

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-AUG-1999 11:34:34.00

SUBJECT: Re: Don't Ask, Don't Tell

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

sure -- karen tramantino, chuck allen, mara rudman, and richard were all in the earlier meeting.

Edward W. Correia

08/31/99 10:32:37 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Cheryl D. Mills/WHO/EOP@EOP

cc:

Subject: Don't Ask, Don't Tell

Also, we should invite someone from NSC, e.g., Mara Rudman. I should have thought of all this yesterday.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-AUG-1999 10:21:10.00

SUBJECT:

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Does the President agree with the Vice President's recent criticisms of the don't ask, don't tell policy?

The President believes that Secretary Cohen is committed to the fair enforcement of the policy. That is not to say, however, that there isn't room for improvement, and that was implicit in the new guidelines recently issued by the Pentagon.

Does the President believe the policy needs to be changed?

The President believes that the Pentagon is working hard to more fairly implement the congressionally enacted policy and that that is the appropriate course.

Does the President support the discharge of Arizona State legislator Steve May?

It would not be appropriate to comment on any specific pending case.

[if pressed]: There are obviously going to be instances when the blind application of such a policy may produce seemingly unwarranted results.

Now Army Reserve officials are investigating May under a "don't ask, don't tell" policy, governing homosexuals in the military, established in 1993.

Do not publish this item without permission from the originating media operation.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.

May contends he wasn't subject to Defense Department regulations when he spoke to the press because he was not an active reservist. He was recalled to active duty in February after the comments were made.

May argues that since he has never discussed the issue with Army colleagues or while on active duty, he hasn't violated the policy.

May also sees the investigation as 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 an investigation is under way but provided no details.

One aspect of the policy permits military investigation when there is "credible information" to believe the subject is gay, the issue in May's case.

Stacey Sobel, senior attorney with the Washington-based Service Members Legal Defense Network, told The Arizona Republic the fact that May's comments came before he was recalled into active duty may not make a difference.

"If he has made a statement in the past ... they can try to pursue a discharge," said Sobel, whose network represents military employees involved in "don't ask, don't tell" cases.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-AUG-1999 12:19:32.00

SUBJECT: Commentay on "Don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue"

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP on 08/31/99

12:19 PM -----

Doug.Case@sdsu.edu

08/29/99 04:16:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Richard Socarides@EOP

cc:

Subject: Commentay on "Don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue"

Boston Globe, August 29, 1999

(<http://www.boston.com/globe>)

To some, 'Don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue' means, 'Do harass, do ridicule, do act violently'

By Chuck Colbert

To say that the "don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue" policy on gays in

the military is not working is an understatement. As the murder of a gay soldier last month in Fort Campbell, Ky., makes perfectly clear, military service can be outright deadly for gays.

While the fact-finding continues, one soldier has been charged with premeditated murder in the killing of Private First Class Barry L.

Winchell,

21, who was bludgeoned to death with a baseball bat. Winchell's roommate, who is said to have egged on the assailant, has also been charged with being

a principal to premeditated murder and acting as an accessory to the fact.

As the evidence mounts, the beating and murder look more and more like a

hate crime. If that's true, Winchell's death would be the first known incident of a hate crime based on sexual orientation at a US military base.

But incidents of harassment, ridicule, and even violence are not so out

of the ordinary in the military's culture of hostility toward gays.

Consider

these examples:

Antigay harassment, which has been on the rise for five years, more

than doubled in 1998) up 120 percent from the previous year) according to the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, or SLDN, an independent legal aid and watchdog organization.

During the last five years, staff attorneys at SLDN have helped more than 1,800 military personnel. Some of their clients have reported verbal gay bashing and threats on a daily, even hourly, basis, according to an annual report, released by the organization last March.

"Asking" and "pursuing" violations of the policy have also increased for the fifth year, according to SLDN. The organization documented

511 such incidents during 1998, up from 359 reported the previous year.

Overall, the number of gay discharges (1,149) in 1998 is the highest in a decade) up 86 percent since 1993, the year before Congress and the president approved "don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue," which went into effect on Feb. 28, 1994. That means that the Pentagon fired three to four people every day for being lesbian, gay, or bisexual. Those pink slips have cost the tax-paying public \$130 million over the past five years.

So, what are the president, a Democrat, and the secretary of defense, a Republican) the two people ultimately responsible for the implementation and enforcement of "don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue") doing about the violations and the policy's skyrocketing costs? Two weeks ago, the Defense Department released a couple of policy directives "intend[ed] to improve application of the homosexual conduct policy."

The new directives require, for the first time, antigay harassment training at all levels of the armed forces, beginning with basic training of recruits. The directives also recommend that lower-level legal officers consult with, and get approval from, more senior lawyers before opening an investigation of anyone suspected of being gay.

But these directives represent no fundamental change in policy and are still much too little) and much too late for Winchell, his family, and friends.

While the new training requirement has received the lion's share of media attention, the latest target of "don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue," a Republican state legislator and Army reserve officer from Arizona, sees right through the military's nonsense and double-think: "First, we're going to indoctrinate our soldiers to believe that homosexuals are inferior and a threat because of this policy, and then we're going to indoctrinate them into believing that gays shouldn't be harassed," Steve May told The New York Times last week.

May did active duty in the Army and then entered the reserve. Elected to the Arizona Legislature last November, he became outspokenly critical of a failed bill that would have barred the use of public funds for same-sex domestic-partner health benefits. In the process he came out publicly.

May's public self-outing is what triggered an investigation by the Army because under "don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue" gays are not

permitted
to disclose their sexual orientation in public settings.

Granted this case is as unlikely as it is unusual, but "don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue" does not take into account the way real gay people live their lives, either in military service or public office. But more important, who really believes those directives will fundamentally change the hostile climate that makes it so unsafe for gay and lesbian service members?

Several days before the Defense Department issued the new guidelines, military officials at Fort Campbell heard testimony concerning Winchell's death. Sworn testimony revealed that because of his perceived sexual orientation, Winchell faced daily harassment for four to six months before he was murdered) and that superiors knew about it but took no steps to stop it.

Winchell's section leader reportedly testified he had been part of an investigation seeking to find if Winchell was gay.

Such blatant abuses and violations of "don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue" indicate a pathetic policy.

As he issued the new directives, Defense Secretary William S. Cohen declared, "I've made it clear there is no room for harassment or threats in the military. The department is determined to implement the homosexual conduct policy with fairness to all concerned."

Try using those lines on the parents and friends of Private First Class Winchell. And ask yourself: Will the new Defense Department directives really be enough to save the future Private Winchells of our armed forces?

Chuck Colbert of Cambridge was a surface warfare officer in the Navy from 1981 to 1985. He is on the board of the National Lesbian and Gay Journalists Association.

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-AUG-1999 01:44:20.00

SUBJECT: Gore Chides Gays in Military Policy

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Associated Press, August 30, 1999
Gore Chides Gays in Military Policy
By SANDRA SOBIERAJ

WASHINGTON (AP)) Vice President Al Gore criticized the Clinton administration's policy toward gays in the military and said he would implement "don't ask, don't tell" with more compassion.

In an interview published in the September editions of The Advocate, due on newsstands Tuesday, the vice president also asserted that adoption agencies) not federal or state governments) should decide on a case-by-case basis whether gays and lesbians should adopt children or serve as foster parents.

"Local adoption officials can evaluate the circumstances of the child and the parenting ability of prospective parents and decide if there's a good match," Gore said.

The vice president, who is on vacation with his family this week, was interviewed in June as he campaigned in California for the Democratic presidential nomination. His comments came before the much-publicized, Aug.

13 announcement by the Pentagon of new, mandatory training on anti-harassment guidelines for all troops.

Last year, 1,145 people were discharged from the armed forces for homosexuality, the Pentagon reported. In 1997, the total was 997, the highest number since 1987. The number of discharges hit a low of 617 in 1994, the year that President Clinton effected his "don't ask, don't tell" policy, which allows gays to serve in the military as long as their sexual orientation is not discovered.

"The statistics may be reflecting some phenomenon I don't understand, but the easiest explanation is that it's not being implemented in a way that fully reflects the spirit of the policy," Gore told The Advocate.

"I would implement the policy with more compassion," Gore said. He added that he would work with military leaders on developing "an implementation strategy that's fairer," but did offer specifics.

Asked if gays and lesbians were, by their nature, antithetical to "family values," the vice president replied: "I believe that God makes us in different ways. I don't believe that having made us, God intends us to

suffer discrimination and prejudice.

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 anyplace 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:31-AUG-1999 12:25:36.00

SUBJECT: Arizona legislator takes on 'don't ask, don't tell' (2 stories

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

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP on 08/31/99
12:25 PM -----

Doug.Case@sdsu.edu
08/28/99 06:46:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Richard Socarides@EOP

cc:

Subject: Arizona legislator takes on 'don't ask, don't tell' (2 stories

Arizona Republic, August 28, 1999
(<http://www.azcentral.com/>)

Gay state lawmaker speaks out
Assails military's 'don't tell' rule

By Charles Kelly, The Arizona Republic

The government's hush-hush policy on gays in the military got another loud airing this week as the case of Arizona lawmaker Steve May reverberated across the country.

May, 27, who could be kicked out of the Army Reserve for admitting he is gay, called Friday for an end to the military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy at a news conference in New York.

He noted that the military is having trouble recruiting and keeping service members and that Congress is thinking about bringing back the draft.

Given that, May said, "How much longer will we degrade our military readiness by discharging competent, qualified, trained men and women? "This policy must come to an end."

Before the news conference, May's story was picked up by the New York Times and the national talk shows. May has done interviews with Good Morning

America and MSNBC and is scheduled to do The Larry King Show on Monday.

May told The Arizona Republic that the publicity caught him unawares while he was visiting New York on business and to attend a convention of the

Log Cabin Republicans, a gay group.

"I'm very surprised," May said. "This isn't my issue. . . . I was

ordered back into the service, I put a uniform on. I'm trying to do my job.

And the military has taken an action, not me."

May's situation is the latest to cast doubt on the wisdom of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy, said his lawyer, Stacey Sobel.

"Because of the unusual nature of his case, he is receiving a lot of publicity," Sobel said. "But the fact is, he's just one of many people who have had their careers jeopardized because of this policy."

Sobel is the senior attorney at the Service Members Legal Defense Network in Washington, D.C., which counsels troops being questioned about their sexual orientation.

She said that, as far as she knows, May is the first elected official to be targeted under the military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy. Also unusual, she said, is the fact that the investigation is based on reports in the media that he said he is gay.

The "don't ask, don't tell" policy says that the military shouldn't go out of its way to find out if a service member is gay and that the service member shouldn't be open about it.

Under the policy, the military discharged 1,145 gay people in 1998, up from 997 in 1997.

The policy, adopted in 1993, lets commanders investigate a service member's sexual orientation if there is "credible evidence" the member is gay, has taken part in homosexual conduct or tried to marry someone of the same gender.

During the 1999 legislative session, May, a state representative from east Phoenix, acknowledged in a committee meeting that he is gay, a fact that had come out while he was running for office.

May was called back to active reserve duty in February after the Kosovo crisis blew up. Then, based on his open admissions, the Army began an investigation to see whether he should be kicked out of the service for admitting his homosexuality. It's not known when that investigation will be completed.

May has attended monthly drills as a lieutenant serving as second-in-command of the 484th Transportation Battalion, based in Phoenix.

He is scheduled to attend an informal training session of his unit on Tuesday, and to take part in a two-day drill starting Sept. 10.

His fellow reservists have been sympathetic to his plight, May said.

"What I've gotten is total support from my soldiers and my commander," he said. "It's really been gratifying."

May also said that his constituents have generally told him they care only about his work on issues, not his sexual orientation.

But on Friday, two residents of May's northeast Valley District 26 expressed widely differing views on the lawmaker's possible ouster from the military.

Juanita Lenstrohm, 62, who lives near Roosevelt Street and Scottsdale Road, said she wasn't aware that May is her representative. She does think he should be kicked out of the Reserve because homosexuality "is not God's way," Lenstrohm said.

Sandy Beedle, 59, who lives in the northern reaches of the district near Jackrabbit and Scottsdale roads, called the threat to expel May "a terrible thing."

"I don't think a person should be judged by his sexual preference," Beedle said. "That would not affect his ability as a legislator."

Two conservative lawmakers who serve with May split Friday over whether he should be dumped by the military.

Rep. Karen Johnson, R-Mesa, who clashed with May on Feb. 3 in a debate over her ill-fated bill to deny insurance benefits to gay and unmarried couples, said he should be dumped.

If May wanted a military career, he should have kept quiet about his lifestyle, Johnson said.

"He is an avowed homosexual activist," she said. "He became a legislator to push his homosexual agenda. Every time he stands up, he links it to every issue, and we hear about him and his . . . spouse."

But Rep. Barry Wong, R-north central Phoenix, said a discharge would violate May's right to speak out as a legislator and his constituents' right to be represented by him.

"The House and its lawyers should be defending him," Wong said. "Every member of the House should be concerned."

Republic reporters Carol Sowers and Mike McCloy and the Associated Press contributed to this article.

Associated Press, August 28, 1999

Arizona legislator takes on 'don't ask, don't tell'

By Melanie Carroll, Associated Press, 08/27/99 23:06

NEW YORK (AP) — "Don't ask, don't tell?" Doesn't work.

That's the word from an openly gay Arizona legislator and Army Reserve officer being investigated for discharge by the military.

State Rep. Steve May, in New York for a meeting Friday of the Log Cabin Republicans, a gay political group, called for an end to the military's policy on gays.

