that. Do you know if that happened, or if it's common for the Secret Service to be used in that way, to interfere with press coverage of the President?

MR. TOIV: The answer to the second question, which is the fairer question of the two questions to be asking me up here, is I don't believe so.

Q Well, what's the answer to the first one?

MR. TOIV: The answer to the first question, of course, as you know, I've no idea, since that's the first time I'm hearing of that.

Week ahead?

Q Yes.

MR. TOIV: Let's see. I have to do this one by heart. Monday, the President is traveling to Kansas City, where he will



address the annual convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. And he will speak about foreign policy issues there, and I think I'll need to leave it at that for now.

MR. LEAVY: I can do a little bit more, but that's fine. I mean, if folks want, I can talk afterward.

MR. TOIV: Yes, David will fill you in a little bit more. I think he's going to focus to some degree on our obligations overseas. And that's the only event planned for that trip. He'll be back late afternoon, I believe, or maybe early evening at the latest.

On Tuesday, the President will announce some new PSAs relating to school violence. With kids starting to come back to school, obviously, this is a subject that is on a lot of people's minds, particularly with the incidents that occurred during the last school year. And there are going to be some new PSAs that are unveiled at that time.

Also on Tuesday, we have the visit from the NCAA champion Tennessee Vols, the football champions. They'll be here on Tuesday.

Wednesday, the President is down. And then Thursday, he heads to Martha's Vineyard for a well-deserved vacation.

Any questions?

Q Is he going to say anything on the way out today?

MR. TOIV: Is he going to say -- no.

Okay, thank you. Have a good weekend, everybody.

END 12:50 P.M. EDT

Message Sent

To: \_\_\_\_\_

"Alejandro G. Cabrera"@Ingate4.eop.gov  
Andrew J. Mayock/WHO/EOP  
Ann C. Hertelendy/WHO/EOP  
Ann F. Lewis/WHO/EOP  
Anne E. McGuire/WHO/EOP  
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP  
Antony J. Blinken/NSC/EOP  
"Aprill\_N.\_Springfield/who/eop/gov"@PMDF.EOP.GOV  
Michele Ballantyne/WHO/EOP  
BARTHLOW\_T@a1.eop.gov  
Barbara D. Woolley/WHO/EOP  
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP  
Bradley M. Campbell/CEQ/EOP  
Brenda M. Anders/WHO/EOP  
"Brian A. Reich"@Ingate4.eop.gov  
Brian A. Barreto/OPD/EOP  
CUTLER\_L@a1.eop.gov  
Stephanie A. Cutter/WHO/EOP

Stephanie A. Cutter/WHO/EOP  
Carmen B. Fowler/WHO/EOP  
Catherine T. Kitchen/WHO/EOP  
Cheryl D. Mills/WHO/EOP  
Christine N. Macy/WHO/EOP  
"Christopher S. Lehane"@lgate4.eop.gov  
DICKKEY\_L@a1.eop.gov  
Patrick M. Dorton/OPD/EOP  
Daniel W. Burkhardt/WHO/EOP  
Dario J. Gomez/WHO/EOP  
David E. Kalbaugh/WHO/EOP  
David R. Goodfriend/WHO/EOP  
David T. Johnson/NSC/EOP  
David Vandivier/OMB/EOP  
Dawn M. Chirwa/WHO/EOP  
Deborah Akel/WHO/EOP  
Debra D. Bird/WHO/EOP  
Delia A. Cohen/WHO/EOP  
Denver R. Peacock/WHO/EOP  
Dominique L. Cano/WHO/EOP  
Dorian V. Weaver/WHO/EOP  
Dorinda A. Salcido/WHO/EOP  
Douglas\_R.\_Matties@lgate2.eop.gov  
Douglas\_R.\_Matties@lgate2.eop.gov  
"Eli G. Attie"@lgate4.eop.gov  
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP  
Elliot J. Diringier/CEQ/EOP  
Erica S. Lepping/WHO/EOP  
FORDE\_R@a1.eop.gov  
GRAY\_W@a1.eop.gov  
George G. Caudill/WHO/EOP  
"Gina N. Dennis/WHO/EOP"@EOP.eop.gov  
Irma L. Martinez/WHO/EOP  
Jackson T. Dunn/WHO/EOP  
James\_M.\_Teague@lgate2.eop.gov  
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP  
Jeannetta P. Allen/OA/EOP  
Jennifer Ferguson/OMB/EOP  
"Jim Kohlenberger"@lgate4.eop.gov  
Jocelyn A. Bucaro/WHO/EOP  
Joel Johnson/WHO/EOP  
John A. Gribben/WHO/EOP  
John\_See@ed.gov  
Jonathan A. Kaplan/OPD/EOP  
Jonathan M. Prince/WHO/EOP  
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP  
Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP  
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP  
Julie\_B.\_Goldberg@lgate2.eop.gov  
Julie E. Mason/WHO/EOP  
Justin L. Coleman/WHO/EOP  
KTORPEY@AOL.COM  
Karen C. Burchard/WHO/EOP  
Karen L. Barbuschak/OA/EOP

Katharine Button/WHO/EOP  
Kathleen K. Ahn/WHO/EOP  
Kris M Balderston/WHO/EOP  
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP  
Laura S. Marcus/WHO/EOP  
Leslie Bernstein/WHO/EOP  
Lori\_E.\_Abrams@lmgate2.eop.gov  
MOFFETT\_J@a1.eop.gov  
Margaret M. Suntum/WHO/EOP  
Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP  
Mark D. Neschis/WHO/EOP  
Mark H. Bartholomew/OA/EOP  
Mark J. Bernstein/WHO/EOP  
Marsha E. Berry/WHO/EOP  
Martha Foley/WHO/EOP  
Marty J. Hoffmann/WHO/EOP  
Mary E. Cahill/WHO/EOP  
Maureen A. Hudson/WHO/EOP  
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP  
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP  
Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP  
Michael V. Terrell/CEQ/EOP  
Mindy E. Myers/WHO/EOP  
Minyon Moore/WHO/EOP  
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP  
"Nathan B. Naylor"@lmgate4.eop.gov  
Neera\_Tanden@lmgate2.eop.gov  
Noa A. Meyer/WHO/EOP  
OLCOTT\_E@a1.eop.gov  
PALMIERI\_J@a1.eop.gov  
Charles J. Payson/WHO/EOP  
"/R=OPUS/R=MRP/PR-L=AVUOEOP/PR-U=TDIXON/FFN=Timothy  
Dixon/"@mr.eop.gov  
Patrick E. Briggs/WHO/EOP  
Paul D. Glastris/WHO/EOP  
Philip\_J.\_Crowley@lmgate2.eop.gov  
Pub\_Arch@eop.eop.gov  
Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP  
Ralph Alswang/WHO/EOP  
Robin J. Bachman/WHO/EOP  
Robin J. Bachman/WHO/EOP  
Francisco J. Sanchez/WHO/EOP  
SUNTUM\_M@a1.eop.gov  
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP  
Sarah S. Knight/WHO/EOP  
Sean P. Maloney/WHO/EOP  
Sean P. O'Shea/WHO/EOP  
Sharon Farmer/WHO/EOP  
Sheyda Jahanbani/NSC/EOP  
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP  
Tanya E. Martin/OPD/EOP  
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP  
Toby C. Graff/WHO/EOP  
Todd A. Bledsoe/WHO/EOP

Wayne C. Johnson/OA/EOP  
William C. Haymes/OA/EOP  
William Hadley/OA/EOP  
backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu  
pcaplan@fbr.com  
Reuben L. Musgrave Jr/OSTP/EOP  
wh-outbox-distr@publ.pub.whitehouse.gov

- PIC20734.PCX===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====  
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:  
Reporting-MTA: dns; aol.com  
Arrival-Date: Fri, 13 Aug 1999 14:48:22 -0400 (EDT)

Final-Recipient: RFC822; rmikkelsen@aol.com  
Action: failed  
Status: 2.0.0  
Remote-MTA: DNS; air-yd02.mail.aol.com  
Diagnostic-Code: SMTP; 250 OK  
Last-Attempt-Date: Fri, 13 Aug 1999 14:48:36 -0400 (EDT)

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

===== ATTACHMENT 2 =====  
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:  
Unable to convert ARMS\_EXT:[ATTACH.D24]ARMS20912452Q.236 to ASCII,  
The following is a HEX DUMP:

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



RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lotus Pager Gateway ( Lotus Pager Gateway [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-AUG-1999 09:49:54.00

SUBJECT: Re: need you in gaggle... be prepped to answer Don't Ask Don't Tell...Erica (Sent to: DAVID C LEAVY [Pager])

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

To: 4112 @ WHCA

cc:

From: Erica S. Lepping

Date: 8/13/1999

Time: 09:46:39

Subject: need you in gaggle... be prepped to answer Don't Ask Don't Tell...Erica

Body:

Priority:

-----

Message history for recipient DAVID C LEAVY [Pager]

Friday 13 Aug 1999 09:46:57 Eastern Standard Time - Message received by  
Pager Gateway

Friday 13 Aug 1999 09:48:03 Eastern Standard Time - Message received by  
Paging Service

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-AUG-1999 21:53:56.00

SUBJECT: Pentagon Clarifying Gay Policy

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Associated Press, August 13, 1999

Pentagon Clarifying Gay Policy

By TOM RAUM

WASHINGTON (AP) ) The Pentagon updated its "don't ask, don't tell" policy for gays in the military on Friday, requiring mandatory training on anti-harassment guidelines for all troops, beginning with boot camp.

"I've made it clear there is no room for harassment or threats in the military," Defense Secretary William Cohen said in issuing the revised guidelines.

While the directives make no basic changes in the practices and protections in place since the policy was instituted in 1994, Cohen said he wanted to make sure they were "clearly understood and fairly enforced" throughout the military.

Michelle Benecke, co-director of the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, the leading advocacy group on the issue of gays in the military, praised Cohen's statements but with reservations.

"The real issue is whether leaders will be committed at every level to stop anti-gay harassment," said Benecke, a former Army officer. She also complained that the updated guidelines say nothing about limits on investigations or how commanders in the field should proceed. She noted that the directives essentially restate 1997 guidelines and recommendations a Pentagon working group made last year.

The new guidelines come just weeks after the bludgeoning death of a soldier in his barracks at Fort Campbell, Ky., renewed focus on gay harassment. Pfc. Barry L. Winchell, 21, had been rumored to be gay although neither the Army nor his family would comment on his sexuality.

"Don't ask, don't tell" allows gays to serve in the military as long as their sexual orientation is not discovered. It took effect in February 1994 after Congress balked at President Clinton's efforts to end the military's ban on homosexuals.

The law was supposed to help gays in the military. But gay-rights and civil-rights groups say hostilities have risen since its adoption, and that soldiers who complain about being harassed are often subjected to questions about their own sexuality.

White House spokesman Barry Toiv said the policy has worked overall, but

"improvements were needed" in some areas and the new guidelines "are intended to address those issues."

The updated guidelines continue a prohibition against inquiries into a service member's sexual orientation while allowing discharge for homosexual conduct or for a "propensity" to engage in homosexual conduct. A service member's statement that he or she is gay is considered evidence of a propensity to engage in such acts.

Under the 5-year-old policy, the military isn't supposed to investigate sexual orientation unless "credible information" surfaces about a person's homosexuality.

The guidelines also prohibit investigators from soliciting information on sexual orientation from those who report that they have been harassed or threatened. Such complaints must result in "the prompt investigation of the threat or harassment itself," the guidelines say.

"Service members should be able to report crimes and harassment free from fear of harm, reprisal or inappropriate or inadequate governmental response," Rudy de Leon, undersecretary of defense for personnel and readiness, said Friday in a memo to military leaders.

A new provision requires that the anti-harassment guidelines be "made part of training programs for law enforcement personnel, commanders and supervisors." And the guidelines are to be "incorporated into the required training that members of the armed forces receive upon entry into the armed forces and periodically thereafter," said a Pentagon statement.

Another new provision requires that investigations be conducted at higher levels in the military justice system, with input from "senior legal officers," a response to criticism that entry-level investigators or those lacking proper training had conducted many of the investigations.

In addition, any "substantial investigation" into whether a service member "made a statement regarding his or her homosexuality for the purpose of seeking separation" must be approved by the secretary of the relevant service, under a new guideline.

Last year, 1,145 people were discharged from the armed forces for homosexuality, a Pentagon report says. In 1997, the total was 997, the highest number since 1987. The number of discharges hit a low of 617 in 1994, the year the "don't ask, don't tell" policy took effect.

-----  
-----  
The item above is being distributed as a free, non-profit informational service to a limited number of individuals who have expressed interest in this topic for educational and research purposes only. Please do not redistribute or post copyrighted material anywhere on the Internet accessible to the public without attribution and permission from the author. Please note that distribution of this item does not necessarily constitute endorsement of the content; in fact, often items are distributed as "opposition research."



RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: OLCOTT\_E@A1@CD@LNGTWY ( OLCOTT\_E@A1@CD@LNGTWY [ UNKNOWN ] ) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-AUG-1999 13:56:39.00

SUBJECT: attachment: 8/13 toiv, leavy briefing

TO: WOZNIAK\_N@A1@CD@LNGTWY ( WOZNIAK\_N@A1@CD@LNGTWY [ UNKNOWN ] ) (NSC)

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SUNTUM\_M@A1@CD@LNGTWY ( SUNTUM\_M@A1@CD@LNGTWY [ UNKNOWN ] ) (WHO)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason H. Schechter@eop ( Jason H. Schechter@eop [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: megan moloney@eop ( megan moloney@eop [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Deborah Akel@eop ( Deborah Akel@eop [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

see attached===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

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

TEXT:

WPC

2BVJZCourier&?xxx,Q#x6X@`7X@HP LaserJet 5LHPLAS5L.PRS5x

@\~-%VX@uD3'3'StandardA'LegalA'LegalrJet 5L/E.>AuDX` hp x (#%'0\*,.8135@8:<H?AX`

2 ZnuDuD|Dier 10 Pitch#|x+Xx

@X@Standard PrinterSTANDARD.PRSx

@ )X@2

#|xT{P3'3'StandardA'LegalA'LegalHPLAS5L.PRS5x

uDX` hp x (#%'0\*,.8135@8:<H?A` 2

89'MORE`h(#CDATE #8&9'MORE&A'LegalA'LegalHPLAS5L.PRS5x

3'3'StandardHPLAS5L.PRS5x

|D

h#THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate  
Release

August 13, 1999

#PRESS BRIEFING  
t)BY

BARRY TOIV AND DAVID LEAVY

"The Briefing Room

12:30 P.M. EDT

MR. TOIV: Good afternoon, everybody. Happy Friday.

Q` ` I don't think everybody's here, Barry.

MR. TOIV: Come on in. We can wait.

Q` ` This is not a comment on your

MR. TOIV: Well, I'm happy today. I expect all the tough  
questions to go to David.  
vid.

Just as I mentioned earlier today, we're going to have a  
briefing at 2:30 p.m.  
on the radio address. The subject has to  
do with clean water, and we'll have Carol  
Brown here again,  
making an encore appearance, as well as Elgie Holstein  
, who is  
the Associate Director for Natural Resources at OMB. This will  
take place  
at 2:30 p.m., but it will be on camera. It will be  
embargoed until 10:06  
a.m. tomorrow, as usual.

Any questions?

MR. LEAVY: All right, thank you very much. Appreciate your  
coming in.

MR. TOIV: Well, thank you.

Q` ` Well, a couple of them. One about the Pentagon, new  
policy for "don't ask  
, don't tell." Any comments on that?

MR. TOIV: Well, as you know, Secretary Cohen has been committed to implementing the "don't ask, don't tell" policy fairly. And the President agrees with him on that. The Pentagon, a little over a year ago, issued a report that said that "don't ask, don't tell" was working, but that there were a couple of areas where improvements needed to be made. I think today, the guidelines that they are issuing today are intended to address those issues. I would suggest you check over there for details of what they are announcing today.

Q: I understand that China has not conveyed any explicit threats to the United States in regards to Taiwan. But can you characterize what has changed? Has there been any ratcheting up of the rhetoric of the implied threats, of the indications that you're getting that they may be more bellicose towards Taiwan?

MR. LEAVY: Let me just say, Bill, a couple of things generally. One, the peace and stability in East Asia and the Pacific is a fundamental national interest to the United States. We are certainly watching developments closely, have been in contact with both sides about our concerns and about reiterating our policy of resuming peaceful dialogue.

Just specifically on your question, it is my understanding that the intelligence community has not seen any extraordinary developments or signs that the PRC is mobilizing for military action in the Taiwan Strait.

Q: Would you say that there has been a ratcheting up of the rhetoric in diplomatic channels? Are they trying to send signals?

MR. LEAVY: Well, I don't want to characterize, Kevin, other people's rhetoric, other people's statements. I think there has obviously been some increased tension in the Strait over the last several weeks. That comes as no surprise to

any of us or anybody  
in this room. We've talked about that. But I think what  
we have  
to do is look forward, and we have communicated to both sides  
that there  
is a danger of escalating tensions, that we have to  
resume a dialog based on  
a One China formula. And we're going to  
continue to do that.

Q` ` Specifically, there was one report that the embassy  
here had been saying t  
hat they are going to take action.

MR. LEAVY: I would steer you away from that report. As I  
said earlier today,  
we have not received any threats or  
ultimatums from the PRC. I checked about t  
hat again this  
afternoon, earlier this afternoon, and that was confirmed. So,  
I  
would steer you away from that report.

I would just say, though, generally, that there is nothingH&0\*"@@new in China'  
s longstanding position. They have made clear that  
from their point of view Ta  
iwan is an internal matter, and they  
hope that there is peaceful reunification,  
but they don't rule  
out military means. We have a longstanding disagreement o  
n  
that. So I don't think any the context is not new.

Q` ` Does the United States still have a commitment to go to  
the defense of Tai  
wan, should there be an unprovoked attack from  
the mainland?

MR. LEAVY: Our longstanding position this goes back  
many years, both Republic  
an and Democratic administrations is  
that any effort to resolve the issue of T  
aiwan by other than  
peaceful means would be considered of grave concern to the  
United  
States. That position hasn't changed today.

Q` ` How would you view a Chinese seizure of a small Taiwancontrolled island, o  
r some smaller military action?

MR. LEAVY: See, that's the kind of hypothetical question  
that I want to avoid  
getting into. Again, the Taiwan Relations  
Act has been in place for many years

. It has guided our relationship on this issue, our policy on this issue. And I don't want to change, or speculate on hypotheticals today.

Q` ` David, is there concern that the U.S. might get drawn into something because of this rhetoric?

MR. LEAVY: Oh, I think there's concern that the interests of both sides won't be advanced. The One China policy that the President has advocated and that has been the foundation of our approach to this issue for many, many years has been successful for all sides. Both China and Taiwan have benefited economically. Taiwan's the sixth largest economy in the world. Chinese economic growth has grown vastly over the last 20 years.