"At a time when recruiting and retention is becoming a serious problem, and some members of Congress are discussing a reinstatement of the draft, how much longer will we degrade our military readiness by discharging competent, qualified, trained men and women? ... This policy must come to an end," May said.

A spokesman for the Army Reserve confirmed an investigation of May is under way; it started Aug. 7.

May, 27, was in town for a meeting of the Log Cabin Republicans, a gay political group.

"Today I am facing discharge proceedings because I have refused to lie about who I am," May said. While never discussing his sexual orientation

with military officials, he was open about it when seeking election last year.

Still serving in the Army Reserve once a month, May said he will likely be discharged when the Army's investigation is complete.

Sen. John McCain, a former POW who took his Republican presidential campaign to the Navajo Reservation on Friday, said there is room in the GOP for openly gay representatives but added that he supports the military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy.

"We should in our party refrain from discrimination in any form," McCain said.

As for the Phoenix lawmaker, "he's a fine man," McCain added. "I have the greatest respect for him."

Yet, as a member of the military, May is subject to constraints growing out of the nature of the military service, McCain said. He said that since soldiers must live in place and with people not of their own choosing, the police regarding a soldier's sexual orientation makes sense.

Stacey Sobel, a senior attorney with the Washington-based Service Members Legal Defense Network, is representing May against the Army Reserve. "It's ironic that his qualities of integrity and honesty got him elected in Arizona. Now those qualities are getting him kicked out of the Army Reserve," Sobel said.

Sobel added that since the implementation of "don't ask, don't tell," in 1994 the number of people discharged from the armed services has increased.

"This demonstrates that the policy is not working," Sobel said.

Last year the Army discharged 1,149 members of the armed forces for being gay under "don't ask, don't tell." In 1997, the law forced 997 people out of the military. In 1994, 617 people were dismissed.

May, a lieutenant trained in nuclear, chemical and biological warfare defense, also is qualified as a paratrooper. He is second-in-command of the 348th Transportation Company.

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: winnie stachelberg <winnie.stachelberg@mail.hrc.org> (winnie stachelberg
<winnie.stachelberg@mail.hrc.org> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-AUG-1999 11:03:37.00

SUBJECT: Fwd:

TO: kivers@lcr.org (kivers@lcr.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dbrazile@gorennet.com (dbrazile@gorennet.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: kirk.fordham@mail.house.gov (kirk.fordham@mail.house.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: rtafel@lcr.org (rtafel@lcr.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: TNEVADA@aol.com (TNEVADA@aol.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ccfrancis@aol.com (ccfrancis@aol.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jtrammel@hillandknowlton.com (jtrammel@hillandknowlton.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mtdbos@aol.com (mtdbos@aol.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: spengler@smtp.democrats.org (spengler@smtp.democrats.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: tpotter@wrf.com (tpotter@wrf.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
From The Advocate online, 8/31/99

McCain says Arizona reservist should be discharged
Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), a former POW who took his
Republican
presidential campaign to a Navajo reservation Friday,
said
there is room
in the GOP for openly gay representatives but added
that he

supports the military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy. "We should in our party refrain from discrimination in any form," McCain said. His comments were sparked by a controversy surrounding openly gay state representative Steve May, who is also an Army Reservist and is facing possible discharge as a result of the military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy. "He's a fine man," McCain said of May. "I have the greatest respect for him." Yet as a member of the military, May is subject to constraints growing out of the nature of the military service, McCain said. He said that since soldiers must live in place and with people not of their own choosing, the policy regarding a soldier's sexual orientation makes sense. Stacey Sobel, a senior attorney with the Washington, D.C. ? based Service Members Legal Defense Network, is representing May against the Army Reserve. "It's ironic that his qualities of integrity and honesty got him elected in Arizona. Now those qualities are getting him kicked out of the Army Reserve," Sobel said.

Wendy Howell
Human Rights Campaign PAC
919 18th St., NW, Suite 800, Washington, DC 20006
P: (202)628-4160, F: (202)347-5323
wendy.howell@hrc.org

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)

CREATOR: Heather M. Riley@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-AUG-1999 11:27:00.00

SUBJECT: Don't ask, don't tell.

TO: WOZNIAK_N (WOZNIAK_N@A1@CD) (NSC)
READ: 1-SEP-1999 12:31:15.45

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

TO: BERNSTEIN_MJ (BERNSTEIN_MJ@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: SUNTUM_M (SUNTUM_M@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: OLCOTT_E (OLCOTT_E@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ: 7-SEP-1999 14:27:53.07

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Mark D. Neschis READ:NOT READ	(Mark D. Neschis@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Nanda Chitre READ:NOT READ	(Nanda Chitre@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: James M. Teague READ:NOT READ	(James M. Teague@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Beverly J. Barnes READ:NOT READ	(Beverly J. Barnes@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Mark A. Kitchens READ:NOT READ	(Mark A. Kitchens@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Jason H. Schechter READ:NOT READ	(Jason H. Schechter@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Dorinda A. Salcido READ:NOT READ	(Dorinda A. Salcido@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Sarah E. Gegenheimer READ:NOT READ	(Sarah E. Gegenheimer@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Julie E. Mason READ:NOT READ	(Julie E. Mason@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Kevin S. Moran READ:NOT READ	(Kevin S. Moran@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Nathan B. Naylor READ:NOT READ	(Nathan B. Naylor@OVP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Patrick E. Briggs READ:NOT READ	(Patrick E. Briggs@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: LEAVY_D READ:31-AUG-1999 13:24:48.49	(LEAVY_D@AI@CD@VAXGTWY@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX) (NSC)
TO: Joshua S. Gottheimer READ:NOT READ	(Joshua S. Gottheimer@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Toby C. Graff READ:NOT READ	(Toby C. Graff@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Heather M. Riley READ:NOT READ	(Heather M. Riley@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Richard L. Siewert READ:NOT READ	(Richard L. Siewert@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Michael A. Hammer READ:NOT READ	(Michael A. Hammer@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

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

TO: Erica S. Lepping (Erica S. Lepping@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Karen C. Burchard (Karen C. Burchard@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lindsey E. Huff (Lindsey E. Huff@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Denver R. Peacock (Denver R. Peacock@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jenni R. Engebretsen (Jenni R. Engebretsen@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:
Message Creation Date was at 31-AUG-1999 11:22:00

----- Forwarded by Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP on 08/31/99 11:23
AM -----

Richard Socarides 08/31/99 10:34:00 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP@EOP, Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP, Erica S.
Lepping/WHO/EOP@EOP
cc: Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP@EOP
Subject: Don't ask, don't tell.

Does the President agree with the Vice President's recent criticisms of the
don't ask, don't tell policy?

The President believes that the Department of Defense under the leadership of
Secretary Cohen is committed to the fair enforcement of the policy. That is
not to say, however, that there isn't room for improvement, and that was
implicit in the new guidelines recently issued by the Pentagon.

Does the President believe the policy needs to be changed?

The President believes that the Pentagon is working hard too more fairly
implement the congressionally enacted policy and that that is the appropriate
course.

Does the President support the discharge of Arizona State legislator Steve May?

It would not be appropriate to comment on any specific pending case.

Isn't this the kind of case the Vice President is talking about when he says

the policy needs to be implemented more compassionately?

This case, like every case, has to be reviewed by individual circumstances and the use of common sense. It ,s up to the DOD to do that.

MOHLER: Well, the first issue is I believe God has clearly revealed that it's wrong. Almost every civilization) virtually every civilization throughout time has ruled that it's wrong. We rightly privilege heterosexual relationships. And it has been that way throughout human civilization.

The result of embracing the homosexual lifestyle is cultural chaos, the breakdown of our entire moral order.

It may be popular, but it is not going to work.

KING: Congresswoman Baldwin, are you surprised that this is still a major issue?

BALDWIN: Well, I actually don't know that our panel this evening is necessarily reflective of thought throughout the nation anymore. I think that people like Steve May and others who have become the subject of public discussion have brought us a long way in recognizing that there are honest, hardworking, committed citizens who are engaged in public service. And I think that people are beginning to say enough with the discrimination, both in the civilian job force as well as the military job force.

KING: We'll pick up with Steve May and the panel. And Steve may want to cross-examine some of the panel as well, and the panel may wish to ask questions of him or Martina or Congresswoman Baldwin. They're our guests for the full hour. Your calls will be included. I'm Larry King. Don't go away.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, DECEMBER 19, 1997)

REV. JERRY FALWELL, LIBERTY UNIVERSITY: As a minister of the gospel of Jesus Christ who believes the Bible to be the word of God, of course, I believe that homosexuality is wrong. It's moral perversion.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, APRIL 22)

ELLEN DEGENERES, ACTRESS: You know, I think that people are just scared and have been conditioned to think that we're some kind of freaks, that we live) I hate the term "lifestyle." We don't live a lifestyle. We live a life.

And it's) it's) it's the same as anybody else.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: We're back with our panel.

And I know that Representative May has been chomping at the bit to say something to Reverend Mohler and possibly Congressman Barr, and we'll pick it up from there, but, Steve?

MAY: Well, Larry, I'd have to agree with something Representative Barr said and that is this is about military readiness. This is about defending our nation. When I received those orders from the Pentagon in February of 1999, I knew that I was at risk for being activated for duty in Kosovo. I knew that I was at risk for coming home in a body bag. My mother knew that, my partner knew that. It was something I considered very seriously. But that's my job. That's what I'm trained to do. Gay and lesbian soldiers across the country in our services risk their lives every day in training as well as in actual combat.

KING: Do you disagree) we'll go back to) we'll have Mr. Barr respond in a minute -- but do you disagree with Reverend Mohler, who he said that most of the country agrees with him?

MAY: Oh, he's absolutely incorrect. I don't know which polls he's reading, but all the polls that I've seen show that almost 80 percent of

Americans support employment and non-discrimination so that gays and lesbians aren't fired simply on the basis of their sexual orientation.

KING: Congressman Barr, this man was willing to die for you recently.

BARR: Well, first of all, I would hate for this to degenerate into a battle of statistics. I mean, people use statistics...

KING: But he) no, he's not a statistic. He's Steve May, and he was willing to go to Kosovo...

BARR: Well, that may very well...

KING: He was willing. He's sitting here. It's not a statistic. It's him.

BARR: Well, but he's throwing around statistics and other people are. This is a very real issue. It has nothing to do with statistics.

You're right, Larry. It has to do with military readiness. And while Mr. May may pat himself on the back and think he's a great legislator) I think he said that) the fact of the matter is that I think military leaders like General Norman Schwarzkopf know an awful lot more about military readiness and what happens in units in the Army when the homosexual element is introduced into it than he does. And they say it is incompatible. That has been consistent military doctrine throughout our nation's history. It has served us well and we ought to continue it.

KING: How, then, has America done so well at work since everyone admits there's a lot of gays that have served over the years? Barry Goldwater said many are buried at Normandy.

BARR: Well, that's not really the point, Larry. The fact of the matter is you set a policy and you try to adhere to it. There will always be exceptions to every single rule. That's not the point. The point is you establish a policy based on the guidance of your military leaders, not a particular individual member with an ax to grind. If you start doing that, then you might as well not have military discipline in order to begin with.

KING: Steve, did you want to say something to the congressman or to Reverend Mohler.

MAY: Larry, I've been given instructions by my commanders to continue serving in my position as the executive officer of the 348th Transportation Company in Phoenix, Arizona. On September 10th, I'll go back and train my soldiers. We're going to conduct a truck rodeo...

KING: Unless they throw you out.

MAY: They won't do it that quickly. I'll continue to serve probably for six months to a year before action is taken. We're going to do a truck rodeo to train my soldiers to be better drivers, and I'm going to train my headquarters personnel to receive and issue missions.

KING: And who...

MAY: And that's my job.

KING: And who, Reverend Mohler, is he harming?

MOHLER: Well, I think it is the larger picture of the military. And who he's harming personalizes it in a way that we probably can't even get at here because it's 250 million Americans.

We have to take this issue seriously. In 1991, candidate Bill Clinton said that if elected he would be for homosexuals what Harry Truman was in terms of the race issue. The only reason we have a don't ask-don't tell policy is because President Clinton was unable, given the opposition in the armed forces and in the population at large, to push through his first agenda. So what we have now is a lowest Clinton denominator policy of don't ask, don't tell. It is sound military policy. It is sound moral

policy that homosexuals should not serve in the military.

KING: Congresswoman Baldwin, how would you respond to that?

BALDWIN: Well, precisely the same arguments that the congressman and the reverend are making right now were used before the military integrated along racial lines. These arguments have been used to hold women from all positions of responsibility in the military historically, and of course women have made some tremendous advances.

We've heard these arguments time and time again about incompatibility for military service, and we've proven them wrong time and time again. And I think this case and the many other cases that are out there continue to erode the wisdom of don't ask, don't tell. It makes no sense.

KING: Martina, when you started to feel this affection for the same sex, did you think to yourself, is this wrong? I mean, when you have a feeling...

NAVRATILOVA: Well, I knew it wasn't exactly popular.

KING: But obviously, did you start to examine your) did you say, why is this? Did you ever examine the choice? If it wasn't a choice, why it happened to you?

NAVRATILOVA: It wasn't a choice. It was like this) this is who I am. And this is what) this is what is going to complete my life. It was not anything that I thought about ahead of time. But when it happened, I was like, oh, that's what it's about.

KING: All right. And are you shocked to hear...

NAVRATILOVA: Absolutely not a choice.

KING: Are you shocked to hear what you hear here tonight? In other words...

NAVRATILOVA: I've heard it all before. I am just, again, surprised that educated people keep making these statements.

I would like to ask Steve May a question. Isn't it true that the reason homosexuality is supposedly not compatible with military service is because it makes the heterosexual soldiers very uncomfortable because of comments like these that we've been hearing tonight?