So the formula is a successful one. We don't see the need to change that, and we have no intention of changing that.

Q` ` Let me follow, too. You said no one had contacted the United States with a threat. Has anyone from either side, Taiwan or China, contacted the United States with a concern over the rhetoric, a concern over the threat?

MR. LEAVY: Well, we've had a number of discussions, both at the State Department and with officials in China. As you remember, the State Department sent Assistant Secretary Stanley Roth and Ken Lieberthal from the National Security Council, several weeks ago, to Beijing to discuss our concern about the rising rhetoric, and a need to get back to a dialogue and to get back to the two parties talking about the issues. And so we have been engaged on this issue. And certainly, there is a concern that this kind of thing leads to accidents, leads to misunderstandings, and that we want to focus both parties on getting back to the table.

Q` ` You said you made a point of saying that there were no extraordinary sign

s coming into the intelligence community of

MR. LEAVY: Extraordinary developments or signs.

Q` ` Right. Does that mean that there is something less than extraordinary or you're telling us what hasn't happened. Can you tell us what has happened?

MR. LEAVY: Well, I want to stay away from commenting on intelligence capabilities and what we do and don't know. I think that's a line we haven't crossed, and appropriately so. But, as I said earlier, it's our judgment, the United States government's judgment, that there aren't any extraordinary developments or signs that there is a mobilization on the PRC's part.

Q` ` David, can you clarify just the conversations between the administration and the Taiwan and Chinese government? Have those conversations been stepped up in recent days? And at what level, if you can clarify, have these conversations been going?

MR. LEAVY: I don't think there has been a stepping up over recent days. Since this issue came to the forefront several weeks ago, we've had a number of discussions with the PRC and with people on Taiwan. There is nothing new in the last several days that I'm aware of.

Our general approach hasn't changed, though, and let me just repeat it again. The United States has a OneChina policy. Our approach is based on dialogue between the two sides and a peaceful resolution of any differences. We've communicated that and we will continue to do so.

Q` ` Let's put the intelligence community issue aside for a minute. If you look in the newspaper this morning, there are several people quoted on the record saying Chinese government representatives came to speak with them and made bellicose statements that there was some sort of imminent military action likely against

against Taiwan. Is that troubling those facts, which are known facts, are they troubling to the administration?

MR. LEAVY: Well, again, I don't think there is anything new in what we are hearing. China has a longstanding position that Taiwan is an internal matter, that they want to see it resolved peacefully, but they don't rule out the use of force. We have a disagreement with that. We don't think that's the way to go. We think there has to be a peaceful resolution to this issue.

It has to come through dialogue. And so there is nothing new in that articulation of those themes. I don't think anyone from the United States government was quoted in those stories, and as I said earlier, no one from the administration has been approached about any particular threat or ultimatum.

Q: But the analysts just to follow up these analysts who were quoted, who are respected China analysts, say that they did feel that there was something imminent, or that there was something new. The U.S. government just doesn't agree with that?

MR. LEAVY: No, I can't speak to that. As I said, we haven't been approached with any specific threat or any specific warning. And just the general notion that at this is a new policy I would just push back on, because this is something that at President Jiang and other Chinese leaders have articulated for some time. So the Chinese have not ruled out the use of military force. We disagree with them. We've made that clear. Our policy is peaceful dialogue.

Q: The question goes, though, David to whether this is imminent or not. We know now that that is their policy, but there seem to be signals that something may happen sooner rather than later.

MR. LEAVY: Well, I don't have any indication of that. And as I said earlier,

it's our intelligence community's best judgment that there aren't any signs that there is PRC military activity underway.

Q` ` What kind of activities, if any, is the President himself engaged in relative to this topic?

MR. LEAVY: Well, he hasn't been engaged over the last 24 hours. As you know, we will be seeing President Jiang at APEC in Auckland, New Zealand, the first week of September. That's going to be an important time for the two leaders to engage on this issue and a number of issues, including trade, human rights, non proliferation, I believe that will be on the margins of the APEC Summit. So I think that will be the next opportunity for the President to sit down with President Jiang and go over the wide range of bilateral issues.

Q` ` But he hasn't been consulting in recent days with his own advisors and what to do about this?

H&0\*"@@MR. LEAVY: Well Mr. Berger has kept him up to date. I believe he briefed him this morning, or he will early this afternoon. But he hasn't been engaged personally.

Q` ` David, as far as the policy, how do you respond to Republican allegations that when it comes time to pressuring China and Taiwan on this issue, the Clinton administration has only been putting pressure on Taiwan to ratchet down tensions?

MR. LEAVY: I would reject that. The United States takes actions based on our own interests. We have had a formula that has managed this issue for some time that's been both Republican and Democratic administrations. As I said earlier, it has benefited all the parties Taiwan, the PRC, the United States. We're going to continue to do that. I think it's not for us to pressure anybody, but to make clear that both sides' their agendas can be advanced, their prosperity



, their security can be advanced by peaceful dialogue.

Q` ` Last night the President told the Jewish leaders that he agreed that we should do more to start monitoring, if not infiltrating, some hate groups. Do you see anything today? Any directive? Any review of how that would be done? Any stepping up?

MR. TOIV: I don't have any additional information for you on that, no. The Justice Department seeks to do an effective job of dealing with hate crimes, certainly, and they also monitor hate groups. But I don't have any information on additional work that's being done.

Q` ` But Clinton said he would look into it personally, and said that he would do more.

MR. TOIV: And if he said that, he will.

Q` ` Barry, it was a year ago that the President was preparing for his grand jury testimony. Any reflections about the atmosphere then, and how things have changed since then around here, and at the White House?

MR. TOIV: Nope.

Q` ` Barry, I want to go back real quick to David about Ethiopia and Eritrea. What is the new development on the White House side in that conflict?

MR. TOIV: Okay. As you know, the United States has actively worked for a peaceful resolution of the dispute between Ethiopia and Eritrea over the past year, and continues to work in cooperation with the OAU to bring about a peaceful resolution to the conflict.

As you know, Tony Lake was appointed as the President's special envoy to this conflict over a year ago. He has traveled there, I think, close to six times. There has been encouraging

movement on the peace process over the last few weeks. At the Organization of African Unity's summit in Algiers in early July, the OAU proposed excuse me, the modalities for implementation of the OAU's framework agreement, both Ethiopia and Eritrea have now accepted the framework agreement, and the modalities for its implementation. We will continue to engage to move this process forward.

Q` ` A followup. Jesse Jackson has been very pivotal in breaking tensions with other factional peoples on that continent. Is the White House thinking at all of bringing Reverend Jackson into this situation, or is he involved at all?

MR. LEAVY: I don't think so. As you know, Reverend Jackson did extraordinary work to bring about a resolution of the conflict in Sierra Leone. He deserves great credit for that. He saved a lot of lives and prevented a lot more violence. I think Tony Lake has the portfolio on Ethiopia and Eritrea. He as well has spent a considerable amount of his own time traveling there, I think, close to half a dozen times.

So I think between Tony Lake, our team at the State Department, Susan Rice and our team here, led by Gail Smith, have been quite engaged and quite successful.

So I don't see any need for Reverend Jackson to come in.

All right. Have a great weekend, everybody.

Q` ` Barry?

Q` ` Hold on.

MR. LEAVY: Oh, Barry, I'm sorry.

Q` ` Week ahead?

Q` ` Barry, I've got one question for you before you go away. Black Navy veterans have asked the President to dismiss mutiny charges against black sailors who

o refused to load ammo on the ships after the 1944 Port Chicago disaster in California.

Does the request have merit and, if so, what is the President doing about it?

MR. TOIV: Well, until recently, there had not been a request for pardons for any of these individuals. Now, a few months ago, a request such a request was made. It's being considered under the usual process at the Justice Department, and obviously the President will give careful consideration to that.

Q: Is the President well aware of the situation?

MR. TOIV: I believe he is.

Q: Any time frame?

MR. TOIV: I don't have a time frame for you, no.

Q: Barry, back on the gays in the military; as a candidate, the President said that he would end discrimination against gays in the military, "don't ask, don't tell" falls far short of that. Has the President given up hope that during his term in office he'll end discrimination against gays?

MR. TOIV: Well the President believes that the "don't ask, don't tell" policy has worked effectively. And I expect that that will be the policy throughout his administration.

Q: But you concede it doesn't end discrimination that if you admit you're a homosexual in the military, you get thrown out?

MR. TOIV: Well, I will concede that it is a policy that has worked, and is the best policy that can be workable at this time.

Q: Yes, but if it's worked, why are they changing it?

MR. TOIV: Well, no, it has worked. As I said before I'm not sure if you heard what I had to say about it before, but there have been a couple of areas that improvements were needed.

And in fact, that's the work that's been going on that has led to the guidelines that are being issued today. And so I said it worked. I didn't say it was working perfectly.

Q. Barry, the Arkansas DemocratGazette reported this morning that during a fundraiser on Saturday, several members of the Secret Service lined up to obstruct camera view of the President as he greeted Mrs. Arkansas in the ropeline, and that they later apologized for doing that. Do you know if that happened, or if it's common for the Secret Service to be used in that way, to interfere with press coverage of the President?

MR. TOIV: The answer to the second question, which is the fairer question of the two questions to be asking me up here, is I don't believe so. We'll, what's the answer to the first one?

MR. TOIV: The answer to the first question, of course, as you know, I've no idea, since that's the first time I'm hearing of that.

Week ahead?

Q. Yes.

MR. TOIV: Let's see. I have to do this one by heart. Monday, the President is traveling to Kansas City, where he will address the annual convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. And he will speak about foreign policy issues there, and I think I'll need to leave it at that for now.

MR. LEAVY: I can do a little bit more, but that's fine. I mean, if folks want, I can talk afterward.

MR. TOIV: Yes, David will fill you in a little bit more. I think he's going to focus to some degree on our obligations overseas. And that's the only event planned for that trip. He'll be back late afternoon, I believe, or maybe early evening at the

latest.

On Tuesday, the President will announce some new PSAs relating to school violence. With kids starting to come back to school, obviously, this is a subject that is on a lot of people's minds, particularly with the incidents that occurred during the last school year. And there are going to be some new PSAs that are unveiled at that time.

Also on Tuesday, we have the visit from the NCAA champion Tennessee Vols, the football champions. They'll be here on Tuesday.

Wednesday, the President is down. And then Thursday, he heads to Martha's Vineyard for a well-deserved vacation.

Any questions?

Q: Is he going to say anything on the way out today?

MR. TOIV: Is he going to say no.

Okay, thank you. Have a good weekend, everybody.

8)END`(#=12:50 P.M. EDT===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Donna Dejban ( CN=Donna Dejban/OU=NSC/O=EOP [ NSC ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-AUG-1999 11:45:35.00

SUBJECT: Re: 12:30 pm meeting TODAY

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Charles Allen ( CN=Charles Allen/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [ NSC ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Joan Hunerwadel ( CN=Joan Hunerwadel/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [ NSC ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Carolyn, attending for Jamie Baker will be Chuck Allen. Thank you.

Carolyn T. Wu  
08/13/99 11:14:14 AM  
Record Type: Record

To: Donna Dejban/NSC/EOP@EOP, Cheryl D. Mills/WHO/EOP@EOP, Melissa J. Prober/WHO/EOP@EOP, Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP@EOP

cc:

Subject: 12:30 pm meeting TODAY

The meeting on Don't Ask, Don't tell regulations and Fort Campbell is scheduled for 12:30 today in Karen's office. The following are invited:

Jamie Baker  
Mara Rudman  
Cheryl Mills  
Richard Socarides

Please let me know of conflicts/problems. Thanks!

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-AUG-1999 18:14:59.00

SUBJECT: 1999-8/13 toiv, leavy briefing

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP on 08/13/99 06:14 PM -----

OLCOTT\_E@a1.eop.gov

08/13/99 01:44:20 PM

Record Type:-Record

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

cc:

Subject: 1999-8/13 toiv, leavy briefing

Note: Some recipients have been dropped due to syntax errors.  
Please refer to the "\$AdditionalHeaders" item for the complete headers.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

August 13, 1999

PRESS BRIEFING

BY

BARRY TOIV AND DAVID LEAVY

The Briefing Room

12:30 P.M. EDT

MR. TOIV: Good afternoon, everybody. Happy Friday.

Q I don't think everybody's here, Barry.

MR. TOIV: Come on in. We can wait.

Q This is not a comment on your --

MR. TOIV: Well, I'm happy today. I expect all the tough questions to go to David.

Just as I mentioned earlier today, we're going to have a briefing at 2:30 p.m. on the radio address. The subject has to do with clean water, and we'll have Carol Browner here again, making an encore appearance, as well as Elgie Holstein, who is the Associate Director for Natural Resources at OMB. This will take place at 2:30 p.m., but it will be on camera. It will be embargoed until 10:06 a.m. tomorrow, as usual.

Any questions?

MR. LEAVY: All right, thank you very much. Appreciate your coming in.

MR. TOIV: Well, thank you.

Q Well, a couple of them. One about the Pentagon, new policy for "don't ask, don't tell." Any comments on that?

MR. TOIV: Well, as you know, Secretary Cohen has been committed to implementing the "don't ask, don't tell" policy fairly. And the President agrees with him on that. The Pentagon, a little over a year ago, issued a report that said that "don't ask, don't tell" was working, but that there were a couple of areas where improvements needed to be made. I think today, the guidelines that they are issuing today are intended to address those issues. I would suggest you check over there for details of what they are announcing today.

Q I understand that China has not conveyed any explicit threats to the United States in regards to Taiwan. But can you characterize what has changed? Has there been any ratcheting up of the rhetoric of the implied threats, of the indications that you're getting that they may be more bellicose towards Taiwan?

MR. LEAVY: Let me just say, Bill, a couple of things generally. One, the peace and stability in East Asia and the Pacific is a fundamental national interest to the United States. We are certainly watching developments closely, have been in contact with both sides about our concerns and about reiterating our policy of resuming peaceful dialogue.

Just specifically on your question, it is my understanding that the intelligence community has not seen any extraordinary developments or signs that the PRC is mobilizing for military



action in the Taiwan Strait.

Q Would you say that there has been a ratcheting up of the rhetoric in diplomatic channels? Are they trying to send signals?

MR. LEAVY: Well, I don't want to characterize, Kevin, other people's rhetoric, other people's statements. I think there has obviously been some increased tension in the Strait over the last several weeks. That comes as no surprise to any of us or anybody in this room. We've talked about that. But I think what we have to do is look forward, and we have communicated to both sides that there is a danger of escalating tensions, that we have to resume a dialog based on a One China formula. And we're going to continue to do that.

Q Specifically, there was one report that the embassy here had been saying that they are going to take action.

MR. LEAVY: I would steer you away from that report. As I said earlier today, we have not received any threats or ultimatums from the PRC. I checked about that again this afternoon, earlier this afternoon, and that was confirmed. So, I would steer you away from that report.

I would just say, though, generally, that there is nothing new in China's long-standing position. They have made clear that from their point of view Taiwan is an internal matter, and they hope that there is peaceful reunification, but they don't rule out military means. We have a long-standing disagreement on that. So I don't think any -- the context is not new.

Q Does the United States still have a commitment to go to the defense of Taiwan, should there be an unprovoked attack from the mainland?

MR. LEAVY: Our long-standing position -- this goes back many years, both Republican and Democratic administrations -- is that any effort to resolve the issue of Taiwan by other than peaceful means would be considered of grave concern to the United States. That position hasn't changed today.

Q How would you view a Chinese seizure of a small Taiwan-controlled island, or some smaller military action?

MR. LEAVY: See, that's the kind of hypothetical question that I want to avoid getting into. Again, the Taiwan Relations Act has been in place for many years. It has guided our relationship on this issue, our policy on this issue. And I don't want to change, or speculate on hypotheticals today.

Q David, is there concern that the U.S. might get drawn into something because of this rhetoric?

MR. LEAVY: Oh, I think there's concern that the interests of both sides won't be advanced. The One China policy that the President has advocated -- and that has been the foundation of our approach to this issue for many, many years -- has been successful for all sides. Both China and Taiwan have benefited economically. Taiwan's the sixth-largest economy in the world. Chinese economic growth has grown vastly over the last 20 years.

So the formula is a successful one. We don't see the need to change that, and we have no intention of changing that.

Q Let me follow, too. You said no one had contacted the United States with a threat. Has anyone from either side, Taiwan or China, contacted the United States with a concern over the rhetoric, a concern over the threat?

MR. LEAVY: Well, we've had a number of discussions, both at the State Department and with officials in China. As you remember, the State Department sent Assistant Secretary Stanley Roth and Ken Lieberthal from the National Security Council, several weeks ago, to Beijing to discuss our concern about the rising rhetoric, and a need to get back to a dialogue and to get back to the two parties talking about the issues. And so we have been engaged on this issue. And certainly, there is a concern that this kind of thing leads to accidents, leads to misunderstandings, and that we want to focus both parties on getting back to the table.

Q You said -- you made a point of saying that there were no extraordinary signs coming into the intelligence community of --

MR. LEAVY: Extraordinary developments or signs.

Q Right. Does that mean that there is something less than extraordinary -- or you're telling us what hasn't happened. Can you tell us what has happened?

MR. LEAVY: Well, I want to stay away from commenting on intelligence capabilities and what we do and don't know. I think that's a line we haven't crossed, and appropriately so. But, as I said earlier, it's our judgment, the United States government's judgment, that there aren't any extraordinary developments or signs that there is a mobilization on the PRC's part.

Q David, can you clarify just the conversations between the administration and the Taiwan and Chinese government? Have those conversations been stepped up in recent days? And at what level, if you can clarify, have these conversations been going?

MR. LEAVY: I don't think there has been a stepping up over recent days. Since this issue came to the forefront several weeks ago, we've had a number of discussions with the PRC and with people on Taiwan. There is nothing new in the last several

days that I'm aware of.

Our general approach hasn't changed, though, and let me just repeat it again. The United States has a One-China policy. Our approach is based on dialogue between the two sides and a peaceful resolution of any differences. We've communicated that and we will continue to do so.

Q Let's put the intelligence community issue aside for a minute. If you look in the newspaper this morning, there are several people quoted on the record saying Chinese government representatives came to speak with them and made bellicose statements that there was some sort of imminent military action likely against Taiwan. Is that troubling -- those facts, which are known facts, are they troubling to the administration?

MR. LEAVY: Well, again, I don't think there is anything new in what we are hearing. China has a longstanding position that any -- that Taiwan is an internal matter, that they want to see it resolved peacefully, but they don't rule out the use of force. We have a disagreement with that. We don't think that's the way to go. We think there has to be a peaceful resolution to this issue. It has to come through dialogue. And so there is nothing new in that articulation of those themes. I don't think anyone from the United States government was quoted in those stories, and as I said earlier, no one from the administration has been approached about any particular threat or ultimatum.