BARR: That's not true.

MAY: That is...

BARR: That's not the reason.

KING: Well, you were in) Steve, you're the gay person in the military. Do you think that's the reason? Because it makes heterosexuals uncomfortable?

MAY: Well, it may make some heterosexuals uncomfortable, but frankly, Larry, some white people are uncomfortable living and sleeping with black people and vice versa. We continue...

KING: Still?

NAVRATILOVA: Exactly. That doesn't make it right.

MAY: We continue to have race problems in the military, but the military has a culture which has worked very hard to prevent or try to mitigate the problems of race and gender integration. However, the military has worked very hard to promote the problems dealing with homosexuals in the service, to promote homophobia, harassment and even violence against gay service members.

KING: You certainly don't support violence, Congressman Barr, against gays because they're gay?

BARR: No, that's...

KING: What do you think happens to) what would happen to Steve in the military that concerns you about readiness and Steve? What could

happen to him that would make you concerned?

BARR: No, none of us on this problem condone violence. And that's not the issue here at all. That's a red herring. What concerns me is the same thing that concerns our military leaders like General Schwarzkopf. And that is that in the military you have to have absolute, strict, immediate adherence to commands. You can't have loyalties from one soldier to another, whereas homosexuals...

KING: All right, but gays) gays would not respond to commands? Is that the point? I don't understand.

MAY: My soldiers obey my commands, and I follow those of my commanders.

BARR: The point is when you have a homosexual officer or a homosexual enlisted man and you interject them into a small cohesive military unit, they begin to either develop bonds or animosities with other soldiers. That is a proven fact. General Norman Schwarzkopf, who is from West Point and led this nation to victory in Desert Storm, is not lying when he says that. He know knows what he's talking about, Larry...

KING: Don't...

BARR: Lieutenant May has an ax to grind...

KING: Forgive...

BARR: ... He doesn't know.

KING: Forgive my ignorance. Don't bonds and animosities develop among heterosexual soldiers?

BARR: Well, there are always going to be bonds and animosities...

KING: So?

BARR: ... but history has proved that it accelerates and it expands...

KING: You mean...

BARR: ... with the homosexual element.

KING: ... gays bond more and are more demonstrative. This is a fact?

BARR: Well, now that) yes, that is. That is what) and they have testified, Larry, these generals have testified before Congress to that. They have brought experts in. And I agree with the pastor...

KING: How do you...

BARR: ... It's ridiculous that we have these arguments, but they have proven it to me.

KING: All right, how do you respond, Steve, to his) Schwarzkopf is a military hero. He's certainly not a regressive man. Colin Powell) how do you respond?

MAY: Well, the issue is, again) in militaries across the world and in history since) all recorded history, gays have served in the military. Ultimately this is about...

KING: Now how do you respond to respected generals who are opposed to your position?

MAY: They've never done studies. The generals haven't worked with contemporary American soldiers in maybe 30 years. I work with troops. I work in the trenches with the troops, and I've been doing it since 1993.

BARR: Norman Schwarzkopf hasn't worked with contemporary soldiers? What nonsense is that?

MAY: Well I don't know when the last time you were in the service was, Representative, but I serve with soldiers today. And soldiers support me and I support them. And that) the real issue here is asking...

BARR: No, you just tried to say that General Schwarzkopf hadn't

worked with real soldiers. What are you talking about?

KING: Yes, you said that...

MAY: No, he...

BALDWIN: I'd like to interject.

KING: All right, go ahead. Tammy, go ahead.

BALDWIN: Yes, actually, when the policy was brought into question back in 1993, the Pentagon, the Congress did look to some research on whether a policy change would be in order and actually conducted a study (act) asked the Rand Corporation to look at this issue. And they came out resoundingly with their conclusions and recommendations to Congress and the military that the policy, the prohibition on gays in the military be stricken. And it was ignored by the body that examined those results, but they in fact did ask for research, and they did ask for recommendations.

KING: All right, I've got to...

BALDWIN: And it was pretty strong.

KING: I got to get a break here. We'll come back. We'll include your phone calls.

Don't go away.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: We'll include some phone calls. Hanover, Germany, hello.

CALLER: Yes. Hello, Larry.

KING: Hi.

CALLER: Thank you for taking my call.

KING: Sure.

CALLER: My question is for Representative May. Now, I was discharged in 1984 after 18 years, 364 days, which is one day before presidential intervention would have been required.

KING: What's your question?

CALLER: Basically because I was homosexual. I was on the list for E-8...

KING: What's the question?

CALLER: ... with a special recommendation as first sergeant.

KING: What's the question?

CALLER: And my question to Representative May is, what would you do in this case? You would be discharged. And we're sitting here, all of us...

KING: What is your question!

(CROSSTALK)

CALLER: and condemned.

KING: OK. If you're discharged.

MAY: Well, I think this is, again, it's about living your life with integrity. And that's the situation I'm in, and this gentleman...

(CROSSTALK)

KING: He's saying you may be discharged.

MAY: He's saying I'll also be discharged and so I will. But my...

KING: Would it be dishonorably discharged?

MAY: I don't know if I would be dishonorably discharged. Most service members now who are prosecuted under don't-ask/don't-tell are discharged honorably.

But you know, the issue is I was called back into active service by my country during the crisis in Kosovo and I responded to the orders.

KING: Do you get mad then when you hear Congressman Barr or Reverend Mohler?

MAY: Well, I think it's offensive. I think it's a poor choice of

words.

I was called back by my country. I didn't ask to go back in. I'm not trying to make a statement. I have work to do back in my district.

I was called to serve in uniform and I was willing to die for my country.

I do not have an ax to grind.

KING: Reverend Mohler, don't you appreciate that on Mr. May's part?

MOHLER: Well, without any doubt. Just talking to him here by means of this program, I can see much in Representative May that is very honorable and that would be admirable, certainly his willingness to serve his country. That really isn't the issue here. Not everyone who's willing to serve or even demonstrates that kind of courage under fire should serve the country. There are other issues involved here.

The military has said that there is the priority of unit cohesion, which is absolutely essential in warfare. It is the generals) just as Representative Barr has said) the consensus of military authorities who have said that homosexuality intrudes into that and violates that in a way that they feel would hamper our military effectiveness.

But this is an agenda, Larry, that is being pushed by activists. It is being pushed on the Boy Scouts, as we have seen just recently, and being pushed here in the military.

KING: By whom? By whom?

MOHLER: This is just a part of the picture.

Well, the homosexual movement. And that's not a conspiracy theory. They're very public about the demands they are now making for special rights, for what is called the nondiscrimination rights. But basically, homosexuality...

KING: By the way, you don't...

MOHLER: is not a favorable characteristic.

KING: You don't favor discrimination, do you, Reverend?

MOHLER: Well, we all favor some kind of moral discrimination. The question is what kind...

KING: You do?

MOHLER: ... of discrimination. Well, certainly. There are different levels of that. You certainly would want to discriminate against child molesters working at a preschool.

The real issues is all of us discriminate in some sense. Where should we discriminate and on what issues?

As a Christian minister, I have to go by the holy scriptures. And on this issue, I believe the vast majority of Americans clearly are in agreement, we should discriminate.

NAVRATILOVA: OK. How) how) I would like to ask the reverend, how would you discriminate against me? What's OK to discriminate against me? Tell me please.

MOHLER: Well, I don't know what exactly you would wish to do, but you mentioned privileging your partnership as marriage and that just simply should not happen. No civilized society can recognize homosexual partnerships on a par with heterosexual marriage. That is just impossible.

KING: I have got to get a break. We'll be right back with more calls. Don't go away.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, DECEMBER 16, 1997)

CHASTITY BONO, GAY-LESBIAN ACTIVIST: When you're promoting this anti-gay agenda, you are literally killing people. We have three times

higher rate of suicide for gay youth. It encourages gay bashing. It has an effect on people's lives.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, MAY 7, 1997)

CALLER: What is your view on homosexuality and the impact it has on society, especially with TV promoting it with the new "Ellen" episode?

KING: Do you have a problem with that, Billy?

REV. BILLY GRAHAM: I think everybody has a problem with that. The Bible calls it a sin, but the Bible also calls jealousy or pride a sin. And there are many, many sins, but there's only one sin. And the real sin that we have is in our hearts and it produces all kinds of effects. And that is one of the sins.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: Toronto, hello.

CALLER: Hi. As an outsider, this discussion is odd and somewhat humorous. For me, I see the U.S.A. has fought in wars and protected human rights for years, and I'm sure that included gay men and women. My question is for Mr. May. Why are you a member of a party, the Republican Party, which generally does not generally support gay rights issues?

KING: Mr. Barr and you are in the same party.

MAY: Yes, and I'm sure Mr. Barr and I agree on many, many issues, primarily, of course, fiscal issues. But the Republican Party isn't the party of homophobia. It's not the party that opposes gay people in American society. Yes, there are some people like Representative Barr and some others who have really hijacked our party and gotten us away from our mainstream values that made our party great...

BARR: Oh, come on now Mr. May.

MAY: We're the party of Lincoln, the party of Roosevelt. We believe in limited government, not more government. So there's

BARR: I know you think you're a great legislator and a great military strategist, but the fact of the matter is...

KING: He didn't say that.

MAY: I never said that.

BARR: ... you know) well, you complimented yourself extensively at the beginning. But be that as it may, the fact of the matter is this is not a matter of your great integrity. If you were so full of integrity, you would recognize that the federal law prohibits the practice of homosexuality in the military, and it prohibits homosexuals in the military. That is the law. It was passed in 1994...

MAY: Well...

BARR: ... So if you were so full of this...

MAY: Congressman...

BARR: ... almighty integrity that you keep talking about, you would then resign out of the military if you want to protect your integrity. Otherwise you're violating the law.

MAY: Congressman, my nation called me when we were at war in Kosovo.

BARR: You've told us that 15 times already.

MAY: And I reported for duty as ordered.

This issue really is about honesty and integrity, Larry, and this is the problem in America today. There aren't many politicians who have honesty and integrity. But I was trained, I was taught these values as an Eagle Scout...

BARR: Only you do, of course.

MAY: ... I was taught these values as an Eagle Scout) I hope you would too) as a member of my church, by my parents. These are values that I hold very dear: honesty, integrity, duty, honor, country. And I will not surrender those values.

KING: We'll take a break, be back with our remaining moments. We'll get a comment from everyone on the panel.

Don't go away.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: Get a closing comment from everybody but first a quick call from Atlanta) hello.

CALLER: Hello.

KING: Yes.

CALLER: I'd like to get a response from Mr. Barr. Why) why do you believe that -- what is the basic fundamental reason that we don't allow gays in the military?

BARR: Well, I...

KING: Is there a fundamental reason?

BARR: The fundamental reason is that when you interject homosexuality, which creates bonds between men that can be very, very strong, you interject an element that interferes with the chain of command and the absolute adherence to orders that might contradict a personal relationship that's developed.

KING: Martina, as we approach the year 2000, from your standpoint, do you think things are going to get better or worse?

NAVRATILOVA: Things are going to get better. Just because some things are law doesn't make them right. We have to remember that interracial marriage was illegal in the country until 1967. That's not so long ago.

This is about social change. It's going to happen. The question is whether the military is going to lead the way or is going to follow.

KING: Reverend Mohler, your final thoughts?

MOHLER: Well, Larry, I believe that homosexuality is one of the great moral challenges facing this nation. The decisions we make on this issue are going to shape the future of our country. We will either order our society by God's law or contravene that law and face the consequences.

But the last word has to be that in the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ there is the means of overcoming all sin, including the sin of homosexuality.

And so that last word has to be a word of grace and hope.

KING: And you do love the homosexual, do you not?

MOHLER: Yes, we're told to love the sinner and to hate the sin. And the first act of really loving someone is to tell them the truth. And we believe that scripture reveals the truth about homosexuality, and it is an act of love to tell people what God has said about that sin.

KING: Congresswoman Baldwin, is Congress going to pass or defeat the hate crime and employment discrimination legislation?

BALDWIN: Well, I certainly think that we're making some strong progress and that it's high time, especially after recent hearings in the House and Senate Judiciary committees, to pass the Hate Crimes Prevention Act.

I'm encouraged. I believe that we are seeing a time in our nation where people, you know, they've heard these arguments that we've heard tonight recycled when we had racial segregation. We've heard it time and time again in our country, and people are saying discrimination is wrong

and it's time that we ended it in all employment.

KING: Congressman Barr, when there were laws against interracial marriage, were you opposed to them?

BARR: Absolutely, because that is a very clear unconstitutional limitation. The Supreme Court has...

KING: But there were laws?

BARR: Pardon?

KING: States had laws that...

BARR: But I was opposed to those laws and in support of laws that overturned them because it represents a fundamental rejection of constitutional principles.

There is no fundamental constitutional principle or right to homosexual activity. The Supreme Court has said that...

KING: Well said.

BARR: ... consistently, the military has maintained it, and Lieutenant May notwithstanding and Miss Baldwin notwithstanding, that remains the law of the land.

KING: Only have ten seconds. Everybody has been well-spoken.

Representative May, do you think they're going to toss you out?

MAY: Larry, I don't know what they're going to do, but I'm proud to serve my country. I'll keep doing my job until they discharge me. The choice is really up to the Army. I made my choice. That is to serve my country in uniform as I was ordered to do so.

KING: Thank you, Steve.

MAY: Thanks, Larry.

KING: Thanks to all our guests.

David Frost tomorrow. Thanks for joining us from Washington. Good night.

"This policy must come to an end."

Before the news conference, May's story was picked up by the New York Times and the national talk shows. May has done interviews with Good Morning America and MSNBC and is scheduled to do The Larry King Show on Monday.