Q But the analysts -- just to follow up -- these analysts who were quoted, who are respected China analysts, say that they did feel that there was something imminent, or that there was something new. The U.S. government just doesn't agree with that?

MR. LEAVY: No, I can't speak to that. As I said, we haven't been approached with any specific threat or any specific warning. And just the general notion that this is a new policy I would just push back on, because this is something that President Jiang and other Chinese leaders have articulated for some time. So the Chinese have not ruled out the use of military force. We disagree with them. We've made that clear. Our policy is peaceful dialogue.

Q The question goes, though, David to whether this is imminent or not. We know that that is their policy, but there seem to be signals that something may happen sooner rather than later.

MR. LEAVY: Well, I don't have any indication of that. And as I said earlier, it's our intelligence community's best judgment that there aren't any signs that there is PRC military activity underway.

Q What kind of activities, if any, is the President himself engaged in relative to this topic?

MR. LEAVY: Well, he hasn't been engaged over the last 24 hours. As you know, we will be seeing President Jiang at APEC in Auckland, New Zealand, the first week of September. That's going to be an important time for the two leaders to engage on this issue and a number of issues, including trade, human rights, non-proliferation, I believe that will be on the margins of the APEC Summit. So I think that will be the next opportunity for the President to sit down with President Jiang and go over the wide range of bilateral issues.

Q But he hasn't been consulting in recent days with his own advisors and what to do about this?

MR. LEAVY: Well Mr. Berger has kept him up to date. I believe he briefed him this morning, or he will early this afternoon. But he hasn't been engaged personally.

Q David, as far as the policy, how do you respond to Republican allegations that when it comes time to pressuring China and Taiwan on this issue, the Clinton administration has only been putting pressure on Taiwan to ratchet down tensions?

MR. LEAVY: I would reject that. The United States takes actions based on our own interests. We have had a formula that has managed this issue for some time that's been both Republican and Democratic administrations. As I said earlier, it has benefited all the parties -- Taiwan, the PRC, the United States. We're going to continue to do that. I think it's not for us to pressure anybody, but to make clear that both sides -- their agendas can be advanced, their prosperity, their security can be advanced by peaceful dialogue.

Q Last night the President told the Jewish leaders that he agreed that we should do more to start monitoring, if not infiltrating, some hate groups. Do you -- is there anything today? Any directive? Any review of how that would be done? Any stepping up?

MR. TOIV: I don't have any additional information for you on that, no. The Justice Department seeks to do an effective job of dealing with hate crimes, certainly, and they also monitor hate groups. But I don't have any information on additional work that's being done.

Q But Clinton said he would look into it personally, and said that he would do more.

MR. TOIV: And if he said that, he will.

Q Barry, it was a year ago that the President was preparing for his grand jury testimony. Any reflections about the atmosphere then, and how things have changed since then around here, and at the White House?

MR. TOIV: Nope.

Q Barry, I want to go back real quick to David about Ethiopia and Eritrea. What is the new development on the White House side in that conflict?

MR. TOIV: Okay. As you know, the United States has actively worked for a peaceful resolution of the dispute between Ethiopia and Eritrea over the past year, and continues to work in cooperation with the OAU to bring about a peaceful resolution to the conflict.

As you know, Tony Lake was appointed as the President's special envoy to this conflict over a year ago. He has traveled there, I think, close to six times. There has been encouraging movement on the peace process over the last few weeks. At the Organization of African Unity's summit in Algiers in early July, the OAU proposed -- excuse me, the modalities for implementation of the OAU's framework agreement, both Ethiopia and Eritrea have now accepted the framework agreement, and the modalities for its implementation. We will continue to engage to move this process forward.

Q A follow-up. Jesse Jackson has been very pivotal in breaking tensions with other factional peoples on that continent. Is the White House thinking at all of bringing Reverend Jackson into this situation, or is he involved at all?

MR. LEAVY: I don't think so. As you know, Reverend Jackson did extraordinary work to bring about a resolution of the conflict in Sierra Leone. He deserves great credit for that. He saved a lot of lives and prevented a lot more violence. I think Tony Lake has the portfolio on Ethiopia and Eritrea. He as well has spent a considerable amount of his own time traveling there, I think, close to half a dozen times.

So I think between Tony Lake, our team at the State Department, Susan Rice and our team here, led by Gail Smith, have been quite engaged and quite successful. So I don't see any need for Reverend Jackson to come in.

All right. Have a great weekend, everybody.

Q Barry?

Q Hold on.

MR. LEAVY: Oh, Barry, I'm sorry.

Q Week ahead?

Q Barry, I've got one question for you before you go away. Black Navy veterans have asked the President to dismiss mutiny charges against black sailors who refused to load ammo on the ships after the 1944 Port Chicago disaster in California. Does the request have merit and, if so, what is the President doing about it?

MR. TOIV: Well, until recently, there had not been a request for pardons for any of these individuals. Now, a few months ago, a request -- such a request was made. It's being considered under the usual process at the Justice Department, and obviously the President will give careful consideration to that.

Q Is the President well aware of the situation?

MR. TOIV: I believe he is.

Q Any time frame?

MR. TOIV: I don't have a time frame for you, no.

Q Barry, back on the gays in the military; as a candidate, the President said that he would end discrimination against gays in the military, "don't ask, don't tell" falls far short of that. Has the President given up hope that during his term in office he'll end discrimination against gays?

MR. TOIV: Well the President believes that the "don't ask, don't tell" policy has worked effectively. And I expect that that will be the policy throughout his administration.

Q But you concede it doesn't end discrimination -- that if you admit you're a homosexual in the military, you get thrown out?

MR. TOIV: Well, I will concede that it is a policy that has worked, and is the best policy that can be workable at this time.

Q Yes, but if it's worked, why are they changing it?

MR. TOIV: Well, no, it has worked. As I said before -- I'm not sure if you heard what I had to say about it before, but there have been a couple of areas that improvements were needed. And in fact, that's the work that's been going on that has led to the guidelines that are being issued today. And so -- I said it worked. I didn't say it was working perfectly.

Q Barry, the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette reported this morning that during a fundraiser on Saturday, several members of the Secret Service lined up to obstruct camera view of the President as he greeted Mrs. Arkansas in the ropeline, and that they later apologized for doing that. Do you know if that happened, or if it's common for the Secret Service to be used in that way, to interfere with press coverage of the President?

MR. TOIV: The answer to the second question, which is the fairer question of the two questions to be asking me up here, is I don't believe so.

Q Well, what's the answer to the first one?

MR. TOIV: The answer to the first question, of course, as you know, I've no idea, since that's the first time I'm hearing of that.

Week ahead?

Q Yes.

MR. TOIV: Let's see. I have to do this one by heart. Monday, the President is traveling to Kansas City, where he will address the annual convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. And he will speak about foreign policy issues there, and I think I'll need to leave it at that for now.

MR. LEAVY: I can do a little bit more, but that's fine. I mean, if folks want, I can talk afterward.

MR. TOIV: Yes, David will fill you in a little bit more. I think he's going to focus to some degree on our obligations overseas. And that's the only event planned for that trip. He'll be back late afternoon, I believe, or maybe early evening at the latest.

On Tuesday, the President will announce some new PSAs relating to school violence. With kids starting to come back to school, obviously, this is a subject that is on a lot of people's minds, particularly with the incidents that occurred during the last school year. And there are going to be some new PSAs that are unveiled at that time.

Also on Tuesday, we have the visit from the NCAA champion Tennessee Vols, the football champions. They'll be here on Tuesday.

Wednesday, the President is down. And then Thursday, he heads to Martha's Vineyard for a well-deserved vacation.

Any questions?

Q Is he going to say anything on the way out today?

MR. TOIV: Is he going to say -- no.

Okay, thank you. Have a good weekend, everybody.

END

12:50 P.M. EDT

Message Sent

To:

---

"Alejandro G. Cabrera"@lmgate4.eop.gov  
Andrew J. Mayock/WHO/EOP  
Ann C. Hertelendy/WHO/EOP  
Ann F. Lewis/WHO/EOP  
Anne E. McGuire/WHO/EOP  
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP  
Antony J. Blinken/NSC/EOP  
"Aprill\_N\_Springfield/who/eop/gov"@PMDf.EOP.GOV  
Michele Ballantyne/WHO/EOP  
BARTHOLOW\_T@a1.eop.gov  
Barbara D. Woolley/WHO/EOP  
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP  
Bradley M. Campbell/CEQ/EOP  
Brenda M. Anders/WHO/EOP  
"Brian A. Reich"@lmgate4.eop.gov  
Brian A. Barreto/OPD/EOP  
CUTLER\_L@a1.eop.gov  
Stephanie A. Cutter/WHO/EOP  
Stephanie A. Cutter/WHO/EOP  
Carmen B. Fowler/WHO/EOP  
Catherine T. Kitchen/WHO/EOP  
Cheryl D. Mills/WHO/EOP  
Christine N. Macy/WHO/EOP  
"Christopher S. Lehane"@lmgate4.eop.gov  
DICKKEY\_L@a1.eop.gov  
Patrick M. Dorton/OPD/EOP  
Daniel W. Burkhardt/WHO/EOP  
Dario J. Gomez/WHO/EOP  
David E. Kalbaugh/WHO/EOP  
David R. Goodfriend/WHO/EOP  
David T. Johnson/NSC/EOP  
David Vandivier/OMB/EOP  
Dawn M. Chirwa/WHO/EOP  
Deborah Akel/WHO/EOP  
Debra D. Bird/WHO/EOP  
Delia A. Cohen/WHO/EOP  
Denver R. Peacock/WHO/EOP  
Dominique L. Cano/WHO/EOP  
Dorian V. Weaver/WHO/EOP  
Dorinda A. Salcido/WHO/EOP  
Douglas\_R\_Matties@lmgate2.eop.gov  
Douglas\_R\_Matties@lmgate2.eop.gov  
"Eli G. Attie"@lmgate4.eop.gov  
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP  
Elliot J. Diringer/CEQ/EOP  
Erica S. Lepping/WHO/EOP  
FORDE\_R@a1.eop.gov  
GRAY\_W@a1.eop.gov



George G. Caudill/WHO/EOP  
"Gina N. Dennis/WHO/EOP"@EOP.eop.gov  
Irma L. Martinez/WHO/EOP  
Jackson T. Dunn/WHO/EOP  
James\_M.\_Teague@lncgate2.eop.gov  
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP  
Jeannetta P. Allen/OA/EOP  
Jennifer Ferguson/OMB/EOP  
"Jim Kohlenberger"@lncgate4.eop.gov  
Jocelyn A. Bucaro/WHO/EOP  
Joel Johnson/WHO/EOP  
John A. Gribben/WHO/EOP  
John\_See@ed.gov  
Jonathan A. Kaplan/OPD/EOP  
Jonathan M. Prince/WHO/EOP  
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP  
Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP  
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP  
Julie\_B.\_Goldberg@lncgate2.eop.gov  
Julie E. Mason/WHO/EOP  
Justin L. Coleman/WHO/EOP  
KTORPEY@AOL.COM  
Karen C. Burchard/WHO/EOP  
Karen L. Barbuschak/OA/EOP  
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP  
Kathleen K. Ahn/WHO/EOP  
Kris M. Balderston/WHO/EOP  
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP  
Laura S. Marcus/WHO/EOP  
Leslie Bernstein/WHO/EOP  
Lori\_E.\_Abrams@lncgate2.eop.gov  
MOFFETT\_J@a1.eop.gov  
Margaret M. Suntum/WHO/EOP  
Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP  
Mark D. Neschis/WHO/EOP  
Mark H. Bartholomew/OA/EOP  
Mark J. Bernstein/WHO/EOP  
Marsha E. Berry/WHO/EOP  
Martha Foley/WHO/EOP  
Marty J. Hoffmann/WHO/EOP  
Mary E. Cahill/WHO/EOP  
Maureen A. Hudson/WHO/EOP  
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP  
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP  
Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP  
Michael V. Terrell/CEQ/EOP  
Mindy E. Myers/WHO/EOP  
Minyon Moore/WHO/EOP  
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP  
"Nathan B. Naylor"@lncgate4.eop.gov  
Neera\_Tanden@lncgate2.eop.gov  
Noa A. Meyer/WHO/EOP  
OLCOTT\_E@a1.eop.gov  
PALMIERI\_J@a1.eop.gov

Charles J. Payson/WHO/EOP  
"/R=OPUS/R=MRP/PR-L=AVUOEOP/PR-U=TDIXON/FFN=Timothy Dixon/"@mr.eop.gov  
Patrick E. Briggs/WHO/EOP  
Paul D. Glastris/WHO/EOP  
Philip\_J.\_Crowley@lmgate2.eop.gov  
Pub\_Arch@eop.eop.gov  
Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP  
Ralph Alswang/WHO/EOP  
Robin J. Bachman/WHO/EOP  
Robin J. Bachman/WHO/EOP  
Francisco J. Sanchez/WHO/EOP  
SUNTUM\_M@a1.eop.gov  
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP  
Sarah S. Knight/WHO/EOP  
Sean P. Maloney/WHO/EOP  
Sean P. O'Shea/WHO/EOP  
Sharon Farmer/WHO/EOP  
Sheyda Jahanbani/NSC/EOP  
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP  
Tanya E. Martin/OPD/EOP  
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP  
Toby C. Graff/WHO/EOP  
Todd A. Bledsoe/WHO/EOP  
Wayne C. Johnson/OA/EOP  
William C. Haymes/OA/EOP  
William Hadley/OA/EOP  
backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu  
pcaplan@fbr.com  
Reuben L. Musgrave Jr/OSTP/EOP  
wh-outbox-distr@publ.pub.whitehouse.gov

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

CREATOR: Ellen E. Olcott ( OLCOTT\_E ) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-AUG-1999 13:48:12.36

SUBJECT: 1999-8/13 toiv, leavy briefing

TO: Alejandro G. Cabrera ( Alejandro G. Cabrera@lmgate4.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Andrew\_J.\_Mayock ( Andrew\_J.\_Mayock@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Ann\_C.\_Hertelendy ( Ann\_C.\_Hertelendy@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Ann\_F.\_Lewis ( Ann\_F.\_Lewis@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Anne\_E.\_McGuire ( Anne\_E.\_McGuire@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Anne\_M.\_Edwards ( Anne\_M.\_Edwards@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Antony\_J.\_Blinken ( Antony\_J.\_Blinken@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Aprill\_N.\_Springfield/who/eop/gov ( Aprill\_N.\_Springfield/who/eop/gov@PMDf.EOP.GOV@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Michele Ballantyne ( BALLANTYNE\_M ) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee ( Michele Ballantyne@eop@lmgatwy@eopmrX ) (WHO)  
READ:NOT READ

TO: BARTHOLOW\_T ( BARTHOLOW\_T@Al@CD ) (OA)  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Barbara\_D.\_Woolley ( Barbara\_D.\_Woolley@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Beverly\_J.\_Barnes ( Beverly\_J.\_Barnes@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Bradley\_M.\_Campbell ( Bradley\_M.\_Campbell@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Brenda\_M.\_Anders ( Brenda\_M.\_Anders@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Brian A. Reich ( Brian A. Reich@lmgate4.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

READ:NOT READ

TO: Brian\_A.\_Barreto ( Brian\_A.\_Barreto@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: CUTLER\_L ( CUTLER\_L@A1@CD ) (WHO)  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Stephanie A. Cutter ( CUTTER\_S ) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee ( Stephanie A.  
Cutter@eop@lmgtwy@eopmrk ) (WHO)  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Carmen\_B.\_Fowler ( Carmen\_B.\_Fowler@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Catherine\_T.\_Kitchen ( Catherine\_T.\_Kitchen@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Cheryl\_D.\_Mills ( Cheryl\_D.\_Mills@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Christine\_N.\_Macy ( Christine\_N.\_Macy@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Christopher S. Lehane ( Christopher S. Lehane@lmgate4.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: DICKEY\_L ( DICKEY\_L@A1@CD ) (WHO)  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Patrick M. Dorton ( DORTON\_P ) Autoforward to: Patrick M. Dorton ( Patrick M.  
Dorton@eop@lmgtwy@eopmrk ) (OPD)  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Daniel\_W.\_Burkhardt ( Daniel\_W.\_Burkhardt@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Dario\_J.\_Gomez ( Dario\_J.\_Gomez@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: David\_E.\_Kalbaugh ( David\_E.\_Kalbaugh@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: David\_R.\_Goodfriend ( David\_R.\_Goodfriend@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: David\_T.\_Johnson ( David\_T.\_Johnson@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX ) (DON)  
READ:NOT READ

TO: INTERNET (PMDF) DESTINATION ( David\_Vandivier@omb.eop.gov@INET )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Dawn\_M.\_Chirwa ( Dawn\_M.\_Chirwa@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Deborah\_Akel  
READ:NOT READ ( Deborah\_Akel@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Debra\_D.\_Bird  
READ:NOT READ ( Debra\_D.\_Bird@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Delia\_A.\_Cohen  
READ:NOT READ ( Delia\_A.\_Cohen@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Denver\_R.\_Peacock  
READ:NOT READ ( Denver\_R.\_Peacock@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Dominique\_L.\_Cano  
READ:NOT READ ( Dominique\_L.\_Cano@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Dorian\_V.\_Weaver  
READ:NOT READ ( Dorian\_V.\_Weaver@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Dorinda\_A.\_Salcido  
READ:NOT READ ( Dorinda\_A.\_Salcido@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Douglas\_R.\_Matties  
READ:NOT READ ( Douglas\_R.\_Matties@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Eli G. Attie  
READ:NOT READ ( Eli G. Attie@lmgate4.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Elizabeth\_R.\_Newman  
READ:NOT READ ( Elizabeth\_R.\_Newman@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Elliot\_J.\_Diringer  
READ:NOT READ ( Elliot\_J.\_Diringer@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Erica\_S.\_Lepping  
READ:NOT READ ( Erica\_S.\_Lepping@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: FORDE\_R  
READ:NOT READ ( FORDE\_R@A1@CD ) ( )

TO: GRAY\_W  
READ:NOT READ ( GRAY\_W@A1@CD ) (NSC)