May told The Arizona Republic that the publicity caught him unawares while he was visiting New York on business and to attend a convention of the Log Cabin Republicans, a gay group.

"I'm very surprised," May said. "This isn't my issue. . . . I was ordered back into the service, I put a uniform on. I'm trying to do my job. And the military has taken an action, not me."

May's situation is the latest to cast doubt on the wisdom of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy, said his lawyer, Stacey Sobel.

"Because of the unusual nature of his case, he is receiving a lot of publicity," Sobel said. "But the fact is, he's just one of many people who have had their careers jeopardized because of this policy."

Sobel is the senior attorney at the Service Members Legal Defense Network in Washington, D.C., which counsels troops being questioned about their sexual orientation.

She said that, as far as she knows, May is the first elected official to be targeted under the military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy. Also unusual, she said, is the fact that the investigation is based on reports in the media that he said he is gay.

The "don't ask, don't tell" policy says that the military shouldn't go out of its way to find out if a service member is gay and that the service member shouldn't be open about it.

Under the policy, the military discharged 1,145 gay people in 1998, up from 997 in 1997.

The policy, adopted in 1993, lets commanders investigate a service member's sexual orientation if there is "credible evidence" the member is gay, has taken part in homosexual conduct or tried to marry someone of the same gender.

During the 1999 legislative session, May, a state representative from east Phoenix, acknowledged in a committee meeting that he is gay, a fact that had come out while he was running for office.

May was called back to active reserve duty in February after the Kosovo crisis blew up. Then, based on his open admissions, the Army began an investigation to see whether he should be kicked out of the service for admitting his homosexuality. It's not known when that investigation will be completed.

May has attended monthly drills as a lieutenant serving as second-in-command of the 484th Transportation Battalion, based in Phoenix.

He is scheduled to attend an informal training session of his unit on Tuesday, and to take part in a two-day drill starting Sept. 10.

His fellow reservists have been sympathetic to his plight, May said.

"What I've gotten is total support from my soldiers and my commander," he said. "It's really been gratifying."

May also said that his constituents have generally told him they care only about his work on issues, not his sexual orientation.

But on Friday, two residents of May's northeast Valley District 26 expressed widely differing views on the lawmaker's possible ouster from the military.

Juanita Lenstrohm, 62, who lives near Roosevelt Street and Scottsdale Road, said she wasn't aware that May is her representative. She does think he should be kicked out of the Reserve because homosexuality "is not

"Today I am facing discharge proceedings because I have refused to lie about who I am," May said. While never discussing his sexual orientation with military officials, he was open about it when seeking election last year.

Still serving in the Army Reserve once a month, May said he will likely be discharged when the Army's investigation is complete.

Sen. John McCain, a former POW who took his Republican presidential campaign to the Navajo Reservation on Friday, said there is room in the GOP for openly gay representatives but added that he supports the military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy.

"We should in our party refrain from discrimination in any form," McCain said.

As for the Phoenix lawmaker, "he's a fine man," McCain added. "I have the greatest respect for him."

Yet, as a member of the military, May is subject to constraints growing out of the nature of the military service, McCain said. He said that since soldiers must live in place and with people not of their own choosing, the police regarding a soldier's sexual orientation makes sense.

Stacey Sobel, a senior attorney with the Washington-based Service Members Legal Defense Network, is representing May against the Army Reserve.

"It's ironic that his qualities of integrity and honesty got him elected in Arizona. Now those qualities are getting him kicked out of the Army Reserve," Sobel said.

Sobel added that since the implementation of "don't ask, don't tell," in 1994 the number of people discharged from the armed services has increased.

"This demonstrates that the policy is not working," Sobel said.

Last year the Army discharged 1,149 members of the armed forces for being gay under "don't ask, don't tell." In 1997, the law forced 997 people out of the military. In 1994, 617 people were dismissed.

May, a lieutenant trained in nuclear, chemical and biological warfare defense, also is qualified as a paratrooper. He is second-in-command of the 348th Transportation Company.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: slate3-errors+emrich_t+a1.eop.gov@bounce.exactis.com@INET@LNGTWY (slate3-errors+emrich_t+a1.eop.gov@bounce.exactis.com@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-AUG-1999 07:14:32.00

SUBJECT: SLATE NEWS: Tues., Aug. 31, 1999

TO: Timothy W. Emrich@eop (Timothy W. Emrich@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
SLATE NEWS: Tues., Aug. 31, 1999

--today's papers: Pop Culture

today's papers

Pop Culture

By Scott Shuger

The newest statistics on the spread and lethality of AIDS lead at the WP, LAT and USAT. The NYT fronts the story but goes instead with AT&T's decision to respond to MCI's and Sprint's recent 5 cents/minute (plus monthly fee) plans with a 7 cents/minute (plus monthly fee) option. The phone news is on nobody else's front page.

The multiple AIDS stories are prompted by the government's release of new numbers at a national HIV conference in Atlanta. Every paper's main takeaway is the same: the steep decline in new AIDS cases and in AIDS deaths that began three years ago, and which is associated with the emergence of the multiple medication anti-AIDS "cocktails," has leveled off appreciably. New AIDS cases declined 18 percent in 1997, but only 11 percent last year. AIDS deaths, which dropped 42 percent in 1997, declined just 20 percent last year.

This means that, in the words of the top HIV official at the CDC, quoted by USAT, "There is no magic bullet." Prevention, she says, is turning out to be more important for controlling the spread of the disease than treatment.

The papers pass along the experts' consensus for why anti-AIDS success is flattening out: There is a saturation effect in which most people who know they're infected with HIV are already taking the more powerful cocktail therapies; HIV seems to be gaining some resistance to the therapies; and the strict regimen that optimizes

their effectiveness is hard to stick to. Another factor that the WP emphasizes more than the others and high up to boot is that excessive confidence in the therapies may be prompting people to practice more unsafe sex. The Post, NYT and WSJ note that drug users and black people account for higher rates of infection. In 1998, note the two Times, blacks, who represent 13 percent of the population, accounted for 49 percent of all AIDS deaths. The WSJ is alone in mentioning the strikingly good news about infantile AIDS--there were only 242 cases last year, down 73 percent from 1992.

The USAT off-lead reports that senior U.S. law enforcement officials now say that Bank of New York records that would have served as evidence of the laundering of billions in Russian mob money have been tampered with or destroyed. An inside story at the NYT reports that on Russian television Monday night, a Russian investigator said that he had evidence of bribes paid to Kremlin officials and members of Boris Yeltsin's family by Mabetex, a Swiss-based construction company.

A NYT front-pager reviews the blooming of open "God-talk" among presidential hopefuls, seeing in it an efficient way to flash distance from the squalor of the Clinton scandals. The story notes that the new public piety seems to have unwritten rules: it's apparently a political plus for Protestants only. And just having opinions about religious matters isn't enough--an atheist, no matter how earnest, would, says a historian quoted in the piece, still get slaughtered.

A story on page 15 of the LAT reports that Al Gore has given an interview to the gay-oriented magazine The Advocate in which he says the "don't ask, don't tell" rules in the military governing the service of gays "aren't working the way they were intended to work," and that he would work with military leaders to bring about an implementation strategy that's "fairer." The story reminds that the policy was a major headache for the Clinton administration in its earliest days. And that until now, Republican candidates have largely ignored it. In addition, the paper reports, Bill Bradley has responded to Gore's interview by taking a position "aggressively to Gore's left," expressing grave doubts about the current policy, and saying that we ought to move toward a time "when gays can serve openly in the military."

The NYT and WP go inside with a new survey of teenagers indicating that low paternal involvement with a teen is a key determinant of adolescent substance abuse. A teenager with an excellent relationship with a single mom, the study says, has a far better chance of avoiding drug abuse than does one living in a two-parent household including a diffident father.

The WSJ reports on a new version of SAT scoring being developed by the ETS folks. The idea is to incorporate certain sociological background factors-- such as English isn't his/her first language, he/she went to a crappy high school, is from a poor family

etc.--about the student, to come up with a likely score range for him or her, and if the person's actual score exceeds the likely one by at least 200 points, then the applicant is identified by admissions personnel as in the valued category of "Striver." The ETS is preparing race-blind and race-sensitive versions. The idea is that this would enable the identification of talented minority students in a way that will survive the recent negative rulings about affirmative action in admissions. But the piece isn't too clear on why this would work. Doesn't it just transfer the legally dubious extra-academic evaluations from the admissions committee to the test designers?

Sometimes you just know the editors are messin' with ya. The WP's "Names and Faces" column reports that Monica Lewinsky would like to launch her own lipstick line and recently tested the staying power of various lipsticks. She says, according to the Post, "the secret is opening your mouth 'really wide' when eating."

Click here to share your opinion of this article and see what others have said:

<http://bbs.slate.com/bbs/slate-todayspapers/index.asp>

Also in today's Slate <http://www.slate.com>

Choosing Your Beer: James Fallows Brings Science to One of Life's Key Decisions

<http://www.slate.com/Shopping/99-08-30/Shopping.asp>

Chatterbox: The World's Deadliest Vacations

<http://www.slate.com/Code/chatterbox/chatterbox.asp?Show=8/27/99&idMessage=3509>

Diary of an Internet Startup

<http://www.slate.com/diary/99-08-30/diary.asp>

Click here to share your opinion of this article and see what others have said:

<http://bbs.slate.com/bbs/slate-internatpapers/index.asp>

The Internet's informed look at politics and culture -- SLATE. What Matters. (<http://www.slate.com>)

SLATE offers a variety of e-mail delivery services that enable you to get your favorite SLATE articles delivered right to your in-box. Go to <http://www.slate.com/Code/Reg3/emailservices.asp> and see

what's available to both SLATE subscribers and non-subscribers.

For additional information about SLATE, go to
<http://www.slate.com/code/reg3/memberservices.asp> for SLATE Reader
Services.

This delivery powered by Exactis.com <http://www.exactis.com>

Copyright (c) 1999 Microsoft and/or its suppliers. All rights
reserved.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-AUG-1999 10:34:07.00

SUBJECT: Don't ask, don't tell.

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Does the President agree with the Vice President's recent criticisms of the don't ask, don't tell policy?

The President believes that the Department of Defense under the leadership of Secretary Cohen is committed to the fair enforcement of the policy. That is not to say, however, that there isn't room for improvement, and that was implicit in the new guidelines recently issued by the Pentagon.

Does the President believe the policy needs to be changed?

The President believes that the Pentagon is working hard too more fairly implement the congressionally enacted policy and that that is the appropriate course.

Does the President support the discharge of Arizona State legislator Steve May?

It would not be appropriate to comment on any specific pending case.

Isn't this the kind of case the Vice President is talking about when he says the policy needs to be implemented more compassionately?

This case, like every case, has to be reviewed by individual circumstances and the use of common sense. It's up to the DOD to do that.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Heather M. Riley@EOP@LNGTWY@LNGTWY (Heather M. Riley@EOP@LNGTWY@LNGTWY [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-AUG-1999 11:25:40.00

SUBJECT: Don't ask, don't tell.

TO: Mark J. Bernstein@eop (Mark J. Bernstein@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Message Creation Date was at 31-AUG-1999 11:22:00

----- Forwarded by Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP on 08/31/99
11:23
AM -----

Richard Socarides 08/31/99 10:34:00 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP@EOP, Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP, Erica S. Lepping/WHO/EOP@EOP
cc: Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP@EOP
Subject: Don't ask, don't tell.

Does the President agree with the Vice President's recent criticisms of the don't ask, don't tell policy?

The President believes that the Department of Defense under the leadership of Secretary Cohen is committed to the fair enforcement of the policy. That is not to say, however, that there isn't room for improvement, and that was implicit in the new guidelines recently issued by the Pentagon.

Does the President believe the policy needs to be changed?

The President believes that the Pentagon is working hard too more fairly implement the congressionally enacted policy and that that is the appropriate course.

Does the President support the discharge of Arizona State legislator Steve May?

It would not be appropriate to comment on any specific pending case.

Isn't this the kind of case the Vice President is talking about when he says the policy needs to be implemented more compassionately?

This case, like every case, has to be reviewed by individual circumstances and the use of common sense. It's up to the DOD to do that.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-AUG-1999 11:33:47.00

SUBJECT: Re: Don't Ask, Don't Tell

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

sure

Edward W. Correia

08/31/99 10:21:43 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Cheryl D. Mills/WHO/EOP@EOP

cc:

Subject: Don't Ask, Don't Tell

As you may have seen, the VP has made some statements recently regarding Don't Ask, Don't Tell. I think it might be a good idea to invite Charles or Lisa or someone from his office to our 4:30 to bring them up to speed. OK?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Slate Magazine <delivery_morning@slate.com> (Slate Magazine <delivery_morning@slate.com> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-AUG-1999 07:23:44.00

SUBJECT: SLATE NEWS: Tues., Aug. 31, 1999

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

TEXT:
SLATE NEWS: Tues., Aug. 31, 1999

--today's papers: Pop Culture

today's papers

Pop Culture

By Scott Shuger

The newest statistics on the spread and lethality of AIDS lead at the WP, LAT and USAT. The NYT fronts the story but goes instead with AT&T's decision to respond to MCI's and Sprint's recent 5 cents/minute (plus monthly fee) plans with a 7 cents/minute (plus monthly fee) option. The phone news is on nobody else's front page.

The multiple AIDS stories are prompted by the government's release of new numbers at a national HIV conference in Atlanta. Every paper's main takeaway is the same: the steep decline in new AIDS cases and in AIDS deaths that began three years ago, and which is associated with the emergence of the multiple medication anti-AIDS "cocktails," has leveled off appreciably. New AIDS cases declined 18 percent in 1997, but only 11 percent last year. AIDS deaths, which dropped 42 percent in 1997, declined just 20 percent last year.

This means that, in the words of the top HIV official at the CDC, quoted by USAT, "There is no magic bullet." Prevention, she says, is turning out to be more important for controlling the spread of the disease than treatment.

The papers pass along the experts' consensus for why anti-AIDS success is flattening out: There is a saturation effect in which most people who know they're infected with HIV are already taking the more powerful cocktail therapies; HIV seems to be gaining some resistance to the therapies; and the strict regimen that optimizes

their effectiveness is hard to stick to. Another factor that the WP emphasizes more than the others and high up to boot is that excessive confidence in the therapies may be prompting people to practice more unsafe sex. The Post, NYT and WSJ note that drug users and black people account for higher rates of infection. In 1998, note the two Times, blacks, who represent 13 percent of the population, accounted for 49 percent of all AIDS deaths. The WSJ is alone in mentioning the strikingly good news about infantile AIDS--there were only 242 cases last year, down 73 percent from 1992.

The USAT off-lead reports that senior U.S. law enforcement officials now say that Bank of New York records that would have served as evidence of the laundering of billions in Russian mob money have been tampered with or destroyed. An inside story at the NYT reports that on Russian television Monday night, a Russian investigator said that he had evidence of bribes paid to Kremlin officials and members of Boris Yeltsin's family by Mabetex, a Swiss-based construction company.

A NYT front-pager reviews the blooming of open "God-talk" among presidential hopefuls, seeing in it an efficient way to flash distance from the squalor of the Clinton scandals. The story notes that the new public piety seems to have unwritten rules: it's apparently a political plus for Protestants only. And just having opinions about religious matters isn't enough--an atheist, no matter how earnest, would, says a historian quoted in the piece, still get slaughtered.

A story on page 15 of the LAT reports that Al Gore has given an interview to the gay-oriented magazine The Advocate in which he says the "don't ask, don't tell" rules in the military governing the service of gays "aren't working the way they were intended to work," and that he would work with military leaders to bring about an implementation strategy that's "fairer." The story reminds that the policy was a major headache for the Clinton administration in its earliest days. And that until now, Republican candidates have largely ignored it. In addition, the paper reports, Bill Bradley has responded to Gore's interview by taking a position "aggressively to Gore's left," expressing grave doubts about the current policy, and saying that we ought to move toward a time "when gays can serve openly in the military."

The NYT and WP go inside with a new survey of teenagers indicating that low paternal involvement with a teen is a key determinant of adolescent substance abuse. A teenager with an excellent relationship with a single mom, the study says, has a far better chance of avoiding drug abuse than does one living in a two-parent household including a diffident father.

The WSJ reports on a new version of SAT scoring being developed by the ETS folks. The idea is to incorporate certain sociological background factors-- such as English isn't his/her first language, he/she went to a crappy high school, is from a poor family

etc.--about the student, to come up with a likely score range for him or her, and if the person's actual score exceeds the likely one by at least 200 points, then the applicant is identified by admissions personnel as in the valued category of "Striver." The ETS is preparing race-blind and race-sensitive versions. The idea is that this would enable the identification of talented minority students in a way that will survive the recent negative rulings about affirmative action in admissions. But the piece isn't too clear on why this would work. Doesn't it just transfer the legally dubious extra-academic evaluations from the admissions committee to the test designers?

Sometimes you just know the editors are messin' with ya. The WP's "Names and Faces" column reports that Monica Lewinsky would like to launch her own lipstick line and recently tested the staying power of various lipsticks. She says, according to the Post, "the secret is opening your mouth 'really wide' when eating."

Click here to share your opinion of this article and see what others have said:
<http://bbs.slate.com/bbs/slate-todayspapers/index.asp>

Also in today's Slate <http://www.slate.com>

Choosing Your Beer: James Fallows Brings Science to One of Life's Key Decisions
<http://www.slate.com/Shopping/99-08-30/Shopping.asp>

Chatterbox: The World's Deadliest Vacations
<http://www.slate.com/Code/chatterbox/chatterbox.asp?Show=8/27/99&idMessage=3509>

Diary of an Internet Startup
<http://www.slate.com/diary/99-08-30/diary.asp>

Click here to share your opinion of this article and see what others have said:
<http://bbs.slate.com/bbs/slate-internatpapers/index.asp>

The Internet's informed look at politics and culture -- SLATE. What Matters. (<http://www.slate.com>)

SLATE offers a variety of e-mail delivery services that enable you to get your favorite SLATE articles delivered right to your in-box. Go to <http://www.slate.com/Code/Reg3/emailservices.asp> and see

what's available to both SLATE subscribers and non-subscribers.

For additional information about SLATE, go to
<http://www.slate.com/code/reg3/memberservices.asp> for SLATE Reader
Services.

This delivery powered by Exactis.com <http://www.exactis.com>

Copyright (c) 1999 Microsoft and/or its suppliers. All rights
reserved.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-AUG-1999 16:05:03.00

SUBJECT: Don't Ask, Don't Tell Meeting -- TODAY

TO: Peter Rundlet (CN=Peter Rundlet/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles W. Burson (CN=Charles W. Burson/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

We'll have to reschedule the meeting for today at 4:30. Sorry.

STEVE MAY (R), ARIZONA STATE HOUSE: I'm a soldier. I'm a legislator. I have chosen to live my life with integrity. Because of the legislature,

I'm visible. Because of my integrity, I have created a conflict.

That doesn't make me a gay activist. That makes me an honest soldier and a good legislator.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

KING: Steve May joins us here in Washington. We'll have a panel, as we told you, join us later. This got a lot of nationwide, international attention with a front-page story last week in The New York Times. And in today's "New York Times," on the editorial page, a major editorial, is bigotry in the military.

And about this case, it says: "But better training will not prevent absurd outcomes. The case of Steve May, a Republican state legislator, shows how irrational the policy is. Mr. May is gay and made reference to his own orientation when debating a bill about health insures. He is now under investigation and may be discharged from the military."

Are you shocked by all this?

MAY: Larry, the story is really absurd, and I think my case does show uniquely how absurd the policy is. Don't-ask/don't-tell simply doesn't work.

KING: Was it well-known that you were gay?

MAY: I have been open about my sexual orientation with my constituents for three years. I ran for office first in 1996.

KING: So you were elected to the legislature with the constituency knowing you were gay?

MAY: Absolutely.

KING: And that is a conservative Republican (UNINTELLIGIBLE)?

MAY: Correct.

KING: I mean, what's that? Scottsdale?

MAY: Scottsdale, Paradise Valley, East Phoenix, the Biltmore-Arcadia area.

KING: Are you basically a conservative Republican?

MAY: Absolutely. In fact, no one has ever challenged those credentials at all.

KING: What was the debate about in February that caused you to mention it on the floor of the House?

MAY: One of the other representatives had offered a bill which would have prevented cities from implementing domestic partnership benefits. These were cities whose voters had already decided to offer these benefits to their own city employees, and she basically wanted to prevent the cities from implementing the voter-approved plan.

KING: So you got up and spoke against her and the plan, right?

MAY: Correct.

KING: And blasted the) some of the conservatives in your own party as well?

MAY: Well, just the particular ones who use very ugly personal attacks against me, my family and my constituents.

KING: They were saying it on the floor of the House?

MAY: Oh, yes. It was offensive.

KING: Like what?

MAY: That homosexuals) excuse me. That homosexuals were at the lower end of the behavior spectrum, that homosexuality leads to bestiality, animal sacrifice and cannibalism) just amazingly disgusting terms.

KING: By the way, we have invited) had invited representatives from the United States military to appear with us tonight and they declined.

When were you in active duty?

MAY: I was active-duty for two years, three months and eight days.

KING: When?

MAY: From May of 1993 to August of 1995. And then I was on an inactive status, not at all involved in the military.

KING: Are you an officer?

MAY: I'm an officer. I'm a first lieutenant.

KING: Why don't you just quit?

MAY: Well, it's not that easy. I was not in the military, of course, for 3 1/2 years. And then when the Kosovo crisis heated up, I was sent orders to report for duty and I did. That was my obligation as a soldier. I can't refuse orders when the nation's at war.

KING: Did you go?

MAY: So I did. I pulled my uniform out of the attic and went back to an active Reserve unit. And that's what I've been doing now since April.

KING: Well, if it's don't-ask/don't-tell and you'd already told, how did they not know?

MAY: That's the great) I'm confused too, Larry. When I first got orders to report back in for duty, I was confused. And every month that I went there and served) April, May, June and July) prior to them conducting their investigation, I was confused, because I had been open and honest about my life publicly now for three years.

KING: So did someone contact the Army to say you should be tossed out and used as an example your speech on the House floor?

MAY: My commander told me that she had received a complaint) and she wouldn't tell me who it came from) but a complaint with a copy of a newspaper article that talked about my sexual orientation.

KING: That domestic thing calls for what? If two homosexual partners are living together, one gets the benefits of hospitalization and the like?

MAY: Well, it would have allowed employees...

KING: Like a married couple?

MAY: It would have allowed employees of the state to access the health insurance benefits on even keel, so equally with those who are married. That's correct. And it's not just for homosexuals. It's for domestic partners, whether they be homosexual or heterosexual.

KING: There are many, many, many gay conservatives, right?

MAY: There are very many. In fact, I just returned from a Log Cabin convention, which is a convention of gay conservatives.

KING: Gay conservatives. And is it disturbing to you that most of the constituency against you in the Senate and the House is conservative?

MAY: It is disturbing, because really sexual orientation is irrelevant. It's irrelevant for military service and it's irrelevant for political service.

My constituents elected me knowing my sexual orientation, knowing my military background, because they care about the same issues that I care about: public education. I worked very hard to improve our public schools in Arizona, cutting taxes, stopping corporate welfare, which runs rampant through the Arizona legislature.

KING: But does it disturb you when someone says that politician is anti-gay, their thinking is it's a Republican conservative?

MAY: Yes.

KING: If I gave you the hypothetical, they are) coming into this door now is an anti-gay person and he's elected to office, you would guess he's

a Republican conservative, right?

MAY: Well, I think that's an unfair stereotype, but certainly many people hold that stereotype. But there are certainly Democrats also who are anti-gay.

KING: So you felt this all your life?

MAY: That I was Republican, yes.

KING: And anti-gay, and you felt both the hits and the misses of this.

MAY: Absolutely.

KING: Why do you want to stay in the service? Why at this point would you care?

MAY: Well, it's my obligation. When the nation called me back into service in February of 1999 as the Kosovo crisis was heating up, I didn't have a choice.

KING: But why now do you want) I mean, they may dismiss you, right? Where does it stand now? You're up for promotion and dismissal?

MAY: I'm up for promotion to captain, right, and my captain's board meets in November. And I'm also under investigation for dismissal under a violation of the don't-ask/don't-tell policy.

KING: If they dismiss you, is that appealable?

MAY: No. I don't) no, it's not.

KING: Would it disturb you if you were dismissed?

MAY: Well, it disturbs me that my otherwise spotless record would be) would end this way.

KING: More with state representative Steve May of Arizona. We'll spend another section with him and then bring in our entire panel.

This is LARRY KING-LIVE. Don't go away.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

WILLIAM J. CLINTON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: The issue is not whether there should be homosexuals in the military. Everyone concedes that there are. The issue is whether men and women who can and have served with real distinction should be excluded from military service solely on the basis of their status. And I believe they should not.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: We're back with Arizona State Representative Steve May. He's up for re-election again next year. And he has been elected already with his constituency knowing of his) well, I would say sexual choice. It's not your choice. You don't know why you're gay, do you?

MAY: No. It was not a choice I made at all. I did choose to serve my constituents in the legislature. I did choose to serve my country in uniform. And I also made a choice to live my life with integrity, and that's what's caused this conflict.

KING: Do you) how many) do you know how many people) men and women -- have been tossed out of service since don't-ask/don't- tell, who told and got tossed?

MAY: I don't know how many since the beginning, but I know that the statistics today are that three to four service members are discharged every day. Those service members are otherwise qualified, they perform well in their job duties. They're discharged simply because of their sexual orientation.

KING: And how does it come out, usually? Is there a usual pattern? Did they tell someone? Is that the usual way?

MAY: There are any number of ways this could happen. Perhaps they

made a statement to friends. The policy as it stands now says that you can't even tell your mother, your brother, your sister, your best friend.

KING: What if I tell on you? Does that dismiss you?

MAY: That would cause an investigation, absolutely.

KING: It does, even though you never said it to anybody..

MAY: Absolutely, absolutely. It would cause an investigation. And the same) you'd be in the same situation I am now.

KING: Are you supporting your senator, McCain, for the presidency?

MAY: I have endorsed Senator McCain. I want him to be president.

KING: Do you know where he stands on this?

MAY: I have heard comments that he's made in the press, but ultimately this..

KING: What has he said?

MAY: Well, he says that he supports me and opposes discrimination against gays and lesbians. But he supports don't ask, don't tell. That's really an issue that...

KING: Is that a conflict, do you think?

MAY: Well...

KING: Is it to you?

MAY: Well, I'm-not a single-issue voter. I think most Americans are not single-issue voters, but really this is about soldiers serving with integrity in the military. And that's what this issue needs to come back to is that I served my country in uniform because I want to serve my country in uniform.

KING: When you were in the military) we had a soldier killed last year, didn't we? Fort Campbell?

MAY: We had a soldier killed this year.

KING: This year. When you were in the military, did you see much anti-gay against you or others?

MAY: Not me, personally.

KING: Never saw it?