TO: George\_G.\_Caudill  
READ:NOT READ ( George\_G.\_Caudill@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Gina N. Dennis/WHO/EOP  
READ:NOT READ ( Gina N. Dennis/WHO/EOP@EOP.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Irma\_L.\_Martinez  
READ:NOT READ ( Irma\_L.\_Martinez@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Jackson\_T.\_Dunn  
READ:NOT READ ( Jackson\_T.\_Dunn@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: James_M._Teague READ:NOT READ	( James_M._Teague@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Jason H. Schechter READ:NOT READ	( Jason H. Schechter@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX )
TO: Jeannetta_P._Allen READ:NOT READ	( Jeannetta_P._Allen@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Jennifer_Ferguson READ:NOT READ	( Jennifer_Ferguson@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Jim Kohlenberger READ:NOT READ	( Jim Kohlenberger@lmgate4.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Jocelyn_A._Bucaro READ:NOT READ	( Jocelyn_A._Bucaro@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Joel_Johnson READ:NOT READ	( Joel_Johnson@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: John_A._Gribben READ:NOT READ	( John_A._Gribben@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: John_See READ:NOT READ	( John_See@ed.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Jonathan_A._Kaplan READ:NOT READ	( Jonathan_A._Kaplan@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Jonathan_M._Prince READ:NOT READ	( Jonathan_M._Prince@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Joseph_P._Lockhart READ:NOT READ	( Joseph_P._Lockhart@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Joshua_S._Gottheimer READ:NOT READ	( Joshua_S._Gottheimer@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Julia_M._Payne READ:NOT READ	( Julia_M._Payne@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Julie_B._Goldberg READ:NOT READ	( Julie_B._Goldberg@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Julie_E._Mason READ:NOT READ	( Julie_E._Mason@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Justin_L._Coleman READ:NOT READ	( Justin_L._Coleman@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: KTORPEY READ:NOT READ	( KTORPEY@AOL.COM@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Karen_C._Burchard READ:NOT READ	( Karen_C._Burchard@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Karen_L._Barbuschak READ:NOT READ	( Karen_L._Barbuschak@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Katharine_Button READ:NOT READ	( Katharine_Button@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Kathleen_K._Ahn READ:NOT READ	( Kathleen_K._Ahn@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Kris_M_Balderston READ:NOT READ	( Kris_M_Balderston@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Laura_D._Schwartz READ:NOT READ	( Laura_D._Schwartz@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Laura_S._Marcus READ:NOT READ	( Laura_S._Marcus@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Leslie_Bernstein READ:NOT READ	( Leslie_Bernstein@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Lori_E._Abrams READ:NOT READ	( Lori_E._Abrams@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: MOFFETT_J READ:NOT READ	( MOFFETT_J@A1@CD ) (WHO)
TO: Margaret_M._Suntum READ:NOT READ	( Margaret_M._Suntum@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Mark_A._Kitchens READ:NOT READ	( Mark_A._Kitchens@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Mark_D._Neschis READ:NOT READ	( Mark_D._Neschis@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Mark_H._Bartholomew READ:NOT READ	( Mark_H._Bartholomew@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Mark_J._Bernstein READ:NOT READ	( Mark_J._Bernstein@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Marsha_E._Berry READ:NOT READ	( Marsha_E._Berry@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Martha_Foley READ:NOT READ	( Martha_Foley@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )
TO: Marty_J._Hoffmann READ:NOT READ	( Marty_J._Hoffmann@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Mary\_E.\_Cahill ( Mary\_E.\_Cahill@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Maureen\_A.\_Hudson ( Maureen\_A.\_Hudson@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Megan\_C.\_Moloney ( Megan\_C.\_Moloney@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Melissa\_M.\_Murray ( Melissa\_M.\_Murray@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Michael\_A.\_Hammer ( Michael\_A.\_Hammer@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Michael\_V.\_Terrell ( Michael\_V.\_Terrell@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Mindy\_E.\_Myers ( Mindy\_E.\_Myers@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Minyon\_Moore ( Minyon\_Moore@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Nanda\_Chitre ( Nanda\_Chitre@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Nathan\_B.\_Naylor ( Nathan\_B.\_Naylor@lmgate4.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Neera\_Tanden ( Neera\_Tanden@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Noa\_A.\_Meyer ( Noa\_A.\_Meyer@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: OLCOTT\_E ( OLCOTT\_E@AI@CD ) (WHO)  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jennifer Palmieri ( PALMIERI\_J ) (WHO)  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Charles J. Payson ( PAYSON\_C ) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee ( Charles J.  
Payson@eop@lmgatwy@eopmr ) (WHO)  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Timothy Dixon ( PR\_USERNAME=TDIXON@PR\_LOCATION=AVUOEOb@MRP@OPUS )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Patrick\_E.\_Briggs ( Patrick\_E.\_Briggs@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Paul\_D.\_Glastris ( Paul\_D.\_Glastris@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )



READ:NOT READ

TO: Philip\_J.\_Crowley ( Philip\_J.\_Crowley@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: INTERNET (PMDF) DESTINATION ( Pub\_Arch@eop@INET )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Rajiv\_Y.\_Mody ( Rajiv\_Y.\_Mody@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Ralph\_Alswang ( Ralph\_Alswang@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Robin\_J.\_Bachman ( Robin\_J.\_Bachman@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Francisco J. Sanchez ( SANCHEZ\_F ) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee ( Francisco J.  
Sanchez@eop@lmgatwy@eopmrX (WHO)  
READ:NOT READ

TO: SUNTUM\_M ( SUNTUM\_M@A1@CD ) (WHO)  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sara\_M.\_Latham ( Sara\_M.\_Latham@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sarah\_S.\_Knight ( Sarah\_S.\_Knight@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sean\_P.\_Maloney ( Sean\_P.\_Maloney@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sean\_P.\_O'Shea ( Sean\_P.\_O'Shea@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sharon\_Farmer ( Sharon\_Farmer@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sheyda\_Jahanbani ( Sheyda\_Jahanbani@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Steven\_J.\_Naplan ( Steven\_J.\_Naplan@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Tanya\_E.\_Martin ( Tanya\_E.\_Martin@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Thomas\_D.\_Janenda ( Thomas\_D.\_Janenda@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX ) (VPO)  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Toby\_C.\_Graff ( Toby\_C.\_Graff@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Todd\_A.\_Bledsoe ( Todd\_A.\_Bledsoe@lngate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Wayne\_C.\_Johnson ( Wayne\_C.\_Johnson@lngate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: William\_C.\_Haymes ( William\_C.\_Haymes@lngate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: William\_Hadley ( William\_Hadley@lngate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: backup ( backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: INTERNET (PMDF) DESTINATION ( pcaplan@fbr.com@INET )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: rmusgrav ( rmusgrav@lngate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: wh-outbox-distr ( wh-outbox-distr@publ.pub.whitehouse.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:  
PRINTER FONT 10\_POINT\_COURIER  
BOTTOM ODD

-MORE-

PRINTER FONT 12\_POINT\_COURIER  
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release August 13, 1999

PRESS BRIEFING  
BY  
BARRY TOIV AND DAVID LEAVY

The Briefing Room

12:30 P.M. EDT

MR. TOIV: Good afternoon, everybody. Happy Friday.

Q I don't think everybody's here, Barry.

MR. TOIV: Come on in. We can wait.

Q This is not a comment on your --

MR. TOIV: Well, I'm happy today. I expect all the tough questions to go to David.

Just as I mentioned earlier today, we're going to have a briefing at 2:30 p.m. on the radio address. The subject has to do with clean water, and we'll have Carol Browner here again, making an encore appearance, as well as

Elgie Holstein, who is the Associate Director for Natural Resources at OMB. This will take place at 2:30 p.m., but it will be on camera. It will be embargoed until 10:06 a.m. tomorrow, as usual.

Any questions?

MR. LEAVY: All right, thank you very much. Appreciate your coming in.

MR. TOIV: Well, thank you.

Q Well, a couple of them. One about the Pentagon, new policy for "don't ask, don't tell." Any comments on that?

BOTTOM EVEN

-MORE-

MR. TOIV: Well, as you know, Secretary Cohen has been committed to implementing the "don't ask, don't tell" policy fairly. And the President agrees with him on that. The Pentagon, a little over a year ago, issued a report that said that "don't ask, don't tell" was working, but that there were a couple of areas where improvements needed to be made. I think today, the guidelines that they are issuing today are intended to address those issues. I would suggest you check over there for details of what they are announcing today.

Q I understand that China has not conveyed any explicit threats to the United States in regards to Taiwan. But can you characterize what has changed? Has there been any ratcheting up of the rhetoric of the implied threats, of the indications that you're getting that they may be more bellicose towards Taiwan?

MR. LEAVY: Let me just say, Bill, a couple of things generally. One, the peace and stability in East Asia and the Pacific is a fundamental national interest to the United States. We are certainly watching developments closely, have been in contact with both sides about our concerns and about reiterating our policy of resuming peaceful dialogue.

Just specifically on your question, it is my understanding that the intelligence community has not seen any extraordinary developments or signs that the PRC is mobilizing for military action in the Taiwan Strait.

Q Would you say that there has been a ratcheting up of the rhetoric in diplomatic channels? Are they trying to send signals?

MR. LEAVY: Well, I don't want to characterize, Kevin, other people's rhetoric, other people's statements. I think there has obviously been some increased tension in the Strait over the last several weeks. That comes as no surprise to any of us or anybody in this room. We've talked about that. But I think what we have to do is look forward, and we have communicated to both sides that there is a danger of escalating tensions, that we have to resume a dialog based on a One China formula. And we're going to continue to do that.

Q Specifically, there was one report that the embassy here had been saying that they are going to take action.

MR. LEAVY: I would steer you away from that report. As I said earlier today, we have not received any threats or ultimatums from the PRC. I checked about that again this

afternoon, earlier this afternoon, and that was confirmed. So, I would steer you away from that report.

I would just say, though, generally, that there is nothing new in China's long

-standing position. They have made clear that from their point of view Taiwan is an internal matter, and they hope that there is peaceful reunification, but they don't rule out military means. We have a long

-standing disagreement on that. So I don't think any -- the context is not new.

Q Does the United States still have a commitment to go to the defense of Taiwan, should there be an unprovoked attack from the mainland?

MR. LEAVY: Our long

-standing position -- this goes back many years, both Republican and Democratic administrations -- is that any effort to resolve the issue of Taiwan by other than peaceful means would be considered of grave concern to the United States. That position hasn't changed today.

Q How would you view a Chinese seizure of a small Taiwan

-controlled island, or some smaller military action?

MR. LEAVY: See, that's the kind of hypothetical question that I want to avoid getting into. Again, the Taiwan Relations Act has been in place for many years. It has guided our relationship on this issue, our policy on this issue. And I don't want to change, or speculate on hypotheticals today.

Q David, is there concern that the U.S. might get drawn into something because of this rhetoric?

MR. LEAVY: Oh, I think there's concern that the interests of both sides won't be advanced. The One China policy that the President has advocated -- and that has been the foundation of our approach to this issue for many, many years -- has been successful for all sides. Both China and Taiwan have benefited economically. Taiwan's the sixth

-largest economy in the world. Chinese economic growth has grown vastly over the last 20 years.

So the formula is a successful one. We don't see the need to change that, and we have no intention of changing that.

Q Let me follow, too. You said no one had contacted the United States with a threat. Has anyone from either side, Taiwan or China, contacted the United States with a concern over the rhetoric, a concern over the threat?

MR. LEAVY: Well, we've had a number of discussions, both at the State Department and with officials in China. As you remember, the State Department sent Assistant Secretary Stanley Roth and Ken Lieberthal from the National Security Council, several weeks ago, to Beijing to discuss our concern about the rising rhetoric, and a need to get back to a dialogue and to get

back to the two parties talking about the issues. And so we have been engaged on this issue. And certainly, there is a concern that this kind of thing leads to accidents, leads to misunderstandings, and that we want to focus both parties on getting back to the table.

Q You said -- you made a point of saying that there were no extraordinary signs coming into the intelligence community of

--

MR. LEAVY: Extraordinary developments or signs.

Q Right. Does that mean that there is something less than extraordinary -- or you're telling us what hasn't happened. Can you tell us what has happened?

MR. LEAVY: Well, I want to stay away from commenting on intelligence capabilities and what we do and don't know. I think that's a line we haven't crossed, and appropriately so. But, as I said earlier, it's our judgment, the United States government's judgment, that there aren't any extraordinary developments or signs that there is a mobilization on the PRC's part.

Q David, can you clarify just the conversations between the administration and the Taiwan and Chinese government? Have those conversations been stepped up in recent days? And at what level, if you can clarify, have these conversations been going?

MR. LEAVY: I don't think there has been a stepping up over recent days. Since this issue came to the forefront several weeks ago, we've had a number of discussions with the PRC and with people on Taiwan. There is nothing new in the last several days that I'm aware of.

Our general approach hasn't changed, though, and let me just repeat it again. The United States has a One

-China policy. Our approach is based on dialogue between the two sides and a peaceful resolution of any differences. We've communicated that and we will continue to do so.

Q Let's put the intelligence community issue aside for a minute. If you look in the newspaper this morning, there are several people quoted on the record saying Chinese government representatives came to speak with them and made bellicose statements that there was some sort of imminent military action likely against Taiwan. Is that troubling -- those facts, which are known facts, are they troubling to the administration?

MR. LEAVY: Well, again, I don't think there is anything new in what we are hearing. China has a longstanding position that any -- that Taiwan is an internal matter, that they want to see it resolved peacefully, but they don't rule out the use of force. We have a disagreement with that. We don't think that's the way to go. We think there has to be a peaceful resolution to this issue. It has to come through dialogue. And so there is nothing new in that articulation of those themes. I don't think anyone from the United States government was quoted in those stories, and as I said earlier, no one from the administration has been approached about any particular threat or ultimatum.

Q But the analysts -- just to follow up -- these analysts who were quoted, who are respected China analysts, say that they

did feel that there was something imminent, or that there was something new. The U.S. government just doesn't agree with that?

MR. LEAVY: No, I can't speak to that. As I said, we haven't been approached with any specific threat or any specific warning. And just the general notion that this is a new policy I would just push back on, because this is something that President Jiang and other Chinese leaders have articulated for some time. So the Chinese have not ruled out the use of military force. We disagree with them. We've made that clear. Our policy is peaceful dialogue.

Q The question goes, though, David to whether this is imminent or not. We know that that is their policy, but there seem to be signals that something may happen sooner rather than later.

MR. LEAVY: Well, I don't have any indication of that. And as I said earlier, it's our intelligence community's best judgment that there aren't any signs that there is PRC military activity underway.

Q What kind of activities, if any, is the President himself engaged in relative to this topic?

MR. LEAVY: Well, he hasn't been engaged over the last 24 hours. As you know, we will be seeing President Jiang at APEC in Auckland, New Zealand, the first week of September. That's going to be an important time for the two leaders to engage on this issue and a number of issues, including trade, human rights, non

-proliferation, I believe that will be on the margins of the APEC Summit. So I think that will be the next opportunity for the President to sit down with President Jiang and go over the wide range of bilateral issues.

Q But he hasn't been consulting in recent days with his own advisors and what to do about this?

MR. LEAVY: Well Mr. Berger has kept him up to date. I believe he briefed him this morning, or he will early this afternoon. But he hasn't been engaged personally.

Q David, as far as the policy, how do you respond to Republican allegations that when it comes time to pressuring China and Taiwan on this issue, the Clinton administration has only been putting pressure on Taiwan to ratchet down tensions?

MR. LEAVY: I would reject that. The United States takes actions based on our own interests. We have had a formula that has managed this issue for some time that's been both Republican and Democratic administrations. As I said earlier, it has benefited all the parties -- Taiwan, the PRC, the United States. We're going to continue to do that. I think it's not for us to pressure anybody, but to make clear that both sides -- their agendas can be advanced, their prosperity, their security can be advanced by peaceful dialogue.

Q Last night the President told the Jewish leaders that he agreed that we should do more to start monitoring, if not infiltrating, some hate groups. Do you -- is there anything today? Any directive? Any review of how that would be done? Any stepping up?

MR. TOIV: I don't have any additional information for you on that, no. The Justice Department seeks to do an effective job of dealing with hate crimes, certainly, and they also monitor hate groups. But I don't have any information on additional work that's being done.

Q But Clinton said he would look into it personally, and said that he would do more.

MR. TOIV: And if he said that, he will.

Q Barry, it was a year ago that the President was preparing for his grand jury testimony. Any reflections about the atmosphere then, and how things have changed since then around here, and at the White House?

MR. TOIV: Nope.

Q Barry, I want to go back real quick to David about Ethiopia and Eritrea. What is the new development on the White House side in that conflict?

MR. TOIV: Okay. As you know, the United States has actively worked for a peaceful resolution of the dispute between Ethiopia and Eritrea over the past year, and continues to work in cooperation with the OAU to bring about a peaceful resolution to the conflict.

As you know, Tony Lake was appointed as the President's special envoy to this conflict over a year ago. He has traveled there, I think, close to six times. There has been encouraging movement on the peace process over the last few weeks. At the Organization of African Unity's summit in Algiers in early July, the OAU proposed -- excuse me, the modalities for implementation of the OAU's framework agreement, both Ethiopia and Eritrea have now accepted the framework agreement, and the modalities for its implementation. We will continue to engage to move this process forward.

Q A follow

-up. Jesse Jackson has been very pivotal in breaking tensions with other factional peoples on that continent. Is the White House thinking at all of bringing Reverend Jackson into this situation, or is he involved at all?

MR. LEAVY: I don't think so. As you know, Reverend Jackson did extraordinary work to bring about a resolution of the conflict in Sierra Leone. He deserves great credit for that. He saved a lot of lives and prevented a lot more violence. I think Tony Lake has the portfolio on Ethiopia and Eritrea. He as well has spent a considerable amount of his own time traveling there, I think, close to half a dozen times.

So I think between Tony Lake, our team at the State Department, Susan Rice and our team here, led by Gail Smith, have been quite engaged and quite successful. So I don't see any need for Reverend Jackson to come in.

All right. Have a great weekend, everybody.

Q Barry?

Q Hold on.

MR. LEAVY: Oh, Barry, I'm sorry.

Q Week ahead?

Q Barry, I've got one question for you before you go away. Black Navy veterans have asked the President to dismiss mutiny charges against black sailors who refused to load ammo on the ships after the 1944 Port Chicago disaster in California. Does the request have merit and, if so, what is the President doing about it?

MR. TOIV: Well, until recently, there had not been a request for pardons for any of these individuals. Now, a few months ago, a request -- such a request was made. It's being considered under the usual process at the Justice Department, and obviously the President will give careful consideration to that.

Q Is the President well aware of the situation?

MR. TOIV: I believe he is.

Q Any time frame?

MR. TOIV: I don't have a time frame for you, no.

Q Barry, back on the gays in the military; as a candidate, the President said that he would end discrimination against gays in the military, "don't ask, don't tell" falls far short of that. Has the President given up hope that during his term in office he'll end discrimination against gays?

MR. TOIV: Well the President believes that the "don't ask, don't tell" policy has worked effectively. And I expect that that will be the policy throughout his administration.

Q But you concede it doesn't end discrimination -- that if you admit you're a homosexual in the military, you get thrown out?

MR. TOIV: Well, I will concede that it is a policy that has worked, and is the best policy that can be workable at this time.

Q Yes, but if it's worked, why are they changing it?

MR. TOIV: Well, no, it has worked. As I said before -- I'm not sure if you heard what I had to say about it before, but there have been a couple of areas that improvements were needed. And in fact, that's the work that's been going on that has led to the guidelines that are being issued today. And so -- I said it worked. I didn't say it was working perfectly.

Q Barry, the Arkansas Democrat

-Gazette reported this morning that during a fundraiser on Saturday, several members of the Secret Service lined up to obstruct camera view of the President as he greeted Mrs. Arkansas in the ropeline, and that they later apologized for doing that. Do you know if that happened, or if it's common for the Secret Service to be used in that way, to interfere with press coverage of the President?

MR. TOIV: The answer to the second question, which is the fairer question of the two questions to be asking me up here, is I don't believe so.

Q Well, what's the answer to the first one?

MR. TOIV: The answer to the first question, of course, as you know, I've no idea, since that's the first time I'm hearing of that.



Week ahead?

Q Yes.

MR. TOIV: Let's see. I have to do this one by heart.

Monday, the President is traveling to Kansas City, where he will address the annual convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. And he will speak about foreign policy issues there, and I think I'll need to leave it at that for now.

MR. LEAVY: I can do a little bit more, but that's fine. I mean, if folks want, I can talk afterward.

MR. TOIV: Yes, David will fill you in a little bit more. I think he's going to focus to some degree on our obligations overseas. And that's the only event planned for that trip. He'll be back late afternoon, I believe, or maybe early evening at the latest.

On Tuesday, the President will announce some new PSAs relating to school violence. With kids starting to come back to school, obviously, this is a subject that is on a lot of people's minds, particularly with the incidents that occurred during the last school year. And there are going to be some new PSAs that are unveiled at that time.

Also on Tuesday, we have the visit from the NCAA champion Tennessee Vols, the football champions. They'll be here on Tuesday.

Wednesday, the President is down. And then Thursday, he heads to Martha's Vineyard for a well

-deserved vacation.

Any questions?

Q Is he going to say anything on the way out today?

MR. TOIV: Is he going to say -- no.

Okay, thank you. Have a good weekend, everybody.

END 12:50 P.M. EDT

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

CREATOR: Ellen E. Olcott ( OLCOTT\_E ) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-AUG-1999 19:08:24.57

SUBJECT: 1999-8/13 toiv, leavy briefing

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

TEXT:  
PRINTER FONT 10\_POINT\_COURIER  
BOTTOM ODD

-MORE-

PRINTER FONT 12\_POINT\_COURIER  
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release August 13, 1999

PRESS BRIEFING  
BY  
BARRY TOIV AND DAVID LEAVY

The Briefing Room

12:30 P.M. EDT

MR. TOIV: Good afternoon, everybody. Happy Friday.

Q I don't think everybody's here, Barry.

MR. TOIV: Come on in. We can wait.

Q This is not a comment on your --

MR. TOIV: Well, I'm happy today. I expect all the tough questions to go to David.

Just as I mentioned earlier today, we're going to have a briefing at 2:30 p.m. on the radio address. The subject has to do with clean water, and we'll have Carol Browner here again, making an encore appearance, as well as Elgie Holstein, who is the Associate Director for Natural Resources at OMB. This will take place at 2:30 p.m., but it will be on camera. It will be embargoed until 10:06 a.m. tomorrow, as usual.

Any questions?

MR. LEAVY: All right, thank you very much. Appreciate your coming in.

MR. TOIV: Well, thank you.

Q Well, a couple of them. One about the Pentagon, new policy for "don't ask, don't tell." Any comments on that?

BOTTOM EVEN

-MORE-

MR. TOIV: Well, as you know, Secretary Cohen has been committed to implementing the "don't ask, don't tell" policy fairly. And the President agrees with him on that. The Pentagon, a little over a year ago, issued a report that said that "don't ask, don't tell" was working, but that there were a couple of areas where improvements needed to be made. I think today, the guidelines that they are issuing today are intended to address those issues. I would suggest you check over there for details of what they are announcing today.

Q I understand that China has not conveyed any explicit threats to the United States in regards to Taiwan. But can you characterize what has changed? Has there been any ratcheting up of the rhetoric of the implied threats, of the indications that you're getting that they may be more bellicose towards Taiwan?

MR. LEAVY: Let me just say, Bill, a couple of things generally. One, the peace and stability in East Asia and the Pacific is a fundamental national interest to the United States. We are certainly watching developments closely, have been in contact with both sides about our concerns and about reiterating our policy of resuming peaceful dialogue.

Just specifically on your question, it is my understanding that the intelligence community has not seen any extraordinary developments or signs that the PRC is mobilizing for military action in the Taiwan Strait.

Q Would you say that there has been a ratcheting up of the rhetoric in diplomatic channels? Are they trying to send signals?

MR. LEAVY: Well, I don't want to characterize, Kevin, other people's rhetoric, other people's statements. I think there has obviously been some increased tension in the Strait over the last several weeks. That comes as no surprise to any of us or anybody in this room. We've talked about that. But I think what we have to do is look forward, and we have communicated to both sides that there is a danger of escalating tensions, that we have to resume a dialog based on a One China formula. And we're going to continue to do that.

Q Specifically, there was one report that the embassy here had been saying that they are going to take action.

MR. LEAVY: I would steer you away from that report. As I said earlier today, we have not received any threats or ultimatums from the PRC. I checked about that again this afternoon, earlier this afternoon, and that was confirmed. So, I would steer you away from that report.

I would just say, though, generally, that there is nothing new in China's long

-standing position. They have made clear that from their point of view Taiwan is an internal matter, and they hope that there is peaceful reunification, but they don't rule out military means. We have a long

-standing disagreement on that. So I don't think any -- the context is not new.

Q Does the United States still have a commitment to go to the defense of Taiwan, should there be an unprovoked attack from the mainland?

MR. LEAVY: Our long

-standing position -- this goes back many years, both Republican and Democratic administrations -- is that any effort to resolve the issue of Taiwan by other than peaceful means would be considered of grave concern to the United States. That position hasn't changed today.

Q How would you view a Chinese seizure of a small Taiwan

-controlled island, or some smaller military action?

MR. LEAVY: See, that's the kind of hypothetical question that I want to avoid getting into. Again, the Taiwan Relations Act has been in place for many years. It has guided our relationship on this issue, our policy on this issue. And I don't want to change, or speculate on hypotheticals today.

Q David, is there concern that the U.S. might get drawn into something because of this rhetoric?

MR. LEAVY: Oh, I think there's concern that the interests of both sides won't be advanced. The One China policy that the President has advocated -- and that has been the foundation of our approach to this issue for many, many years -- has been successful for all sides. Both China and Taiwan have benefited economically. Taiwan's the sixth

-largest economy in the world.

Chinese economic growth has grown vastly over the last 20 years.

So the formula is a successful one. We don't see the need to change that, and we have no intention of changing that.

Q Let me follow, too. You said no one had contacted the United States with a threat. Has anyone from either side, Taiwan or China, contacted the United States with a concern over the rhetoric, a concern over the threat?

MR. LEAVY: Well, we've had a number of discussions, both at the State Department and with officials in China. As you remember, the State Department sent Assistant Secretary Stanley Roth and Ken Lieberthal from the National Security Council, several weeks ago, to Beijing to discuss our concern about the rising rhetoric, and a need to get back to a dialogue and to get back to the two parties talking about the issues. And so we have been engaged on this issue. And certainly, there is a concern that this kind of thing leads to accidents, leads to misunderstandings, and that we want to focus both parties on getting back to the table.

Q You said -- you made a point of saying that there were no extraordinary signs coming into the intelligence community of --

MR. LEAVY: Extraordinary developments or signs.

Q Right. Does that mean that there is something less than extraordinary -- or you're telling us what hasn't happened. Can you tell us what has happened?

MR. LEAVY: Well, I want to stay away from commenting on intelligence capabilities and what we do and don't know. I think that's a line we haven't crossed, and appropriately so. But, as I said earlier, it's our judgment, the United States government's judgment, that there aren't any extraordinary developments or signs that there is a mobilization on the PRC's part.

Q David, can you clarify just the conversations between the administration and the Taiwan and Chinese government? Have those conversations been stepped up in recent days? And at what level, if you can clarify, have these conversations been going?

MR. LEAVY: I don't think there has been a stepping up over recent days. Since this issue came to the forefront several weeks ago, we've had a number of discussions with the PRC and with people on Taiwan. There is nothing new in the last several days that I'm aware of.

Our general approach hasn't changed, though, and let me just repeat it again. The United States has a One

-China policy. Our approach is based on dialogue between the two sides and a peaceful resolution of any differences. We've communicated that and we will continue to do so.

Q Let's put the intelligence community issue aside for a minute. If you look in the newspaper this morning, there are several people quoted on the record saying Chinese government representatives came to speak with them and made bellicose statements that there was some sort of imminent military action likely against Taiwan. Is that troubling -- those facts, which are known facts, are they troubling to the administration?

MR. LEAVY: Well, again, I don't think there is anything new in what we are hearing. China has a longstanding position that any -- that Taiwan is an internal matter, that they want to see it resolved peacefully, but they don't rule out the use of force. We have a disagreement with that. We don't think that's the way to go. We think there has to be a peaceful resolution to this issue. It has to come through dialogue. And so there is nothing new in that articulation of those themes. I don't think anyone from the United States government was quoted in those stories, and as I said earlier, no one from the administration has been approached about any particular threat or ultimatum.

Q But the analysts -- just to follow up -- these analysts who were quoted, who are respected China analysts, say that they did feel that there was something imminent, or that there was something new. The U.S. government just doesn't agree with that?

MR. LEAVY: No, I can't speak to that. As I said, we haven't been approached with any specific threat or any specific warning. And just the general notion that this is a new policy I would just push back on, because this is something that President Jiang and other Chinese leaders have articulated for some time. So the Chinese have not ruled out the use of military force. We disagree with them. We've made that clear. Our policy is peaceful dialogue.

Q The question goes, though, David to whether this is imminent or not. We know that that is their policy, but there

seem to be signals that something may happen sooner rather than later.

MR. LEAVY: Well, I don't have any indication of that. And as I said earlier, it's our intelligence community's best judgment that there aren't any signs that there is PRC military activity underway.

Q What kind of activities, if any, is the President himself engaged in relative to this topic?

MR. LEAVY: Well, he hasn't been engaged over the last 24 hours. As you know, we will be seeing President Jiang at APEC in Auckland, New Zealand, the first week of September. That's going to be an important time for the two leaders to engage on this issue and a number of issues, including trade, human rights, non

-proliferation, I believe that will be on the margins of the APEC Summit. So I think that will be the next opportunity for the President to sit down with President Jiang and go over the wide range of bilateral issues.

Q But he hasn't been consulting in recent days with his own advisors and what to do about this?

MR. LEAVY: Well Mr. Berger has kept him up to date. I believe he briefed him this morning, or he will early this afternoon. But he hasn't been engaged personally.

Q David, as far as the policy, how do you respond to Republican allegations that when it comes time to pressuring China and Taiwan on this issue, the Clinton administration has only been putting pressure on Taiwan to ratchet down tensions?

MR. LEAVY: I would reject that. The United States takes actions based on our own interests. We have had a formula that has managed this issue for some time that's been both Republican and Democratic administrations. As I said earlier, it has benefited all the parties -- Taiwan, the PRC, the United States. We're going to continue to do that. I think it's not for us to pressure anybody, but to make clear that both sides -- their agendas can be advanced, their prosperity, their security can be advanced by peaceful dialogue.

Q Last night the President told the Jewish leaders that he agreed that we should do more to start monitoring, if not infiltrating, some hate groups. Do you -- is there anything today? Any directive? Any review of how that would be done? Any stepping up?

MR. TOIV: I don't have any additional information for you on that, no. The Justice Department seeks to do an effective job of dealing with hate crimes, certainly, and they also monitor hate groups. But I don't have any information on additional work that's being done.

Q But Clinton said he would look into it personally, and said that he would do more.

MR. TOIV: And if he said that, he will.

Q Barry, it was a year ago that the President was preparing for his grand jury testimony. Any reflections about the atmosphere then, and how things have changed since then around here, and at the White House?

MR. TOIV: Nope.

Q Barry, I want to go back real quick to David about Ethiopia and Eritrea. What is the new development on the White House side in that conflict?

MR. TOIV: Okay. As you know, the United States has actively worked for a peaceful resolution of the dispute between Ethiopia and Eritrea over the past year, and continues to work in cooperation with the OAU to bring about a peaceful resolution to the conflict.

As you know, Tony Lake was appointed as the President's special envoy to this conflict over a year ago. He has traveled there, I think, close to six times. There has been encouraging movement on the peace process over the last few weeks. At the Organization of African Unity's summit in Algiers in early July, the OAU proposed -- excuse me, the modalities for implementation of the OAU's framework agreement, both Ethiopia and Eritrea have now accepted the framework agreement, and the modalities for its implementation. We will continue to engage to move this process forward.

Q A follow

-up. Jesse Jackson has been very pivotal in breaking tensions with other factional peoples on that continent. Is the White House thinking at all of bringing Reverend Jackson into this situation, or is he involved at all?

MR. LEAVY: I don't think so. As you know, Reverend Jackson did extraordinary work to bring about a resolution of the conflict in Sierra Leone. He deserves great credit for that. He saved a lot of lives and prevented a lot more violence. I think Tony Lake has the portfolio on Ethiopia and Eritrea. He as well has spent a considerable amount of his own time traveling there, I think, close to half a dozen times.

So I think between Tony Lake, our team at the State Department, Susan Rice and our team here, led by Gail Smith, have been quite engaged and quite successful. So I don't see any need for Reverend Jackson to come in.

All right. Have a great weekend, everybody.

Q Barry?

Q Hold on.

MR. LEAVY: Oh, Barry, I'm sorry.

Q Week ahead?

Q Barry, I've got one question for you before you go away. Black Navy veterans have asked the President to dismiss mutiny charges against black sailors who refused to load ammo on the ships after the 1944 Port Chicago disaster in California. Does the request have merit and, if so, what is the President doing about it?

MR. TOIV: Well, until recently, there had not been a request for pardons for any of these individuals. Now, a few months ago, a request -- such a request was made. It's being

considered under the usual process at the Justice Department, and obviously the President will give careful consideration to that.

Q Is the President well aware of the situation?

MR. TOIV: I believe he is.

Q Any time frame?

MR. TOIV: I don't have a time frame for you, no.

Q Barry, back on the gays in the military; as a candidate, the President said that he would end discrimination against gays in the military, "don't ask, don't tell" falls far short of that. Has the President given up hope that during his term in office he'll end discrimination against gays?

MR. TOIV: Well the President believes that the "don't ask, don't tell" policy has worked effectively. And I expect that that will be the policy throughout his administration.

Q But you concede it doesn't end discrimination -- that if you admit you're a homosexual in the military, you get thrown out?

MR. TOIV: Well, I will concede that it is a policy that has worked, and is the best policy that can be workable at this time.

Q Yes, but if it's worked, why are they changing it?

MR. TOIV: Well, no, it has worked. As I said before -- I'm not sure if you heard what I had to say about it before, but there have been a couple of areas that improvements were needed. And in fact, that's the work that's been going on that has led to the guidelines that are being issued today. And so -- I said it worked. I didn't say it was working perfectly.

Q Barry, the Arkansas Democrat

-Gazette reported this morning that during a fundraiser on Saturday, several members of the Secret Service lined up to obstruct camera view of the President as he greeted Mrs. Arkansas in the ropeline, and that they later apologized for doing that. Do you know if that happened, or if it's common for the Secret Service to be used in that way, to interfere with press coverage of the President?

MR. TOIV: The answer to the second question, which is the fairer question of the two questions to be asking me up here, is I don't believe so.

Q Well, what's the answer to the first one?

MR. TOIV: The answer to the first question, of course, as you know, I've no idea, since that's the first time I'm hearing of that.

Week ahead?

Q Yes.

MR. TOIV: Let's see. I have to do this one by heart.

Monday, the President is traveling to Kansas City, where he will address the annual convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. And he will speak about foreign policy issues there, and I think I'll need to leave it at that for now.

MR. LEAVY: I can do a little bit more, but that's fine. I mean, if folks want, I can talk afterward.

MR. TOIV: Yes, David will fill you in a little bit more. I think he's going to focus to some degree on our obligations overseas. And that's the only event planned for that trip. He'll



be back late afternoon, I believe, or maybe early evening at the latest.

On Tuesday, the President will announce some new PSAs relating to school violence. With kids starting to come back to school, obviously, this is a subject that is on a lot of people's minds, particularly with the incidents that occurred during the last school year. And there are going to be some new PSAs that are unveiled at that time.

Also on Tuesday, we have the visit from the NCAA champion Tennessee Vols, the football champions. They'll be here on Tuesday.

Wednesday, the President is down. And then Thursday, he heads to Martha's Vineyard for a well

-deserved vacation.

Any questions?

Q Is he going to say anything on the way out today?

MR. TOIV: Is he going to say -- no.

Okay, thank you. Have a good weekend, everybody.