MAY: No, not at all. In fact, since all the recent publicity I have received e-mails from all over the world from people I served with back at Fort Riley. I've gotten nothing but support from them, from soldiers past and present. It's really been very) very gratifying.

KING: And other armies around the world don't even deal with it, right? They don't discuss it..

MAY: No, absolutely not. In Israel, one of the finest fighting forces in the world, everyone serves, regardless of sexual orientation. So they have soldiers serving openly gay in Israel and in many, many services across the world.

KING: How did the bill come out in the legislature?

MAY: It died. It really was an ugly bill. And there was so much hate-filled rhetoric, I think most of the members of the House were embarrassed. Even those who supported the issue were embarrassed by the rhetoric from my opponent.

KING: So what is the law now in communities in Arizona regarding gays and health benefits and the like?

MAY: Well, cities and counties are allowed to choose whether or not they extend health benefits to domestic partners of their employees, just like many Fortune 500 companies now offer the exact same benefit.

KING: That's right. Does Phoenix do it?

MAY: Phoenix does not. Tempe just implemented that program, Tucson and also Pima County.

KING: Phoenix does not.

MAY: Phoenix does not. I understand they're considering it.

KING: How do you feel, Steve, about all of this? I mean the way it's hit you now. And then you made the speech in February. You figured it went away, right? You knew you were up made for the captaincy, and suddenly they're investigating you on the front page of "The New York Times," you're on a worldwide program tonight. How you react to all of this?

MAY: Well, it's all very confusing because all I am trying to do is serve my constituents in the legislature. That's where my focus has been, that's where it will continue to be. That's my agenda. I also responded to the call that my nation sent to me by certified mail in February of 1999. That's my obligation. And I want to live my life with integrity.

KING: Do the Log Cabin Republicans question their party a lot, because you're at odds with, often, planks in your party's platform, aren't you?

MAY: Right, but we agree with the core values of the Republican Party.

KING: You are a conservative?

MAY: Correct. But we believe in the core values of the Republican Party: a limited government, a strong national defense, individual liberty, economic freedom. Those are the core values of the Republican Party.

Now there have been histories in our party where the far right, really theocrats, have taken over our party. Well that's not who I am. That's not who most Republicans are. We want more freedom for people. We want less government for people. That's the Republican Party I belong to.

KING: Libertarian-Republican.

MAY: Well, that's the party of Barry Goldwater.

KING: Yes. You lambasted someone in particular) did you not?) in the legislature. I mean, opponents but there was one person in particular you really took on, wasn't there?

MAY: Well, the particular sponsor of the bill, who said that homosexuality was at the lower end of the behavioral spectrum and basically condemned me to an early death because of my sexual orientation, I responded to her that she was ill-informed.

KING: Do you converse with her in the halls? Do you...

MAY: You know, in politics...

KING: ... ever sit down to lunch together?

MAY: Sure) well, sure. You know, in politics...

KING: Strange...

MAY: Well, you can be best friends on one issue and bitter enemies on the next. And so...

KING: You probably supported the same issue in many times on other...

MAY: And many times we did. As a matter of fact, a newspaper did a study and found that I voted with her 70 percent of the time over the course of the legislative session this past time. There are many issues where we're strong allies.

KING: Isn't it painful to you personally, emotionally painful?

MAY: Well...

KING: A member of your party, you agree with her 70 percent of the time and she thinks you're vermin.

MAY: I think it's unfortunate that some people believe that way, but you know in this country we have a long history of recognizing that we

have differences of opinion, differences in our lives, but still we all have to work together as Americans. We can't divide our nation over small differences of opinion.

KING: We will meet a panel to discuss this. We'll be taking your calls as well.

This is LARRY KING LIVE.

David Frost tomorrow night.

Don't go away.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, AUGUST 14, 1999, "EVANS NOVAK HUNT & SHIELDS")

ROWLAND EVANS, CO-HOST: As president, Governor Bush, would you go back to the pre-Clinton era when gays were not admitted to the military?

GEORGE W. BUSH (R-TX), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: I'm for don't ask, don't tell. This is a policy that Colin Powell thoughtfully put in place.

EVANS: That's Clinton policy.

BUSH: Well, if that's the Clinton policy I support that. But I think it's up to the military to make sure we enforce it.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: Welcome back. We're discussing gays in the military, the don't ask-don't tell policy, and now a whole broader discussion of gay rights.

Our panel: Here in Washington, Arizona State Representative Steve May, being investigated by the Army reserve, may be discharged because of his orientation, may be promoted; in Aspen, Colorado, retired tennis star Martina Navratilova; in Louisville, Kentucky, the Reverend Albert Mohler Jr., president of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary; in Madison, Wisconsin, Democratic Representative Tammy Baldwin, a member of the House Judiciary Committee, who is also, like our guest in the studio in Washington, openly gay; and in Columbus, Georgia, Republican Bob Barr of Georgia, also a member of the Judiciary Committee. Let's get our panel's thoughts.

First on the May case, Martina, what do you make of all of this regarding the legislator?

MARTINA NAVRATILOVA, FORMER PROFESSIONAL TENNIS PLAYER: Well, I just can't) the don't ask, don't tell cannot work because you have to be able to tell the truth. I mean, morality is about telling the truth. So how can you tell the truth and then pretend you're not who you are?

KING: So you think there should be) the policy should be if you're fit to serve, you're fit to serve, no matter what you are?

NAVRATILOVA: I think it's been proven that sexuality has nothing to do with one's ability to serve the country. I would love to be able to serve the country, but right now I couldn't.

KING: Congressman Mohler) I mean, Reverend Mohler, where do you stand on this particular issue regarding Steve May?

REVEREND STEVE MOHLER, SOUTHERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY: Well, the one thing I would be in agreement with Representative May is that the don't ask-don't tell policy doesn't work. It is inherently wrong. And the American people believe the homosexual behavior is a legitimate issue. And the federal courts have affirmed that indeed it is a legitimate military issue for our armed forces. And so I'm in agreement that the don't ask-don't tell policy doesn't work, but on the most fundamental issue of homosexuality, there is widespread belief among Americans that it is fundamentally wrong and has no place in the military.

KING: So, therefore, you don't think) you think if you're gay you should not be in military service?

MOHLER: Yes.

KING: OK.

MOHLER: And I believe that that is exactly what the armed forces have said by this policy.

KING: Congresswoman Baldwin, your thoughts on the May case.

REP. TAMMY BALDWIN (D), WISCONSIN: Well, I think that Representative May puts a face on this issue. A capable young man dedicated to his country ought to be able to serve with pride. And we shouldn't have a policy that forces him to be dishonest in any way. And he's made that point very well.

I think beyond that the policy of don't-ask/don't-tell has proven a failure. We've seen the amount of harassment against gays in the military increase. We've seen the number of discharges increase under a policy that was supposed to have the opposite effect. And I really think that Steve's case in so many poignant ways means that we need to re-examine this policy.

KING: And Bob Barr of Georgia, nice to see you again, Congressman. Your thoughts?

REP. BOB BARR (R), GEORGIA: Thank you very much, Larry. I appreciate being a part of this very distinguished panel.

The issue, despite what Lieutenant May kept saying over and over and over again, that it's so confusing for him, is not confusing at all. It's not complex at all. As the pastor has said, there is very sound military policy at stake here by such a) enunciated by such very distinguished modern generals as General Norman Schwarzkopf, who has said that homosexuality is incompatible with good order of the military. That being the case, that is what our military has said. That is what this Congress and previous Congresses have stated very clearly in the law. Whether George Bush feels otherwise or not, homosexuality is incompatible with military service.

KING: So Congressman Barr, you also) you also disagree with don't-ask) everybody on the panel then doesn't like don't-ask/don't-tell, but you and...

BARR: I guess it's unanimous.

KING: ... and Reverend Mohler for different reasons. You would not have any gay in the military whether they tell or don't tell, right?

BARR: No. I would uphold the federal law passed in 1994 before the Republican majority that says that homosexuality is incompatible with the military and should not be allowed.

KING: Your party, Representative May, passed that law?

MAY: Yes, Larry, of course, that's true. But the issue really isn't about gays in the military. Gays have always been in the military. I am in the military. Gays will always be in the military.

The issue is about discrimination in the military. And the issue is also about asking soldiers to violate the basic military code of honor: duty, honor, country.

KING: Reverend Mohler, what is your problem with Steve May being in the military? Steve May is sitting right here. What's your problem with him? You have a problem with him being in the military. It is what?

MOHLER: It is his homosexual behavior. And this, again, is one more example of how the homosexual agenda has been literally intrusive into almost every dimension of American life. And here the military, which is supposed to be about defending our country and to be about military goals and military means, is having to deal with an issue where there are some

whose agenda has tried to force the armed services into being about social work and social change. And we have really a pretty fundamental consensus in this country that this is wrong...

KING: Let me get) let me get...

MOHLER: ... a popular consensus and a legal consensus.

KING: Let me get a break. Our panel will be with us all the way.

We'll also be including your phone calls. Don't go away.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: Just so we understand where everybody stands, Congressman Barr, do you take it beyond the military? Are you opposed to the bill to eliminate discrimination in hiring, firing on the basis of sexual orientation?

BARR: Oh, I think that if we try to get into that federally, Larry, whether it's the Employment Nondiscrimination Act or so-called "hate crimes," we're opening a can of worms that I don't think we'd ever see the last of.

KING: So you would be against the bills? Or for...

BARR: Yes, against both) I would be against) against the hate crime bill, because it leaves these) these terms very ill-defined. It doesn't define sexual orientation, yet it tries to enforce people who don't like somebody's sexual orientation...

KING: But you don't disagree) you don't disagree with there should be no discrimination against hiring someone because of their sexual orientation, do you?

BARR: Yes, I do disagree with that.

KING: You do?

BARR: Yes, absolutely. There are some professions, such as the Boy Scouts, where I think here also homosexuality is incompatible with the goals of the organization itself. I think in teaching) and there may be others as well.

The pastor may very well like to address that in terms of...

KING: I will get to that. Martina, are you surprised that this) as a gay person, we seemingly) some people say they have come a) Are you surprised this is still apparently a very major issue in this country?

NAVRATILOVA: I am, you know, because I mean, I came to live in this country) I lived in) under a communist system in Czechoslovakia. And I left that country so I would be free. I thought this was the land of the free. I didn't think it meant land of the free as long as you're heterosexual.

Now the Czech Republic) they're having domestic partnerships. They're having relationships that are) recognized homosexual relationships that are recognized as much as heterosexual ones. And I feel like, what do I need to do now? Go back? I don't want to.

I am surprised at the rhetoric and the misinformation that still exists to this day among very well-educated people.

[continued]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES NONDELIVERY RECEIPT)

CREATOR: MailRouter (MailRouter [SYS])

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-AUG-1999 11:22:29.00

SUBJECT: DELIVERY FAILURE: User Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP@EOP not listed in public Name & Address Book

TO: Heather M. Riley (CN=Heather M. Riley/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

DELIVERY FAILURE REPORT

Your Document:

Don't ask, don't tell.

could not be delivered to:

CN=Kevin S. Moran/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP

because:

User Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP@EOP not listed in public Name & Address Book

Routing Path:

CN=Mail2/O=EOP;CN=Mail2/O=EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Heather M. Riley (CN=Heather M. Riley/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-AUG-1999 11:22:33.00

SUBJECT: Don't ask, don't tell.

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

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP on 08/31/99
11:24 AM -----

Richard Socarides 08/31/99 10:34:00 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP@EOP, Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP, Erica
S. Lepping/WHO/EOP@EOP
cc: Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP@EOP
Subject: Don't ask, don't tell.

Does the President agree with the Vice President's recent criticisms of
the don't ask, don't tell policy?

The President believes that the Department of Defense under the leadership
of Secretary Cohen is committed to the fair enforcement of the policy.
That is not to say, however, that there isn't room for improvement, and
that was implicit in the new guidelines recently issued by the Pentagon.

Does the President believe the policy needs to be changed?

The President believes that the Pentagon is working hard too more fairly
implement the congressionally enacted policy and that that is the
appropriate course.

Does the President support the discharge of Arizona State legislator Steve
May?

It would not be appropriate to comment on any specific pending case.

Isn't this the kind of case the Vice President is talking about when he
says the policy needs to be implemented more compassionately?

This case, like every case, has to be reviewed by individual circumstances
and the use of common sense. It's up to the DOD to do that.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-AUG-1999 10:32:44.00

SUBJECT: Don't Ask, Don't Tell

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Also, we should invite someone from NSC, e.g., Mara Rudman. I should have thought of all this yesterday.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-AUG-1999 09:08:27.00

SUBJECT: Gore Chides Gays in Military Policy

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: Charles W. Burson (CN=Charles W. Burson/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alejandro G. Cabrera (CN=Alejandro G. Cabrera/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Michael B. Feldman (CN=Michael B. Feldman/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

TO: Ansley Jones (CN=Ansley Jones/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP on 08/31/99
09:08 AM -----

Doug.Case@sdsu.edu
08/31/99 01:32:00 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Richard Socarides@EOP
cc:
Subject: Gore Chides Gays in Military Policy

Associated Press, August 30, 1999
Gore Chides Gays in Military Policy
By SANDRA SOBIERAJ

WASHINGTON (AP)) Vice President Al Gore criticized the Clinton administration's policy toward gays in the military and said he would implement "don't ask, don't tell" with more compassion.

In an interview published in the September editions of The Advocate, due on newsstands Tuesday, the vice president also asserted that adoption agencies) not federal or state governments) should decide on a case-by-case basis whether gays and lesbians should adopt children or serve as foster

parents.

"Local adoption officials can evaluate the circumstances of the child and the parenting ability of prospective parents and decide if there's a good match," Gore said.

The vice president, who is on vacation with his family this week, was interviewed in June as he campaigned in California for the Democratic presidential nomination. His comments came before the much-publicized, Aug.

13 announcement by the Pentagon of new, mandatory training on anti-harassment guidelines for all troops.

Last year, 1,145 people were discharged from the armed forces for homosexuality, the Pentagon reported. In 1997, the total was 997, the highest number since 1987. The number of discharges hit a low of 617 in 1994, the year that President Clinton effected his "don't ask, don't tell" policy, which allows gays to serve in the military as long as their sexual orientation is not discovered.

"The statistics may be reflecting some phenomenon I don't understand, but the easiest explanation is that it's not being implemented in a way that fully reflects the spirit of the policy," Gore told The Advocate.

"I would implement the policy with more compassion," Gore said. He added that he would work with military leaders on developing "an implementation strategy that's fairer," but did offer specifics.

Asked if gays and lesbians were, by their nature, antithetical to "family values," the vice president replied: "I believe that God makes us in different ways. I don't believe that having made us, God intends us to suffer discrimination and prejudice.

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 anyplace 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:31-AUG-1999 12:11:55.00

SUBJECT: The Progressive: Courting the Gay Vote

TO: Charles W. Burson (CN=Charles W. Burson/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alejandro G. Cabrera (CN=Alejandro G. Cabrera/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Michael B. Feldman (CN=Michael B. Feldman/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Ansley Jones (CN=Ansley Jones/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP on 08/31/99
12:11 PM -----

Doug.Case@sdsu.edu
08/29/99 10:56:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Richard Socarides@EOP

cc:

Subject: The Progressive: Courting the Gay Vote

THE PROGRESSIVE, September, 1999
(<http://www.progressive.org>)

COURTING THE GAY VOTE

By John Nichols

When Vice President Al Gore showed up for a June meeting with young people at the Los Angeles Gay and Lesbian Community Center, he was confronted by a skeptical Javier Garcia.

"I want to know exactly why you're here," said Garcia, twenty, challenging Gore with unusual bluntness.

Taken aback, Gore responded in classic political jargon. "I'm here to learn and to pay honor to the place," he said and praised the center for "helping to change attitudes and abolish some irrational discrimination that is all too common."

In spite of Gore's game effort, Garcia said he was "suspicious" that the visit might have something to do with the Vice President's desire to get an early start on the 2000 Presidential campaign.

Garcia, a polite young man who presented the Vice President with a book of poems by homeless gay and lesbian youths, had reason for his skepticism. After all, Gore's challenger for the Democratic Presidential nomination, former U.S. Senator Bill Bradley, Democrat of New Jersey, had appeared at the Center just one week earlier. Even as the Vice President offered his platitudes, his aides were dueling with Bradley's over which campaign had been the first to come up with the idea of making a Gay Pride Month visit to the Los Angeles center.

As Campaign 2000 gears up, electioneering and fund raising events targeted at the gay and lesbian community are headlining campaign schedules.

In May, Gore met in Washington, D.C., with forty-five prominent lesbian and gay community activists, including executives and board members of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, AIDS Action, the Human Rights Campaign, the Gay and Lesbian Victory Fund, the National Black Lesbian and Gay Task Force, and the National Latina/Latino Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and transgender Organization.

Gore then whirled through a schedule of events set up to coincide with Gay Pride Month activities in San Francisco and Los Angeles. But when he got there, he found that Bradley had already covered much of the turf.

Gore has gone so far as to request a "gay reading list" from State

Representative Carole Migden, Democrat of California. Meanwhile, Bradley aides have begun setting up one-on-one conversations with prominent gay and lesbian officials around the country) including U.S. Representative Tammy Baldwin, Democrat of Wisconsin, and veteran activist and Democratic fund raiser David Mixner) so the candidate can "get a feel for the community."

Despite their outreach, however, neither Gore nor Bradley has been willing to take the courageous positions that could inspire genuine enthusiasm among lesbian and gay voters. True, both Gore and Bradley have endorsed the Employment Non-Discrimination Act and national hate-crimes legislation. But, so far, their campaigns have shied away from the bold stances) support for gay marriage, for federal domestic partnership protections, and for a dramatic redirection of health care and research funding priorities to reflect the concerns of gay men and lesbians. It is these stances that might win the confidences of young people like Garcia, who listened intently to Gore's rap at the Los Angeles center, but still ended up asking, "What can you say to make us believe you will help the gay community?"

That question gets to the heart of the issue. But it doesn't always get a satisfactory response. While Presidential candidates are going out of their way to solicit support from lesbians and gays in the run-up to the 2000 election, their enthusiasm for votes and campaign contributions is not always matched by a willingness to do right by the targeted voters. As a result, some activists simply turn off to politics, while others struggle to discern subtle distinctions between candidates who speak in the same stilted) some would even say coded) political language. Elizabeth Birch, executive director of the Human Rights campaign, the nation's largest gay and lesbian political group, describes Gore's relationship with the community as "solid and deep" while she says Bradley "is not a stand-out" when it comes to advocacy for lesbian and gay rights. Yet, neither the Vice President nor his only serious rival for the Democratic nomination can claim to have adopted some positions that are clearly within the mainstream of current lesbian and gay rights advocacy.

As an example, both men supported 1996 federal Defense of Marriage Act, designed by the Christian right to bar lesbians and gays from marrying and to stir up anti-gay sentiment at the state and national levels. When asked during their June tours of California about an upcoming state vote on an anti-gay marriage ballot proposal, both candidates shied away from the issue.

Gore produced nothing more than a pledge to study the California initiative before taking a stand.

National Gay and Lesbian Task Force political director Rebecca Isaacs calls Gore's position "incredibly unhelpful and disappointing." Similarly, when Gore proposed in May to direct more federal dollars to "faith-based" groups, lesbian and gay activists joined People for the American Way and

the
Interfaith Alliance in raising serious concerns about whether taxpayer dollars would end up funding religious organizations that promote anti-gay messages.

Despite lingering frustrations, however, the 2000 Presidential campaign is fundamentally different from its predecessors. Never before have candidates competed so openly or so vigorously for the votes of America's gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered community. Even if they are not ready to take bold stands, Gore and Bradley are both pursuing major efforts to recruit support, seeding their campaign staffs with lesbians and gay men, sitting for extended interviews with lesbian and gay publications, and tailoring schedules and positions to appeal to an electorate that in some key

primaries could contribute 10 percent or more of the vote. The two Democratic candidates have pledged to recruit historic numbers of gay and lesbian delegates to the 2000 Democratic National Convention.

"The days when the gay and lesbian community had to court candidates) when we had to hope that they would pose for pictures with us or circulate a

position paper that didn't say very much) are over," says Urvashi Vaid, director of the New York-based Policy Institute of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force. "They're coming to us now. From the perspective of just

a few years ago, it's extraordinary to be able to say that we have major contenders who are going out of their way to reach our community. We're not

begging the Presidential candidates and their campaigns for recognition; they're begging the gays and lesbians for votes and for money."

That was obvious in July, when Tipper Gore was the featured speaker at the first-ever Washington fund raising event organized by a Presidential campaign specifically to raise money from the lesbian and gay community.

"All people, regardless of sexual orientation, should be able to be a part of

a loving relationship in a family without fear of recrimination or discrimination," she told a crowd that contributed \$150,000 to her husband's

campaign. Before the event ended, she was promising that her husband, as President, would "fight for your dreams. He will fight for our dreams."

The pursuit of the gay and lesbian vote does not stop with the Democrats.

While the most conservative GOP contenders) former Vice President Dan Quayle, commentator Pat Buchanan, and Christian right activist Gary Bauer) continue to spout anti-gay rhetoric, the campaigns of Republican front runners George W. Bush, Elizabeth Dole, and John McCain have cautiously reached out to GOP-linked gay and lesbian organizations.

The Log Cabin Republicans, the party's largest gay and lesbian grouping,

may have gone a bit overboard when) following an oblique reference by the Texas governor to his willingness to appoint qualified people) they sent out

an April press release headlined: BUSH TAKES BIG STEP IN FAVOR OF GAY RIGHTS. But there is no denying that Bush has, at most turns, refused the harsh anti-gay positioning demanded by the religious right. He has even

been
quoted as personally pledging to Washington, D.C., gay Republican activist
Carl Schmid, "I will always treat [lesbians and gays] with respect, and
that
is what you deserve."

To the consternation of the Christian Coalition, Dole and McCain (who
rank second and third in most polls) have also been preaching the big-tent
rhetoric that almost disappeared from the GOP lexicon following the 1994
Gingrich revolution. "They may not be saying a lot of what we want to
hear,
but they're trying to put some distance between themselves and the radical
right," explains Vaid. "A willingness to, at the least, say that you won't
discriminate against gays and lesbians has become a litmus test for
candidates who want to establish their moderate credentials) which is
important for Republicans who want to compete in November."

The rationale for this broadened appeal to gays and lesbians is
understandable. Exit polls following the 1998 Congressional elections
indicated that 5 percent of voters identified as gay or lesbian. In some
key
states, ~~the numbers were~~ significantly higher. And that, argues Mixner, is
only the beginning. "The +gay vote' goes a lot further than the gay and
lesbian community," he explains. "When I came out, my parents, my
relatives,
my friends suddenly became a lot more aware of the need to vote for
candidates who support gay and lesbian rights. If I say to someone who
loves
me, +Look, you can't vote for this candidate because he would deny me basic
rights or he would use his office to encourage violence against me,' they
get
it."

Mixner's view is supported by Democratic polling that suggests one in
seven of the votes Bill Clinton collected in his 1992 Presidential run came
from people who voted for him because of indications that he would support
lesbian and gay rights initiatives.

But can Republicans really be serious when they make subtle appeals for
lesbian and gay votes? You bet. The notion that lesbians and gay men tend
exclusively toward the Democratic column has been disproven by exit polling
that indicates between one-quarter and one-third of self-identified lesbian
and gay voters cast their ballots for GOP contenders. Indeed, in some
instances where Republicans have been out front in their support of
lesbian
and gay rights) such as former Massachusetts Governor William Weld,
Senator
Jim Jeffords of Vermont, and Representative Tom Campbell of California)
lesbian and gay voters have been credited with helping provide the GOP
margin
of victory.

Still, Vaid and other lesbian and gay activists doubt that any of the
GOP's Presidential contenders will show the sort of courage that Weld did
during his two terms as governor when he appointed openly gay officials to
powerful state posts, signed a sweeping gay rights bill, and worked to
protect people with AIDS against discrimination. "All the Republican
Presidential candidates in 2000 are bad and degrees of worse," says Vaid.
"Pat Buchanan, Gary Bauer, Steve Forbes) they don't provide a very hopeful

picture. Even George W. Bush, for all his talk about 'compassionate conservatism,' has failed to support anti-hate-crimes legislation. He is the sitting governor of a state that still has sodomy laws on the books. He says gay adoption is wrong. So I think that most of the gay and lesbian vote will probably end up going to the Democrats in November 2000."

So, too, will most of the campaign money. In 1992, Mixner set out to prove that lesbians and gays could provide substantial contributions to candidates who support their interests. "That year, we raised \$3.5 million for Bill Clinton from the gay community. I know because I handled the checks," says Mixner. "And I can tell you that, with the boom in high tech and the general rise in the economy, there will be a lot more money than ever before coming from the gay community in 2000."

Mixner, who is backing Gore, estimates that Presidential campaign donations by gays and lesbians will add up to \$8 million or more over the next year and a half.

"With the way campaigns go after money these days, there is no way that Gore or Bradley is going to write off the gay community," adds Mixner. "But

it goes way beyond money. In California, in New York, in Texas, the candidates know that gay and lesbian voters could easily make the difference for them. And they're going after those votes aggressively."

The pursuit of gay and lesbian votes and money is a far cry from campaigns of even a decade ago, when homosexuality was kept pretty much in the closet. At the 1972 Democratic National Convention that nominated George

McGovern, several gay delegates were present and McGovern expressed his sympathy for their appeals for liberation. After McGovern was badly beaten,

however, the party scrambled away from so-called interest groups) a catch-all classification that would eventually come to include not just lesbians and gays but African Americans, Latino, and trade unionists. It was

not until 1992 that a major party would support an explicitly gay-friendly nominee. With the help of Mixner, Bob Hattoy, and other well-connected gay activists, the 1992 Clinton campaign capitalized on the political maturation

of the lesbian and gay community to draw early campaign money and overwhelming support from voters who feared the Republicans' virulent anti-gay platform.

But the Clinton Administration's record on lesbian and gay rights has turned out to be decidedly mixed. While the President appointed lesbians and gay men to high posts, backed the federal Employment Non-Discrimination Act,

and made comforting statements in the aftermath of hate crime attacks on lesbians and gays, he backed off initial promises to end all discrimination in the military and signed the Defense of Marriage Act. In Clinton's wake, Gore is under pressure to do more than simply offer lip service. Many of his

backers believe the Vice President will meet their expectations. "I think Al

Gore is better on these issues than Bill Clinton," says Mixner, who has met frequently with the Vice President. "Clinton went from zero to sixty. Al Gore, I think, is prepared to take it to the next level. To some extent, he's already doing that."

In June, Gore indicated for the first time that he supports "legal protections" for domestic partnership relationships. A number of cities around the country have passed domestic partnership legislation that allows lesbian and gay couples to share health insurance, take advantage of inheritance laws, and in other ways enjoy the benefits that are available to married couples. These local laws have been under attack by conservatives at the federal and state levels, and Gore's stance is seen by many lesbian and gay activists as a significant step.