END 12:50 P.M. EDT

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: OLCOTT\_E@a1.eop.gov ( OLCOTT\_E@a1.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] ) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-AUG-1999 13:48:25.00

SUBJECT: 1999-8/13 toiv, leavy briefing

TO: Reuben L. Musgrave Jr ( CN=Reuben L. Musgrave Jr/OU=OSTP/O=EOP [ OSTP ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: pcaplan@fbr.com ( pcaplan@fbr.com [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William Hadley ( CN=William Hadley/OU=OA/O=EOP [ OA ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William C. Haymes ( CN=William C. Haymes/OU=OA/O=EOP [ OA ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Wayne C. Johnson ( CN=Wayne C. Johnson/OU=OA/O=EOP [ OA ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Toby C. Graff ( CN=Toby C. Graff/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Tanya E. Martin ( CN=Tanya E. Martin/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Sheyda Jahanbani ( CN=Sheyda Jahanbani/OU=NSC/O=EOP [ NSC ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sharon Farmer ( CN=Sharon Farmer/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Sarah S. Knight ( CN=Sarah S. Knight/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Francisco J. Sanchez ( CN=Francisco J. Sanchez/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ralph Alswang ( CN=Ralph Alswang/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rajiv Y. Mody ( CN=Rajiv Y. Mody/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Pub\_Arch@eop.eop.gov ( Pub\_Arch@eop.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul D. Glastris ( CN=Paul D. Glastris/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patrick E. Briggs ( CN=Patrick E. Briggs/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles J. Payson ( CN=Charles J. Payson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: PALMIERI\_J@a1.eop.gov ( PALMIERI\_J@a1.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] ) (WHO)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Noa A. Meyer ( CN=Noa A. Meyer/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Neera\_Tanden@lmgate2.eop.gov ( Neera\_Tanden@lmgate2.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mindy E. Myers ( CN=Mindy E. Myers/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael V. Terrell ( CN=Michael V. Terrell/OU=CEQ/O=EOP [ CEQ ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Marty J. Hoffmann ( CN=Marty J. Hoffmann/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Martha Foley ( CN=Martha Foley/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marsha E. Berry ( CN=Marsha E. Berry/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark J. Bernstein ( CN=Mark J. Bernstein/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark H. Bartholomew ( CN=Mark H. Bartholomew/OU=OA/O=EOP [ OA ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Margaret M. Suntum ( CN=Margaret M. Suntum/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MOFFETT\_J@a1.eop.gov ( MOFFETT\_J@a1.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] ) (WHO)  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leslie Bernstein ( CN=Leslie Bernstein/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Kris M Balderston ( CN=Kris M Balderston/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kathleen K. Ahn ( CN=Kathleen K. Ahn/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Katharine Button ( CN=Katharine Button/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen L. Barbuschak ( CN=Karen L. Barbuschak/OU=OA/O=EOP [ OA ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Justin L. Coleman ( CN=Justin L. Coleman/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Joshua S. Gottheimer ( CN=Joshua S. Gottheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Jonathan M. Prince ( CN=Jonathan M. Prince/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Jeannetta P. Allen ( CN=Jeannetta P. Allen/OU=OA/O=EOP [ OA ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Jackson T. Dunn ( CN=Jackson T. Dunn/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Irma L. Martinez ( CN=Irma L. Martinez/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: George G. Caudill ( CN=George G. Caudill/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: GRAY\_W@a1.eop.gov ( GRAY\_W@a1.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] ) (NSC)  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Erica S. Lepping ( CN=Erica S. Lepping/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elliot J. Diringer ( CN=Elliot J. Diringer/OU=CEQ/O=EOP [ CEQ ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Douglas\_R\_Matties@lmgate2.eop.gov ( Douglas\_R\_Matties@lmgate2.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Dorian V. Weaver ( CN=Dorian V. Weaver/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dominique L. Cano ( CN=Dominique L. Cano/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Denver R. Peacock ( CN=Denver R. Peacock/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Debra D. Bird ( CN=Debra D. Bird/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Deborah Akel ( CN=Deborah Akel/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: David Vandivier ( CN=David Vandivier/OU=OMB/O=EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David T. Johnson ( CN=David T. Johnson/OU=NSC/O=EOP [ NSC ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David R. Goodfriend ( CN=David R. Goodfriend/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David E. Kalbaugh ( CN=David E. Kalbaugh/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dario J. Gomez ( CN=Dario J. Gomez/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel W. Burkhardt ( CN=Daniel W. Burkhardt/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: DICKEY\_L@a1.eop.gov ( DICKEY\_L@a1.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] ) (WHO)  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Catherine T. Kitchen ( CN=Catherine T. Kitchen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carmen B. Fowler ( CN=Carmen B. Fowler/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Brian A. Barreto ( CN=Brian A. Barreto/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Bradley M. Campbell ( CN=Bradley M. Campbell/OU=CEQ/O=EOP [ CEQ ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Barbara D. Woolley ( CN=Barbara D. Woolley/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michele Ballantyne ( CN=Michele Ballantyne/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Antony J. Blinken ( CN=Antony J. Blinken/OU=NSC/O=EOP [ NSC ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Anne E. McGuire ( CN=Anne E. McGuire/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Ann C. Hertelendy ( CN=Ann C. Hertelendy/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrew J. Mayock ( CN=Andrew J. Mayock/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: wh-outbox-distr@publ.pub.whitehouse.gov ( wh-outbox-distr@publ.pub.whitehouse.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: SUNTUM\_M@a1.eop.gov ( SUNTUM\_M@a1.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] ) (WHO)  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Philip\_J.\_Crowley@lmgate2.eop.gov ( Philip\_J.\_Crowley@lmgate2.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ( "/R=OPUS/R=MRP/PR-L=AVUOEOP/PR-U=TDIXON/FFN=Timothy Dixon/"@mr.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: OLCOTT\_E@a1.eop.gov ( OLCOTT\_E@a1.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] ) (WHO)  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Nathan B. Naylor"@lmgate4.eop.gov ( "Nathan B. Naylor"@lmgate4.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lori\_E.\_Abrams@lmgate2.eop.gov ( Lori\_E.\_Abrams@lmgate2.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: KTORPEY@AOL.COM ( KTORPEY@AOL.COM [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie\_B.\_Goldberg@lmgate2.eop.gov ( Julie\_B.\_Goldberg@lmgate2.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John\_See@ed.gov ( John\_See@ed.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Jim Kohlenberger"@lmgate4.eop.gov ( "Jim Kohlenberger"@lmgate4.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James\_M.\_Teague@lmgate2.eop.gov ( James\_M.\_Teague@lmgate2.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Gina N. Dennis ( "Gina N. Dennis/WHO/EOP"@EOP.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: FORDE\_R@a1.eop.gov ( FORDE\_R@a1.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] ) ()  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Eli G. Attie"@lmgate4.eop.gov ( "Eli G. Attie"@lmgate4.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN



TO: "Christopher S. Lehane"@lmgate4.eop.gov ( "Christopher S. Lehane"@lmgate4.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: CUTLER\_L@a1.eop.gov ( CUTLER\_L@a1.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] ) (WHO)  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Brian A. Reich"@lmgate4.eop.gov ( "Brian A. Reich"@lmgate4.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BARTHOLOW\_T@a1.eop.gov ( BARTHOLOW\_T@a1.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] ) (OA)  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Aprill\_N.\_Springfield ( "Aprill\_N.\_Springfield/who/eop/gov"@PMDf.EOP.GOV [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Alejandro G. Cabrera"@lmgate4.eop.gov ( "Alejandro G. Cabrera"@lmgate4.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:  
Note: Some recipients have been dropped due to syntax errors.Please refer to the "\$AdditionalHeaders" item for the complete headers.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release August 13, 1999

PRESS BRIEFING  
BY  
BARRY TOIV AND DAVID LEAVY

The Briefing Room

12:30 P.M. EDT

MR. TOIV: Good afternoon, everybody. Happy Friday.

Q I don't think everybody's here, Barry.

MR. TOIV: Come on in. We can wait.

Q This is not a comment on your --

MR. TOIV: Well, I'm happy today. I expect all the tough questions to go to David.

Just as I mentioned earlier today, we're going to have a briefing at

2:30 p.m. on the radio address. The subject has to do with clean water, and we'll have Carol Browner here again, making an encore appearance, as well as Elgie Holstein, who is the Associate Director for Natural Resources at OMB. This will take place at 2:30 p.m., but it will be on camera. It will be embargoed until 10:06 a.m. tomorrow, as usual.

Any questions?

MR. LEAVY: All right, thank you very much. Appreciate your coming in.

MR. TOIV: Well, thank you.

Q Well, a couple of them. One about the Pentagon, new policy for "don't ask, don't tell." Any comments on that?

MR. TOIV: Well, as you know, Secretary Cohen has been committed to implementing the "don't ask, don't tell" policy fairly. And the President agrees with him on that. The Pentagon, a little over a year ago, issued a report that said that "don't ask, don't tell" was working, but that there were a couple of areas where improvements needed to be made. I think today, the guidelines that they are issuing today are intended to address those issues. I would suggest you check over there for details of what they are announcing today.

Q I understand that China has not conveyed any explicit threats to the United States in regards to Taiwan. But can you characterize what has changed? Has there been any ratcheting up of the rhetoric of the implied threats, of the indications that you're getting that they may be more bellicose towards Taiwan?

MR. LEAVY: Let me just say, Bill, a couple of things generally. One, the peace and stability in East Asia and the Pacific is a fundamental national interest to the United States. We are certainly watching developments closely, have been in contact with both sides about our concerns and about reiterating our policy of resuming peaceful dialogue.

Just specifically on your question, it is my understanding that the intelligence community has not seen any extraordinary developments or signs that the PRC is mobilizing for military action in the Taiwan Strait.

Q Would you say that there has been a ratcheting up of the rhetoric in diplomatic channels? Are they trying to send signals?

MR. LEAVY: Well, I don't want to characterize, Kevin, other people's rhetoric, other people's statements. I think there has

obviously been some increased tension in the Strait over the last several weeks. That comes as no surprise to any of us or anybody in this room. We've talked about that. But I think what we have to do is look forward, and we have communicated to both sides that there is a danger of escalating tensions, that we have to resume a dialog based on a One China formula. And we're going to continue to do that.

Q Specifically, there was one report that the embassy here had been saying that they are going to take action.

MR. LEAVY: I would steer you away from that report. As I said earlier today, we have not received any threats or ultimatums from the PRC. I checked about that again this afternoon, earlier this afternoon, and that was confirmed. So, I would steer you away from that report.

I would just say, though, generally, that there is nothing new in China's long-standing position. They have made clear that from their point of view Taiwan is an internal matter, and they hope that there is peaceful reunification, but they don't rule out military means. We have a long-standing disagreement on that. So I don't think any -- the context is not new.

Q Does the United States still have a commitment to go to the defense of Taiwan, should there be an unprovoked attack from the mainland?

MR. LEAVY: Our long-standing position -- this goes back many years, both Republican and Democratic administrations -- is that any effort to resolve the issue of Taiwan by other than peaceful means would be considered of grave concern to the United States. That position hasn't changed today.

Q How would you view a Chinese seizure of a small Taiwan-controlled island, or some smaller military action?

MR. LEAVY: See, that's the kind of hypothetical question that I want to avoid getting into. Again, the Taiwan Relations Act has been in place for many years. It has guided our relationship on this issue, our policy on this issue. And I don't want to change, or speculate on hypotheticals today.

Q David, is there concern that the U.S. might get drawn into something because of this rhetoric?

MR. LEAVY: Oh, I think there's concern that the interests of both sides won't be advanced. The One China policy that the President has advocated -- and that has been the foundation of our approach to this issue for many, many years -- has been successful for all sides. Both China and Taiwan have benefited economically. Taiwan's the sixth-largest economy in the world. Chinese economic growth has grown vastly over the last 20 years.

So the formula is a successful one. We don't see the need to change that, and we have no intention of changing that.

Q Let me follow, too. You said no one had contacted the United States with a threat. Has anyone from either side, Taiwan or China, contacted the United States with a concern over the rhetoric, a concern over the threat?

MR. LEAVY: Well, we've had a number of discussions, both at the State Department and with officials in China. As you remember, the State Department sent Assistant Secretary Stanley Roth and Ken Lieberthal from the National Security Council, several weeks ago, to Beijing to discuss our concern about the rising rhetoric, and a need to get back to a dialogue and to get back to the two parties talking about the issues. And so we have been engaged on this issue. And certainly, there is a concern that this kind of thing leads to accidents, leads to misunderstandings, and that we want to focus both parties on getting back to the table.

Q You said -- you made a point of saying that there were no extraordinary signs coming into the intelligence community of --

MR. LEAVY: Extraordinary developments or signs.

Q Right. Does that mean that there is something less than extraordinary -- or you're telling us what hasn't happened. Can you tell us what has happened?

MR. LEAVY: Well, I want to stay away from commenting on intelligence capabilities and what we do and don't know. I think that's a line we haven't crossed, and appropriately so. But, as I said earlier, it's our judgment, the United States government's judgment, that there aren't any extraordinary developments or signs that there is a mobilization on the PRC's part.

Q David, can you clarify just the conversations between the administration and the Taiwan and Chinese government? Have those conversations been stepped up in recent days? And at what level, if you can clarify, have these conversations been going?

MR. LEAVY: I don't think there has been a stepping up over recent days. Since this issue came to the forefront several weeks ago, we've had a number of discussions with the PRC and with people on Taiwan. There is nothing new in the last several days that I'm aware of.

Our general approach hasn't changed, though, and let me just repeat it again. The United States has a One-China policy. Our approach is based on dialogue between the two sides and a peaceful resolution of any differences. We've communicated that and we will continue to do so.

Q Let's put the intelligence community issue aside for a minute. If you look in the newspaper this morning, there are several people quoted on the record saying Chinese government representatives came to speak with them and made bellicose statements that there was some sort of imminent military action likely against Taiwan. Is that troubling -- those facts, which are known facts, are they troubling to the administration?

MR. LEAVY: Well, again, I don't think there is anything new in what we are hearing. China has a longstanding position that any -- that Taiwan is an internal matter, that they want to see it resolved peacefully, but they don't rule out the use of force. We have a disagreement with that. We don't think that's the way to go. We think there has to be a peaceful resolution to this issue. It has to come through dialogue. And so there is nothing new in that articulation of those themes. I don't think anyone from the United States government was quoted in those stories, and as I said earlier, no one from the administration has been approached about any particular threat or ultimatum.

Q But the analysts -- just to follow up -- these analysts who were quoted, who are respected China analysts, say that they did feel that there was something imminent, or that there was something new. The U.S. government just doesn't agree with that?

MR. LEAVY: No, I can't speak to that. As I said, we haven't been approached with any specific threat or any specific warning. And just the general notion that this is a new policy I would just push back on, because this is something that President Jiang and other Chinese leaders have articulated for some time. So the Chinese have not ruled out the use of military force. We disagree with them. We've made that clear. Our policy is peaceful dialogue.

Q The question goes, though, David to whether this is imminent or not. We know that that is their policy, but there seem to be signals that something may happen sooner rather than later.

MR. LEAVY: Well, I don't have any indication of that. And as I said earlier, it's our intelligence community's best judgment that there aren't any signs that there is PRC military activity underway.

Q What kind of activities, if any, is the President himself engaged in relative to this topic?

MR. LEAVY: Well, he hasn't been engaged over the last 24 hours. As you know, we will be seeing President Jiang at APEC in Auckland, New Zealand, the first week of September. That's going to be an important time for the two leaders to engage on this issue and a number of issues, including trade, human rights, non-proliferation, I believe that will be on the margins of the APEC Summit. So I think that will be the next opportunity for

the President to sit down with President Jiang and go over the wide range of bilateral issues.

Q But he hasn't been consulting in recent days with his own advisors and what to do about this?

MR. LEAVY: Well Mr. Berger has kept him up to date. I believe he briefed him this morning, or he will early this afternoon. But he hasn't been engaged personally.

Q David, as far as the policy, how do you respond to Republican allegations that when it comes time to pressuring China and Taiwan on this issue, the Clinton administration has only been putting pressure on Taiwan to ratchet down tensions?

MR. LEAVY: I would reject that. The United States takes actions based on our own interests. We have had a formula that has managed this issue for some time that's been both Republican and Democratic administrations. As I said earlier, it has benefited all the parties -- Taiwan, the PRC, the United States. We're going to continue to do that. I think it's not for us to pressure anybody, but to make clear that both sides -- their agendas can be advanced, their prosperity, their security can be advanced by peaceful dialogue.

Q Last night the President told the Jewish leaders that he agreed that we should do more to start monitoring, if not infiltrating, some hate groups. Do you -- is there anything today? Any directive? Any review of how that would be done? Any stepping up?

MR. TOIV: I don't have any additional information for you on that, no. The Justice Department seeks to do an effective job of dealing with hate crimes, certainly, and they also monitor hate groups. But I don't have any information on additional work that's being done.

Q But Clinton said he would look into it personally, and said that he would do more.

MR. TOIV: And if he said that, he will.

Q Barry, it was a year ago that the President was preparing for his grand jury testimony. Any reflections about the atmosphere then, and how things have changed since then around here, and at the White House?

MR. TOIV: Nope.

Q Barry, I want to go back real quick to David about Ethiopia and Eritrea. What is the new development on the White House side in that conflict?

MR. TOIV: Okay. As you know, the United States has actively worked for a peaceful resolution of the dispute between Ethiopia and Eritrea over the past year, and continues to work in cooperation with the OAU to bring about a peaceful resolution to the conflict.

As you know, Tony Lake was appointed as the President's special envoy to this conflict over a year ago. He has traveled there, I think, close to six times. There has been encouraging movement on the peace process over the last few weeks. At the Organization of African Unity's summit in Algiers in early July, the OAU proposed -- excuse me, the modalities for implementation of the OAU's framework agreement, both Ethiopia and Eritrea have now accepted the framework agreement, and the modalities for its implementation. We will continue to engage to move this process forward.

Q A follow-up. Jesse Jackson has been very pivotal in breaking tensions with other factional peoples on that continent. Is the White House thinking at all of bringing Reverend Jackson into this situation, or is he involved at all?

MR. LEAVY: I don't think so. As you know, Reverend Jackson did extraordinary work to bring about a resolution of the conflict in Sierra Leone. He deserves great credit for that. He saved a lot of lives and prevented a lot more violence. I think Tony Lake has the portfolio on Ethiopia and Eritrea. He as well has spent a considerable amount of his own time traveling there, I think, close to half a dozen times.

So I think between Tony Lake, our team at the State Department, Susan Rice and our team here, led by Gail Smith, have been quite engaged and quite successful. So I don't see any need for Reverend Jackson to come in.

All right. Have a great weekend, everybody.

Q Barry?

Q Hold on.

MR. LEAVY: Oh, Barry, I'm sorry.

Q Week ahead?

Q Barry, I've got one question for you before you go away. Black Navy veterans have asked the President to dismiss mutiny charges against black sailors who refused to load ammo on the ships after the 1944 Port Chicago disaster in California. Does the request have merit and, if so, what is the President doing about it?

MR. TOIV: Well, until recently, there had not been a

request for pardons for any of these individuals. Now, a few months ago, a request -- such a request was made. It's being considered under the usual process at the Justice Department, and obviously the President will give careful consideration to that.

Q Is the President well aware of the situation?

MR. TOIV: I believe he is.

Q Any time frame?

MR. TOIV: I don't have a time frame for you, no.

Q Barry, back on the gays in the military; as a candidate, the President said that he would end discrimination against gays in the military, "don't ask, don't tell" falls far short of that. Has the President given up hope that during his term in office he'll end discrimination against gays?

MR. TOIV: Well the President believes that the "don't ask, don't tell" policy has worked effectively. And I expect that that will be the policy throughout his administration.

Q But you concede it doesn't end discrimination -- that if you admit you're a homosexual in the military, you get thrown out?

MR. TOIV: Well, I will concede that it is a policy that has worked, and is the best policy that can be workable at this time.

Q Yes, but if it's worked, why are they changing it?

MR. TOIV: Well, no, it has worked. As I said before -- I'm not sure if you heard what I had to say about it before, but there have been a couple of areas that improvements were needed. And in fact, that's the work that's been going on that has led to the guidelines that are being issued today. And so -- I said it worked. I didn't say it was working perfectly.

Q Barry, the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette reported this morning that during a fundraiser on Saturday, several members of the Secret Service lined up to obstruct camera view of the President as he greeted Mrs. Arkansas in the ropeline, and that they later apologized for doing that. Do you know if that happened, or if it's common for the Secret Service to be used in that way, to interfere with press coverage of the President?

MR. TOIV: The answer to the second question, which is the fairer question of the two questions to be asking me up here, is I don't believe so.

Q Well, what's the answer to the first one?

MR. TOIV: The answer to the first question, of course, as you know, I've no idea, since that's the first time I'm hearing



of that.

Week ahead?

Q Yes.

MR. TOIV: Let's see. I have to do this one by heart. Monday, the President is traveling to Kansas City, where he will address the annual convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. And he will speak about foreign policy issues there, and I think I'll need to leave it at that for now.

MR. LEAVY: I can do a little bit more, but that's fine. I mean, if folks want, I can talk afterward.

MR. TOIV: Yes, David will fill you in a little bit more. I think he's going to focus to some degree on our obligations overseas. And that's the only event planned for that trip. He'll be back late afternoon, I believe, or maybe early evening at the latest.

On Tuesday, the President will announce some new PSAs relating to school violence. With kids starting to come back to school, obviously, this is a subject that is on a lot of people's minds, particularly with the incidents that occurred during the last school year. And there are going to be some new PSAs that are unveiled at that time.

Also on Tuesday, we have the visit from the NCAA champion Tennessee Vols, the football champions. They'll be here on Tuesday.

Wednesday, the President is down. And then Thursday, he heads to Martha's Vineyard for a well-deserved vacation.

Any questions?

Q Is he going to say anything on the way out today?

MR. TOIV: Is he going to say -- no.

Okay, thank you. Have a good weekend, everybody.

END

12:50 P.M. EDT

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-AUG-1999 11:39:51.00

SUBJECT: Re: Weekly Reminder

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

GAY AND LESBIAN:

Fort Campbell hearing reveals pattern of anti-gay harassment. At a pre trial hearing this week in the beating death of Private Barry Winchell, it was revealed that the deceased soldier had been subjected to anti-gay taunting by other soldiers nearly every day for a six month period and that the officer in charge took no action to stop it. Instead, he launched an investigation to determine whether Winchell was gay. Gay rights groups are calling for disciplinary action against the officers in charge and have questioned why Secretary Cohen has yet to say anything about the case. Meanwhile, the new don't ask, don't tell guidelines were scheduled for release Friday afternoon. A Friday NY Times story on them was quite positive.

Christine A. Stanek  
08/13/99 11:14:53 AM  
Record Type: Record

To: Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP@EOP  
cc:  
bcc:  
Subject: Re: Weekly Reminder

Richard - do you have anything for the weekly report?

Jonathan M. Young  
08/13/99 10:40:55 AM  
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message  
cc:  
Subject: Weekly Reminder

If you have not done so already, please send me your weeklies as soon as possible, including any updates from what you submitted yesterday.  
According to my records:

Jay and Barbara had items for POTUS

Chip, Jena, Laura, Maureen, Debi, Danny, Women's Office and myself have nothing for POTUS.

Richard will likely submit something for POTUS.

Have I missed anything?

Message Sent

To: \_\_\_\_\_  
Jackson T. Dunn/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Robin Leeds/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Deborah B. Mohile/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Kelley L. O'Dell/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Jena V. Roscoe/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Maureen T. Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Christine A. Stanek/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Barbara D. Woolley/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Jonathan M. Young/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Sondra L. Seba/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Jennifer M. Luray/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Mary E. Cahill/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Laura Efurd/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Daniel E. O'Brien/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Charles J. Payson/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Brian A. Barreto/OPD/EOP@EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Erica S. Lepping ( CN=Erica S. Lepping/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-AUG-1999 09:46:50.00

SUBJECT: need you in gaggle... be prepped to answer Don't Ask Don't Tell...Erica

TO: 4112 ( 4112 @ WHCA [ UNKNOWN ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-AUG-1999 21:58:20.00

SUBJECT: Military inquiry targets AZ lawmaker

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

ARIZONA REPUBLIC, August 13, 1999  
( <http://www.azcentral.com/> )

Military inquiry targets lawmaker

Reservist Steve May focus of gay-policy rule

Steve May made comments this year to newspapers in response to an anti-gay bill in the Arizona Legislature

By Chris Moeser, The Arizona Republic

As a kid, Steve May was inspired to join the military after talking with

John McCain about his experience as a prisoner of war in Vietnam.

Like McCain, May chose the Navy, at least initially. And like the U.S. senator from Arizona, May later entered politics.

But May, a state representative from east Phoenix, is gay.

And now, his dual careers as a military reservist and lawmaker have collided with President Clinton's "don't ask, don't tell" policy for gays in the military.

Army Reserve officials are investigating May after learning of statements

he made to the press during the 1999 legislative session indicating he was gay. In college, May transferred to the Army ROTC after briefly serving in the Navy ROTC; and after graduation, he went into the Army.

But May says he wasn't subject to Defense Department regulations when he

spoke to the press because he was not an active reservist. He wasn't recalled

to active duty until February, after the comments were made to local newspapers in response to an anti-gay bill in the Legislature.

May says he has never discussed the issue with Army colleagues or while on active duty, which means he hasn't violated the policy. Others, including

advocacy attorneys for gays in the military, aren't so sure.

May believes the case could present an interesting legal dilemma for the

military, pitting his First Amendment rights as a lawmaker against a military

policy he calls destructive.

"My case shows the silliness of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy," he said. "I'm trained and qualified to serve the military. The military has chosen to exclude trained and qualified people simply because of a stated

sexual preference."

May, a lieutenant trained in nuclear, chemical and biological warfare defense, also is qualified as a paratrooper. He is second-in-command in the 348th Transportation Company.

Maj. Eileen Norton, commander of the 484th Transportation Battalion, confirmed that an investigation is under way, but she provided no other details.

The "don't ask, don't tell" policy, adopted in 1993, allows commanders to investigate a subordinate's sexual orientation in one of three scenarios:

when there is "credible information" to believe the subordinate is gay; the soldier has engaged in homosexual conduct; or the person has attempted to marry someone of the same gender.

May's case focuses on whether there's "credible information."

Stacey Sobel, senior attorney with the Washington, D.C.-based Service Members Legal Defense Network, said the fact that May's comments came before

he was recalled into active duty may not make a difference. The network represents military employees who are involved in "don't ask, don't tell" cases.

"If he has made a statement in the past . . . they can try to pursue a discharge," said Sobel. "We've had cases where third parties have turned people in." But May says it's unfair that he should be required to stay silent as a lawmaker.

In early February, May denounced a bill proposed by Rep. Karen Johnson, R-Mesa, that would have prohibited the use of public money to pay for benefits for same-sex couples. Johnson also made disparaging comments about gays in the hearing.

"Does this mean that every time that Karen Johnson pulls her crazy antics that I have to keep my mouth shut?" May asked.

May argues that the policy is hurting the military by discharging qualified people. Military retention recently has dropped significantly, so much so that some members of Congress are calling for a reinstatement of the draft.

In 1998, there were 1,145 gay people discharged from the military, up from 997 in 1997, according to Defense Department figures. Sobel expects the trend to continue.

"We definitely see quite a number of cases where highly qualified men and women who have served with distinction are being forced out of the military because of sexual preference," she said.

May, who was up for a promotion to captain this fall, said he's frustrated that he once again is forced to fight a gay-rights issue, which was not his motivation for entering public life. A Republican, he has been criticized by some in the gay community for not being vocal enough on gay-rights issues.

May is more interested in talking about about tax cuts, education or conservative economic policy.

"I resent being forced into this," he said. "It's an awkward situation, one I didn't want to be in. I'm not trying to make a gay-rights issue out of

it. Service isn't a right. This is an obligation. Why do gay people have less of an obligation to defend the nation?"

The case could take months to resolve. In the meantime, May said he will keep working weekends, training soldiers. He says he has a great working relationship with both his soldiers and the officers he serves.

He says his commanders don't want to pursue the case, but they're stuck with the policy. Ultimately, he says he'll follow his orders.

"When I got called back to the military, I went," he said. "If they want to kick me out. . . . I'm trying to do the right and honorable thing."

-----  
-----  
The item above is being distributed as a free, non-profit informational service to a limited number of individuals who have expressed interest in this topic for educational and research purposes only. Please do not redistribute or post copyrighted material anywhere on the Internet accessible to the public without attribution and permission from the author. Please note that distribution of this item does not necessarily constitute endorsement of the content; in fact, often items are distributed as "opposition-research."

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

**SUBJECT: NC10858: Pentagon admits Don't Ask, Don't Tell abuses**

TEXT:

Do not publish this item without permission from the originating media operation. Do not post this item in a public online forum. This is a small, free mailing list open only to people with whom I am acquainted.

## Pentagon in Move to End Abuses Of 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' Policy

By PHILIP SHENON

WASHINGTON ) The Pentagon has decided to issue broad new guidelines intended to end abuses of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy on people in uniform suspected of being gay, including limits on investigations, Administration officials said on Thursday.

The guidelines, they said, will be issued as early as Friday and will require that troops receive anti-gay-harassment training throughout their careers, beginning with boot camp.

The guidelines will also require that when an investigation is opened into the sexual orientation of a soldier, the inquiry will be handled at a senior level of the military justice system.

Abuses in the past have often been attributed to low-level, poorly trained investigators who have turned their investigations into virtual witch hunts for homosexuals in uniform.

Administration officials said the Pentagon felt the need to announce the new guidelines as quickly as possible, given the uproar over the death last month of a gay soldier at Fort Campbell, Ky., who was beaten with a baseball bat, reportedly by another soldier in his unit.

While it is not clear if the new guidelines will satisfy gay rights and other civil rights groups, Administration officials insisted on Thursday that the new rules will be tough and will end some of the worst abuses of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy established during the Clinton Administration.



The policy was supposed to have made it easier for homosexuals to serve in the military, but Pentagon figures show that gay and lesbian troops are being discharged from the military at a far higher rate than before the policy went into effect in 1994.

Openly gay people are still barred from serving in the military. But under a compromise plan developed early in the Clinton Administration, homosexuals can remain in the service as long as they do not discuss their sexual orientation publicly. And investigators are barred from asking troops about their sexual orientation.

But implementation of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy, as it came to be known, has produced frequent abuses, notably when commanders have pursued investigations of the sexual orientation of their troops based only on suspicion or rumor.

The guidelines are intended to make certain that such inquiries in the future will be handled only by well-trained investigators responding to solid evidence, and that all members of the military services receive anti-harassment training throughout their careers.

"I think they realize at the Pentagon that this can't just be swept under the rug," said a senior Administration official, speaking on condition of anonymity. "There's a recognition there that this problem of gay harassment is worse than they thought."

Michelle M. Benecke of the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, a Washington group that helps troops who are prosecuted over their sexual orientation, said, "We're very anxious to see what comes out of the Pentagon."

"We've pressed for guidelines for several years now, warning Pentagon officials that steps were needed to stop harassment and illegal investigations," Ms. Benecke said. "And until I read them, I can't tell whether the guidelines are a good first step or a minimal response to a very serious problem."

The new guidelines were prepared in response to a Defense Department report last year that found that while the "don't ask, don't tell" policy was working well, the policy should be revised to avoid the small number of abuses that the Pentagon identified.

It suggested new rules requiring that commanders consult with senior military lawyers before opening an investigation of a soldier's sexual orientation to make sure that proper procedures are followed, and that there be better protection for the privacy of gay troops during the period after they acknowledge their homosexuality and before they leave the military.

The report also recommended that the department reissue a directive intended to prevent people who complain of being taunted over their alleged homosexuality from actually becoming targets of investigations of their sex lives.

In some cases identified by gay-rights groups, soldiers who have complained to commanders about being harassed have found themselves ) and not their harassers ) under investigation.

Administration officials said all of those recommendations in the 1998 report were addressed by the new guidelines.

"I think we've made a good faith effort to meet all of the concerns," said a senior Administration official. The new Pentagon guidelines, he said, "track the report ) this is an honest and straightforward effort to implement the results of the report."

He said the guidelines would sharply increase the amount of anti-harassment training given the troops at all levels of the service, and throughout their careers. "It'll begin with basic training," he said. "And it will be top to bottom."

The Administration came up with the "don't ask, don't tell" policy after President Clinton was forced to back away from the blanket moratorium on discrimination against homosexuals that he tried to introduce shortly after taking office in 1993.

It proved an awkward compromise and has never fostered the live-and-let-live attitude within the military that the authors of the policy had sought. The numbers would suggest, in fact, that gay troops are being removed from the military at higher rates than before.

According to last year's report, 67 percent more gay and lesbian troops were discharged in 1997 ) a total of 997 individuals ) than were discharged in 1994, the first full year the policy was in effect.

Gay rights advocates see the figures as evidence of their contention that the policy has backfired and subjected gay and lesbian troops to new harassment. Pentagon officials say, however, that the increase is due instead to voluntary declarations of homosexuality by men and women who wanted to get out of the military.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)

CREATOR: OLCOTT\_E@A1@CD

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-AUG-1999 13:48:00.00

SUBJECT: 1999-8/13 toiv, leavy briefing

TO: Alejandro G. Cabrera ( Alejandro G. Cabrera@lmgate4.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Andrew\_J\_Mayock ( Andrew\_J\_Mayock@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Ann\_C\_Hertelendy ( Ann\_C\_Hertelendy@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Ann\_F\_Lewis ( Ann\_F\_Lewis@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Anne\_E\_McGuire ( Anne\_E\_McGuire@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Anne\_M\_Edwards ( Anne\_M\_Edwards@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Antony\_J\_Blinken ( Antony\_J\_Blinken@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Aprill\_N\_Springfield/who/eop/gov ( Aprill\_N\_Springfield/who/eop/gov@PMD.F.EOP.GOV@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Michele Ballantyne@eop@lmgtwy@eopmr  
READ:NOT READ

TO: BARTHOLOW\_T ( BARTHOLOW\_T@A1@CD ) (OA)  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Barbara\_D\_Woolley ( Barbara\_D\_Woolley@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Beverly\_J\_Barnes ( Beverly\_J\_Barnes@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Bradley\_M\_Campbell ( Bradley\_M\_Campbell@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Brenda\_M\_Anders ( Brenda\_M\_Anders@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Brian A. Reich ( Brian A. Reich@lmgate4.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Brian\_A.\_Barreto ( Brian\_A.\_Barreto@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: CUTLER\_L ( CUTLER\_L@A1@CD ) (WHO)  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Stephanie A. Cutter@eop@lmgtwy@eopmrx  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Carmen\_B.\_Fowler ( Carmen\_B.\_Fowler@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Catherine\_T.\_Kitchen ( Catherine\_T.\_Kitchen@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Cheryl\_D.\_Mills ( Cheryl\_D.\_Mills@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Christine\_N.\_Macy ( Christine\_N.\_Macy@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Christopher S. Lehane ( Christopher S. Lehane@lmgate4.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: DICKY\_L ( DICKY\_L@A1@CD ) (WHO)  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Patrick M. Dorton ( Patrick M. Dorton@eop@lmgtwy@eopmrx )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Daniel\_W.\_Burkhardt ( Daniel\_W.\_Burkhardt@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Dario\_J.\_Gomez ( Dario\_J.\_Gomez@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: David\_E.\_Kalbaugh ( David\_E.\_Kalbaugh@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: David\_R.\_Goodfriend ( David\_R.\_Goodfriend@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: David\_T.\_Johnson ( David\_T.\_Johnson@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX ) (DON)  
READ:NOT READ

TO: INTERNET (PMDF) DESTINATION ( David\_Vandivier@omb.eop.gov@INET )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Dawn\_M.\_Chirwa ( Dawn\_M.\_Chirwa@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Deborah\_Akel ( Deborah\_Akel@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Debra\_D.\_Bird  
READ:NOT READ ( Debra\_D.\_Bird@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Delia\_A.\_Cohen  
READ:NOT READ ( Delia\_A.\_Cohen@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Denver\_R.\_Peacock  
READ:NOT READ ( Denver\_R.\_Peacock@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Dominique\_L.\_Cano  
READ:NOT READ ( Dominique\_L.\_Cano@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Dorian\_V.\_Weaver  
READ:NOT READ ( Dorian\_V.\_Weaver@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Dorinda\_A.\_Salcido  
READ:NOT READ ( Dorinda\_A.\_Salcido@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Douglas\_R.\_Matties  
READ:NOT READ ( Douglas\_R.\_Matties@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Eli G. Attie  
READ:NOT READ ( Eli G. Attie@lmgate4.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Elizabeth\_R.\_Newman  
READ:NOT READ ( Elizabeth\_R.\_Newman@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Elliot\_J.\_Diringer  
READ:NOT READ ( Elliot\_J.\_Diringer@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Erica\_S.\_Lepping  
READ:NOT READ ( Erica\_S.\_Lepping@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: FORDE\_R  
READ:NOT READ ( FORDE\_R@A1@CD ) ( )

TO: GRAY\_W  
READ:13-AUG-1999 14:26:26.06 ( GRAY\_W@A1@CD ) (NSC)

TO: George\_G.\_Caudill  
READ:NOT READ ( George\_G.\_Caudill@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Gina N. Dennis/WHO/EOP  
READ:NOT READ ( Gina N. Dennis/WHO/EOP@EOP.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Irma\_L.\_Martinez  
READ:NOT READ ( Irma\_L.\_Martinez@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Jackson\_T.\_Dunn  
READ:NOT READ ( Jackson\_T.\_Dunn@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: James\_M.\_Teague  
READ:NOT READ ( James\_M.\_Teague@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

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

TO: Jeannetta\_P.\_Allen  
READ:NOT READ  
( Jeannetta\_P.\_Allen@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Jennifer\_Ferguson  
READ:NOT READ  
( Jennifer\_Ferguson@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Jim Kohlenberger  
READ:NOT READ  
( Jim Kohlenberger@lmgate4.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Jocelyn\_A.\_Bucaro  
READ:NOT READ  
( Jocelyn\_A.\_Bucaro@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Joel\_Johnson  
READ:NOT READ  
( Joel\_Johnson@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: John\_A.\_Gribben  
READ:NOT READ  
( John\_A.\_Gribben@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: John\_See  
READ:NOT READ  
( John\_See@ed.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Jonathan\_A.\_Kaplan  
READ:NOT READ  
( Jonathan\_A.\_Kaplan@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Jonathan\_M.\_Prince  
READ:NOT READ  
( Jonathan\_M.\_Prince@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Joseph\_P.\_Lockhart  
READ:NOT READ  
( Joseph\_P.\_Lockhart@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Joshua\_S.\_Gottheimer  
READ:NOT READ  
( Joshua\_S.\_Gottheimer@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Julia\_M.\_Payne  
READ:NOT READ  
( Julia\_M.\_Payne@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Julie\_B.\_Goldberg  
READ:NOT READ  
( Julie\_B.\_Goldberg@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Julie\_E.\_Mason  
READ:NOT READ  
( Julie\_E.\_Mason@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Justin\_L.\_Coleman  
READ:NOT READ  
( Justin\_L.\_Coleman@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: KTORPEY  
READ:NOT READ  
( KTORPEY@AOL.COM@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Karen\_C.\_Burchard  
READ:NOT READ  
( Karen\_C.\_Burchard@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )

TO: Karen\_L.\_Barbuschak ( Karen\_L.\_Barbuschak@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Katharine\_Button ( Katharine\_Button@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Kathleen\_K.\_Ahn ( Kathleen\_K.\_Ahn@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Kris\_M\_Balderston ( Kris\_M\_Balderston@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Laura\_D.\_Schwartz ( Laura\_D.\_Schwartz@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Laura\_S.\_Marcus ( Laura\_S.\_Marcus@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Leslie\_Bernstein ( Leslie\_Bernstein@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lori\_E.\_Abrams ( Lori\_E.\_Abrams@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: MOFFETT\_J ( MOFFETT\_J@A1@CD ) (WHO)  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Margaret\_M.\_Suntum ( Margaret\_M.\_Suntum@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Mark\_A.\_Kitchens ( Mark\_A.\_Kitchens@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Mark\_D.\_Neschis ( Mark\_D.\_Neschis@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Mark\_H.\_Bartholomew ( Mark\_H.\_Bartholomew@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Mark\_J.\_Bernstein ( Mark\_J.\_Bernstein@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Marsha\_E.\_Berry ( Marsha\_E.\_Berry@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Martha\_Foley ( Martha\_Foley@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Marty\_J.\_Hoffmann ( Marty\_J.\_Hoffmann@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Mary\_E.\_Cahill ( Mary\_E.\_Cahill@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Maureen\_A.\_Hudson ( Maureen\_A.\_Hudson@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Megan\_C.\_Moloney ( Megan\_C.\_Moloney@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Melissa\_M.\_Murray ( Melissa\_M.\_Murray@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Michael\_A.\_Hammer ( Michael\_A.\_Hammer@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Michael\_V.\_Terrell ( Michael\_V.\_Terrell@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Mindy\_E.\_Myers ( Mindy\_E.\_Myers@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Minyon\_Moore ( Minyon\_Moore@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Nanda\_Chitre ( Nanda\_Chitre@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Nathan B. Naylor ( Nathan B. Naylor@lmgate4.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Neera\_Tanden ( Neera\_Tanden@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Noa\_A.\_Meyer ( Noa\_A.\_Meyer@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: OLCOTT\_E ( OLCOTT\_E@A1@CD ) (WHO)  
READ:13-AUG-1999 13:51:20.27

TO: Jennifer Palmieri ( PALMIERI\_J@A1@CD ) (WHO)  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Charles J. Payson@eop@lmgtwy@eopmrk  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Timothy Dixon ( PR\_USERNAME=TDIXON@PR\_LOCATION=AVUOEOb@MRP@OPUS )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Patrick\_E.\_Briggs ( Patrick\_E.\_Briggs@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Paul\_D.\_Glastris ( Paul\_D.\_Glastris@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Philip\_J.\_Crowley ( Philip\_J.\_Crowley@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ



TO: INTERNET (PMDf) DESTINATION ( Pub\_Arch@eop@INET )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Rajiv\_Y.\_Mody ( Rajiv\_Y.\_Mody@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Ralph\_Alswang ( Ralph\_Alswang@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Robin\_J.\_Bachman ( Robin\_J.\_Bachman@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Francisco J. Sanchez@eop@lmgtwy@eopmr  
READ:NOT READ

TO: SUNTUM\_M ( SUNTUM\_M@AI@CD ) (WHO)  
READ:23-AUG-1999 14:36:21.66

TO: Sara\_M.\_Latham ( Sara\_M.\_Latham@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sarah\_S.\_Knight ( Sarah\_S.\_Knight@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sean\_P.\_Maloney ( Sean\_P.\_Maloney@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sean\_P.\_O'Shea ( Sean\_P.\_O'Shea@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sharon\_Farmer ( Sharon\_Farmer@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sheyda\_Jahanbani ( Sheyda\_Jahanbani@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Steven\_J.\_Naplan ( Steven\_J.\_Naplan@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Tanya\_E.\_Martin ( Tanya\_E.\_Martin@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Thomas\_D.\_Janenda ( Thomas\_D.\_Janenda@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX ) (VPO)  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Toby\_C.\_Graff ( Toby\_C.\_Graff@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Todd\_A.\_Bledsoe ( Todd\_A.\_Bledsoe@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Wayne\_C.\_Johnson ( Wayne\_C.\_Johnson@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: William\_C.\_Haymes ( William\_C.\_Haymes@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: William\_Hadley ( William\_Hadley@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: backup ( backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: INTERNET (PMDF) DESTINATION ( pcaplan@fbr.com@INET )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: rmusgrav ( rmusgrav@lmgate2.eop.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: wh-outbox-distr ( wh-outbox-distr@publ.pub.whitehouse.gov@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

August 13, 1999

PRESS BRIEFING  
BY  
BARRY TOIV AND DAVID LEAVY

The Briefing Room

12:30 P.M. EDT

MR. TOIV: Good afternoon, everybody. Happy Friday.

Q I don't think everybody's here, Barry.

MR. TOIV: Come on in. We can wait.

Q This is not a comment on your --

MR. TOIV: Well, I'm happy today. I expect all the tough questions to go to David.

Just as I mentioned earlier today, we're going to have a briefing at 2:30 p.m. on the radio address. The subject has to do with clean water, and we'll have Carol Browner here again, making an encore appearance, as well as Elgie Holstein, who is the Associate Director for Natural Resources at OMB.

This will take place at 2:30 p.m., but it will be on camera. It will be embargoed until 10:06 a.m. tomorrow, as usual.

Any questions?

MR. LEAVY: All right, thank you very much. Appreciate your coming in.

MR. TOIV: Well, thank you.

Q Well, a couple of them. One about the Pentagon, new policy for "don't ask, don't tell." Any comments on that?

MR. TOIV: Well, as you know, Secretary Cohen has been committed to implementing the "don't ask, don't tell" policy fairly. And the President agrees with him on that. The Pentagon, a little over a year ago, issued a report that said that "don't ask, don't tell" was working, but that there were a couple of areas where improvements needed to be made. I think today, the guidelines that they are issuing today are intended to address those issues. I would suggest you check over there for details of what they are announcing today.

Q I understand that China has not conveyed any explicit threats to the United States in regards to Taiwan. But can you characterize what has changed? Has there been any ratcheting up of the rhetoric of the implied threats, of the indications that you're getting that they may be more bellicose towards Taiwan?

MR. LEAVY: Let me just say, Bill, a couple of things generally. One, the peace and stability in East Asia and the Pacific is a fundamental national interest to the United States. We are certainly watching developments closely, have been in contact with both sides about our concerns and about reiterating our policy of resuming peaceful dialogue.

Just specifically on your question, it is my understanding that the intelligence community has not seen any extraordinary developments or signs that the PRC is mobilizing for military action in the Taiwan Strait.

Q Would you say that there has been a ratcheting up of the rhetoric in diplomatic channels? Are they trying to send signals?

MR. LEAVY: Well, I don't want to characterize, Kevin, other people's rhetoric, other people's statements. I think there has obviously been some increased tension in the Strait over the last several weeks. That comes as no surprise to any of us or anybody in this room. We've talked about that. But I think what we have to do is look forward, and we have communicated to both sides that there is a danger of escalating tensions, that we have to resume a dialog based on a One China formula. And we're going to continue to do that.

Q Specifically, there was one report that the embassy here had been saying that they are going to take action.

MR. LEAVY: I would steer you away from that report. As I said earlier today, we have not received any threats or ultimatums from the PRC. I checked about that again this afternoon, earlier this afternoon, and that was confirmed. So, I would steer you away from that report.

I would just say, though, generally, that there is nothing new in China's long-standing position. They have made clear that from their point of view Taiwan is an internal matter, and they hope that there is peaceful reunification, but they don't rule out military means. We have a long-standing disagreement on that. So I don't think any -- the context is not new.

Q Does the United States still have a commitment to go to the defense of Taiwan, should there be an unprovoked attack from the mainland?

MR. LEAVY: Our long-standing position -- this goes back many years, both Republican and Democratic administrations -- is that any effort to resolve the issue of Taiwan by other than peaceful means would be considered of grave concern to the United States. That position hasn't changed today.

Q How would you view a Chinese seizure of a small Taiwan-controlled island, or some smaller military action?

MR. LEAVY: See, that's the kind of hypothetical question that I want to avoid getting into. Again, the Taiwan Relations Act has been in place for many years. It has guided our relationship on this issue, our policy on this issue. And I don't want to change, or speculate on hypotheticals today.

Q David, is there concern that the U.S. might get drawn into something because of this rhetoric?

MR. LEAVY: Oh, I think there's concern that the interests of both sides won't be advanced. The One China policy that the President has advocated -- and that has been the foundation of our approach to this issue for many, many years -- has been successful for all sides. Both China and Taiwan have benefited economically. Taiwan's the sixth-largest economy in the world. Chinese economic growth has grown vastly over the last 20 years.

So the formula is a successful one. We don't see the need to change that, and we have no intention of changing that.

Q Let me follow, too. You said no one had contacted the United States with a threat. Has anyone from either side, Taiwan or China, contacted the United States with a concern over the rhetoric, a concern over the threat?

MR. LEAVY: Well, we've had a number of discussions, both at the State Department and with officials in China. As you remember, the State Department sent Assistant Secretary Stanley Roth and Ken Lieberthal from the National Security Council, several weeks ago, to Beijing to discuss our concern about the rising rhetoric, and a need to get back to a dialogue and to get back to the two parties talking about the issues. And so we have been engaged on this issue. And certainly, there is a concern that this kind of thing leads to accidents, leads to misunderstandings, and that we want to focus both parties on getting back to the table.

Q You said -- you made a point of saying that there were no extraordinary signs coming into the intelligence community of --

MR. LEAVY: Extraordinary developments or signs.

Q Right. Does that mean that there is something less than extraordinary -- or you're telling us what hasn't happened. Can you tell us what has happened?

MR. LEAVY: Well, I want to stay away from commenting on intelligence capabilities and what we do and don't know. I think that's a line we haven't crossed, and appropriately so. But, as I said earlier, it's our judgment, the United States government's judgment, that there aren't any extraordinary developments or signs that there is a mobilization on the PRC's part.

Q David, can you clarify just the conversations between the administration and the Taiwan and Chinese government? Have those conversations been stepped up in recent days? And at what level, if you can clarify, have these conversations been going?

MR. LEAVY: I don't think there has been a stepping up over recent days. Since this issue came to the forefront several weeks ago, we've had a number of discussions with the PRC and with people on Taiwan. There is nothing new in the last several days that I'm aware of.

Our general approach hasn't changed, though, and let me just repeat it again. The United States has a One-China policy. Our approach is based on dialogue between the two sides and a peaceful resolution of any differences. We've communicated that and we will continue to do so.

Q Let's put the intelligence community issue aside for a minute. If you look in the newspaper this morning, there are several people quoted on the record saying Chinese government representatives came to speak with them and made bellicose statements that there was some sort of imminent military action likely against Taiwan. Is that troubling -- those facts, which are known facts, are they troubling to the administration?

MR. LEAVY: Well, again, I don't think there is anything new in what we are hearing. China has a longstanding position that any -- that Taiwan is an internal matter, that they want to see it resolved peacefully, but they don't rule out the use of force. We have a disagreement with that. We don't think that's the way to go. We think there has to be a peaceful resolution to this issue. It has to come through dialogue. And so there is nothing new in that articulation of those themes. I don't think anyone from the United States government was quoted in those stories, and as I said earlier, no one from the administration has been approached about any particular threat or ultimatum.

Q But the analysts -- just to follow up -- these analysts who were quoted, who are respected China analysts, say that they did feel that there was something imminent, or that there was something new. The U.S. government just doesn't agree with that?

MR. LEAVY: No, I can't speak to that. As I said, we haven't been approached with any specific threat or any specific warning. And just the general notion that this is a new policy I would just push back on, because this is something that President Jiang and other Chinese leaders have articulated for some time. So the Chinese have not ruled out the use of military force. We disagree with them. We've made that clear. Our policy is peaceful dialogue.

Q The question goes, though, David to whether this is imminent or not. We know that that is their policy, but there seem to be signals that something may happen sooner rather than later.

MR. LEAVY: Well, I don't have any indication of that. And as I said earlier, it's our intelligence community's best judgment that there aren't any signs that there is PRC military activity underway.

Q What kind of activities, if any, is the President himself engaged in relative to this topic?

MR. LEAVY: Well, he hasn't been engaged over the last 24 hours. As you know, we will be seeing President Jiang at APEC in Auckland, New Zealand, the first week of September. That's going to be an important time for the two leaders to engage on this issue and a number of issues, including trade, human rights, non-proliferation, I believe that will be on the margins of the APEC Summit. So I think that will be the next opportunity for the President to sit down with President Jiang and go over the wide range of bilateral issues.

Q But he hasn't been consulting in recent days with his own advisors and what to do about this?

MR. LEAVY: Well Mr. Berger has kept him up to date. I

believe he briefed him this morning, or he will early this afternoon. But he hasn't been engaged personally.

Q David, as far as the policy, how do you respond to Republican allegations that when it comes time to pressuring China and Taiwan on this issue, the Clinton administration has only been putting pressure on Taiwan to ratchet down tensions?

MR. LEAVY: I would reject that. The United States takes actions based on our own interests. We have had a formula that has managed this issue for some time that's been both Republican and Democratic administrations. As I said earlier, it has benefited all the parties -- Taiwan, the PRC, the United States. We're going to continue to do that. I think it's not for us to pressure anybody, but to make clear that both sides -- their agendas can be advanced, their prosperity, their security can be advanced by peaceful dialogue.

Q Last night the President told the Jewish leaders that he agreed that we should do more to start monitoring, if not infiltrating, some hate groups. Do you -- is there anything today? Any directive? Any review of how that would be done? Any stepping up?

MR. TOIV: I don't have any additional information for you on that, no. The Justice Department seeks to do an effective job of dealing with hate crimes, certainly, and they also monitor hate groups. But I don't have any information on additional work that's being done.

Q But Clinton said he would look into it personally, and said that he would do more.

MR. TOIV: And if he said that, he will.

Q Barry, it was a year ago that the President was preparing for his grand jury testimony. Any reflections about the atmosphere then, and how things have changed since then around here, and at the White House?

MR. TOIV: Nope.

Q Barry, I want to go back real quick to David about Ethiopia and Eritrea. What is the new development on the White House side in that conflict?

MR. TOIV: Okay. As you know, the United States has actively worked for a peaceful resolution of the dispute between Ethiopia and Eritrea over the past year, and continues to work in cooperation with the OAU to bring about a peaceful resolution to the conflict.

As you know, Tony Lake was appointed as the President's

special envoy to this conflict over a year ago. He has traveled there, I think, close to six times. There has been encouraging movement on the peace process over the last few weeks. At the Organization of African Unity's summit in Algiers in early July, the OAU proposed -- excuse me, the modalities for implementation of the OAU's framework agreement, both Ethiopia and Eritrea have now accepted the framework agreement, and the modalities for its implementation. We will continue to engage to move this process forward.

Q A follow-up. Jesse Jackson has been very pivotal in breaking tensions with other factional peoples on that continent. Is the White House thinking at all of bringing Reverend Jackson into this situation, or is he involved at all?

MR. LEAVY: I don't think so. As you know, Reverend Jackson did extraordinary work to bring about a resolution of the conflict in Sierra Leone. He deserves great credit for that. He saved a lot of lives and prevented a lot more violence. I think Tony Lake has the portfolio on Ethiopia and Eritrea. He as well has spent a considerable amount of his own time traveling there, I think, close to half a dozen times.

So I think between Tony Lake, our team at the State Department, Susan Rice and our team here, led by Gail Smith, have been quite engaged and quite successful. So I don't see any need for Reverend Jackson to come in.

All right. Have a great weekend, everybody.

Q Barry?

Q Hold on.

MR. LEAVY: Oh, Barry, I'm sorry.

Q Week ahead?

Q Barry, I've got one question for you before you go away. Black Navy veterans have asked the President to dismiss mutiny charges against black sailors who refused to load ammo on the ships after the 1944 Port Chicago disaster in California. Does the request have merit and, if so, what is the President doing about it?

MR. TOIV: Well, until recently, there had not been a request for pardons for any of these individuals. Now, a few months ago, a request -- such a request was made. It's being considered under the usual process at the Justice Department, and obviously the President will give careful consideration to that.

Q Is the President well aware of the situation?



MR. TOIV: I believe he is.

Q Any time frame?

MR. TOIV: I don't have a time frame for you, no.

Q Barry, back on the gays in the military; as a candidate, the President said that he would end discrimination against gays in the military, "don't ask, don't tell" falls far short of that. Has the President given up hope that during his term in office he'll end discrimination against gays?

MR. TOIV: Well the President believes that the "don't ask, don't tell" policy has worked effectively. And I expect that that will be the policy throughout his administration.

Q But you concede it doesn't end discrimination -- that if you admit you're a homosexual in the military, you get thrown out?

MR. TOIV: Well, I will concede that it is a policy that has worked, and is the best policy that can be workable at this time.

Q Yes, but if it's worked, why are they changing it?

MR. TOIV: Well, no, it has worked. As I said before -- I'm not sure if you heard what I had to say about it before, but there have been a couple of areas that improvements were needed. And in fact, that's the work that's been going on that has led to the guidelines that are being issued today. And so -- I said it worked. I didn't say it was working perfectly.

Q Barry, the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette reported this morning that during a fundraiser on Saturday, several members of the Secret Service lined up to obstruct camera view of the President as he greeted Mrs. Arkansas in the ropeline, and that they later apologized for doing that. Do you know if that happened, or if it's common for the Secret Service to be used in that way, to interfere with press coverage of the President?

MR. TOIV: The answer to the second question, which is the fairer question of the two questions to be asking me up here, is I don't believe so.

Q Well, what's the answer to the first one?

MR. TOIV: The answer to the first question, of course, as you know, I've no idea, since that's the first time I'm hearing of that.

Week ahead?

Q Yes.

MR. TOIV: Let's see. I have to do this one by heart.

Monday, the President is traveling to Kansas City, where he will address the annual convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. And he will speak about foreign policy issues there, and I think I'll need to leave it at that for now.

MR. LEAVY: I can do a little bit more, but that's fine. I mean, if folks want, I can talk afterward.

MR. TOIV: Yes, David will fill you in a little bit more. I think he's going to focus to some degree on our obligations overseas. And that's the only event planned for that trip. He'll be back late afternoon, I believe, or maybe early evening at the latest.

On Tuesday, the President will announce some new PSAs relating to school violence. With kids starting to come back to school, obviously, this is a subject that is on a lot of people's minds, particularly with the incidents that occurred during the last school year. And there are going to be some new PSAs that are unveiled at that time.

Also on Tuesday, we have the visit from the NCAA champion Tennessee Vols, the football champions. They'll be here on Tuesday.

Wednesday, the President is down. And then Thursday, he heads to Martha's Vineyard for a well-deserved vacation.

Any questions?

Q Is he going to say anything on the way out today?

MR. TOIV: Is he going to say -- no.

Okay, thank you. Have a good weekend, everybody.

END

12:50 P.M. EDT