"In 1992, it was a big deal to have a candidate) Clinton) saying he would try to do something about overt discrimination against gays and lesbians in the military," says Vaid. "Now, we have candidates discussing the whole range of issues, and we're seeing them begin to move in the right direction of issues like domestic partnership protections."

At times, however, movement in the right direction requires a push.

For example, by concentrating on Gore's campaign, activists seem to have made some progress on the expansion of the availability of AIDS drugs in Africa. Throughout the spring and summer, activists with the AIDS Coalition To Unleash Power (ACT UP) and other groups have followed Gore on his campaign travels, challenging the Clinton Administration's support for a move by pharmaceutical firms to limit production of generic AIDS drugs in South Africa. In mid-July, the Administration) sensing a threat to Gore's appeal

not merely within the gay community but also among African Americans) gave indications that it was rethinking its policy. Activists remain wary, and the pressure on Gore continues. Yet the response by the Clinton Administration raises hopes that, as the campaign goes on, both Gore and Bradley can be pushed to take the bolder stands they so far have skirted.

In particular, Mixner hopes to see them clearly state their opposition to the California anti-gay-marriage initiative.

"That initiative is a direct attack on the rights of gays and lesbians,"

he says. "I don't think it is at all unreasonable to demand that candidates

who would ask for our votes would take absolute positions in opposition to this initiative." Mixner notes that the Clinton Administration's clumsy and

compromised handling of the whole gays-in-the-military fight in 1993 resulted

in a significant decline in lesbian and gay turnout in the 1994 elections.

Those lesbians and gay men who did vote continued to trend in a Democratic direction, but the depressed turnout in key states was one of the factors that doomed the party's attempt to hold onto the U.S. House and Senate.

Without a strong lesbian and gay turnout in 2000, Mixner says, it will be

difficult for the party's nominee to win in November. Yet that strong turnout will come only if the candidates display the sort of courage that inspires genuine enthusiasm. Thus, the veteran activist argues, the need to pressure the candidates to take unequivocal stands on issues such as the California initiative becomes all the more profound.

"What Gore or Bradley does on this issue and so many others will be determined, in large part, by those of us in the lesbian and gay community and by family and friends who support us. If we allow them to take a pass, then they'll take a pass," says Mixner. "But if we take the time to let them know that they will need to show some courage on these issues if they want to have a significant turnout of gay and lesbian voters) a turnout they will ultimately need to win) then I think we can get beyond symbolism to some of the serious commitments and we have a right to demand."

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 anyplace 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."

Pfc. Calvin Glover is accused of premeditated murder and, at his Article 32 earlier this month, the Army acknowledged that the killing was motivated, in part, because Winchell was gay. Investigators also say

Glover killed Winchell as revenge because Winchell beat Glover in a fight two days earlier.

The case outraged homosexuals and gay-rights organizations across the nation and, in part, led the military to announce revisions to its "don't ask, don't tell" policy on gays in the military.

Fisher, Winchell's roommate, is accused of encouraging Glover to strike Winchell. The Lincoln, Neb., native is also charged with making false statements to Army investigators and obstructing the investigation.

No testimony surfaced yesterday about the role Fisher may have played in the killing. The circumstances could surface today or when military prosecutors summarize their case for an investigating officer, who will recommend if the case should proceed to a court martial. The commanding general at Fort Campbell will eventually decide if Glover and Fisher face a court martial. No decision has been made in either case.

Testimony yesterday revealed Glover attempted to blame Fisher, saying Fisher hatched the plan to kill Winchell, then dump his body into a river. Sgt. Carlos Rodriguez testified Glover described such a plot after he had been arrested. The comments surfaced as Rodriguez was guarding Glover at a jail cell at Fort Campbell, the sergeant testified. Glover also made ~~similar comments to another soldier~~ who was guarding him, according to yesterday's hearing.

The most graphic testimony of the day came from the last witness, Staff Sgt. Hardin, who said he realized something was wrong when he heard Fisher yelling, "Oh, God, help me, I think he's dying."

Hardin said he rushed to Winchell's barracks and saw Fisher covered in blood, holding Winchell under his arms and trying to drag him down a flight of stairs to get help. Hardin said Winchell was bleeding from his left ear. Hardin and another soldier tried to stop the bleeding by applying pressure and placing a field dressing on the wound.

Hardin testified Fisher was visibly upset and "freaking out." Other soldiers testified Fisher was running around the barracks, screaming for help and asking people to hope that Winchell would pull through.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-SEP-1999 09:21:46.00

SUBJECT: NC10955: Winchell murder update

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

----- Forwarded by Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP on 09/01/99
09:21 AM -----

To: Richard Socarides@EOP
cc:
Subject: NC10955: Winchell murder update

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.

August 31, 1999

Soldier testifies alleged accomplice suggested gay-bashing soldier

FORT CAMPBELL, Ky.) An Army soldier charged as an accomplice in the bludgeoning death of his barracks roommate allegedly planned the attack, a fellow soldier says.

Spec. Carlos Rodriguez testified during the first day of a military investigative hearing Monday that Pvt. Calvin N. Glover, who is charged with premeditated murder, told Rodriguez soon after the killing that the idea for the attack actually came from Spec. Justin R. Fisher.

Fisher, 25, of Lincoln, Neb., is charged as an accomplice in the assault on Pfc. Barry L. Winchell, his roommate at Fort Campbell. Fisher also is accused of acting as an accessory after the fact, making false statements to Army investigators and obstructing the investigation into Winchell's death.

Winchell, 21, of Kansas City, Mo., was bludgeoned with a baseball bat in his barracks early on July 5 and died the next day at a hospital in Nashville, Tenn.

Gay-rights advocates say anti-homosexual feelings may have been behind, or at least contributed to, the killing. Winchell was perceived as gay by some soldiers in his unit and friends contend he was beginning to explore the gay lifestyle when he died.

On Monday, Rodriguez, who faces no charges, testified Glover told him after the killing that Fisher had suggested the attack and proposed dumping Winchell's body in a river.

"Glover told me it was Fisher's idea," he said.

Hearsay testimony may be presented as evidence at such hearings, which are similar to grand jury investigations in civilian criminal cases.

Military trial counselors, who are similar to prosecutors, say the killing occurred two days after a drunken Glover, 18, picked a fight with

Winchell, 21, at a July 3 party at Fort Campbell.

Members of Glover's defense counsel say much of the Army's case against their client rests on Fisher's accusatory testimony against Glover.

Earlier this month, a two-day investigative hearing was held for Glover, 18, of Sulphur, Okla. No decision has been made about whether the case will go to a general court-martial.

The trial counsel, or prosecutor, in Glover's hearing said that revenge was the motive behind Winchell's killing. Capt. Gregg Engler argued that Glover attacked Winchell because Glover recently had lost a fight to him at a party.

Neither the Army nor Winchell's family have commented on the dead soldier's sexuality. Witnesses at Glover's hearing testified that Winchell was ridiculed in his unit about being homosexual.

Weeks after Winchell's death, the Pentagon updated its "don't ask, don't tell" policy for gays in the military, requiring mandatory training on anti-harassment guidelines for all troops, beginning with boot camp.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-SEP-1999 08:07:24.00

SUBJECT: Don't Ask, Don't Tell Meeting -- TODAY

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

what's this?

----- Forwarded by Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP on 09/01/99
08:06 AM -----

Edward W. Correia

08/31/99 04:04:58 PM

Record Type: Record

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

cc:

Subject: ~~Don't Ask, Don't Tell Meeting~~ -- TODAY

We'll have to reschedule the meeting for today at 4:30. Sorry.

Message Sent

To:

Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP
Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP
Charles Allen/NSC/EOP
Peter Rundlet/WHO/EOP
Charles W. Burson/OVP @ OVP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-SEP-1999 08:44:57.00

SUBJECT: Re: Don't Ask, Don't Tell

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

CC: Peter Rundlet (CN=Peter Rundlet/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

CC: Richard Socarides (CN=Richard Socarides/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TEXT:

i am away -- so i am sorr that i am not able to attend the meeting -- if
you have a chance let me know via e-mail any results -
i had a brief conversation w/ dep secretary hamre -- actually it came up
as part of another unrelated matter we were discussing -- i told him that
the white house had no desire, intention, etc of getting involved in the
murder investigation, hearing -- etc -- but that there had been concern
raised by the community that if no investigation is done re: the ft
campbell command -- that i personally thought that the dod would have a
problem. last he and i spoke rudy de leon and caldera were meeting w/ the
service members defense league -- i do not k now the result s of that
meeting --- perhaps richard does

i concur w/ you eddy that we should not be involved in the investiation of
the murder -- but we should at least understand what they are planning to
do or not do -- p rocess wise -- regardinfg ft campbell's involvement --
approach

A third of the way through the mayor's speech to Log Cabin members and VIPs on Saturday, a thunderous banging erupted in the back of the hotel

ballroom as FUQ protesters, some of whom reportedly pushed their way through one of the hotel's kitchens to gain entry, pounded on the ballroom's closed doors. "Here come my protesters," quipped the mayor in response to the noise. "Now I feel at home." After a few moments the din quieted, and the mayor delivered the remainder of his speech, then left the hotel without incident.

Soon after his departure, however, and unbeknownst to banquet attendees, a melee broke out downstairs in the hotel lobby between FUQ members and hotel staff. The protesters, who had made their way up to the ballroom, were apparently being herded back downstairs when things got ugly on the main floor of the hotel. One protester who had forced her way into the hotel, Suzy Lee Korn, kicked at a security guard as he tried to drag her back outside. The security guard then punched Korn in the face, bloodying her nose.

On Sunday morning, having been released from the hospital the previous night with minor cuts and bruises, Korn said she planned on pressing charges.

"I want to see a formal apology on behalf of the Log Cabin Republicans," she said.

Log Cabin's executive director, Rich Tafel, responded calmly but firmly to Korn's demands: "If anyone owes anyone an apology, it's a group that begins a violent action like that and escalates it into a media situation where they say they are the victims. We were organizing a peaceful convention with activists from all over the country who are on the front lines of gay and lesbian rights. We had people speaking on a panel from a variety of perspectives and things were conducted with mutual respect. If those people wanted to exercise their First Amendment rights, they should have done it across the street."

When Tafel heard about what was happening on the street Saturday night, he left the banquet midway through dinner, went out to the front of the hotel, and attempted to talk with the handful of remaining FUQ protesters, who were still shouting anti-Giuliani slogans and attempting, largely unsuccessfully, to file complaints with the police. (For the purposes of full disclosure, I should add that earlier that afternoon I delivered a speech at the conference. Though I am not a member of the Log Cabin Republicans, I attended the banquet.)

Such diplomacy is typical of Tafel. In fact, at a conference plenary Saturday morning, he made a point of dissuading anyone from hissing, booing, or otherwise disrupting conference proceedings. "We're here to talk to each other in a civilized manner," he said. Panelists at this session, entitled "Visions for the Movement's Future," included representatives from across the gay political spectrum: outspoken progressive Urvashi Vaid, director of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Policy Institute; libertarian Jonathan Rauch, a correspondent for National Journal; Brian Bond, executive director of the Gay and Lesbian Victory Fund; Winnie Stachelberg, political director of the bipartisan Human Rights Campaign (HRC); and State Representative Steve May (Republican of Arizona). (May, who also serves part-time in the army reserves, was front-page news in The New York Times last week when the army announced its intention to investigate him under the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy, because he came out as gay during a bitter dispute in the Arizona legislature over a bill that would have denied the use of public funds to pay health benefits to same-sex partners.)

Though Tafel didn't witness the climactic kicking and punching on

Saturday night, he saw it on the news that evening. On Sunday morning he had this to say about what he'd seen: "Someone kicked a security guard. That is not a peaceful demonstration. Violence begets violence. I would denounce violence on both sides."

Corroborating the allegation that protesters had initiated the violence, a security guard who asked not to be named said: "They bum rushed us. They were carrying chains." Protesters intended to use the chains to lash themselves to hotel furniture.

However, one witness, LGNY journalist Ann Northrop, who was standing outside the hotel when the violence was at its height, claims to have seen a security guard choking a protester while screaming "motherfucker."

At a press conference held on Sunday morning, Clarence Patton, a representative of the Anti-Violence Project, a counseling and advocacy service for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered, and HIV-positive victims of violent crime, voiced his concerns, but he did so, interestingly enough, without acknowledging FUQ's role in provoking the brawl. "The questions we'd like answered are whether these people were harmed simply because they were peacefully demonstrating or if it was escalated because they were in fact lesbians and gay men," he said.

By the end of the evening, police had arrested five protesters, including Korn, but as of press time, they had yet to arrest anyone from the hotel staff, even though the news channels have repeatedly aired footage of a hotel employee punching Korn in the face and her bleeding on the ground afterward. The hotel has declined to comment on the incident, but the NYPD have said that they will accept a complaint against the hotel if one is filed. Still, FUQ members see this as too little too late (one protester said she tried to file a complaint on the spot Saturday night but the police were not cooperating), and they see the NYPD's failure to protect the protesters or to arrest hotel staffers as just another example of what they deem the NYPD's discriminatory policies toward minority groups.

At an impromptu press conference held late Saturday night, FUQ spokeswoman Sue King defended her group, saying that she and her fellow protesters had shown up at the Roosevelt to make it clear that not all gays and lesbians support Giuliani or Log Cabin's endorsement of him in New York's 2000 Senate race. "Giuliani is not a friend of gays and lesbians," said King.

But, in response, Rich Tafel insisted that the gay far left is spreading a myth that the mayor is antigay. By way of evidence, Tafel pointed to legislation the mayor wrote and passed in 1997 that extended domestic partner benefits to lesbians and gays. Tafel called it "the most sweeping domestic partnership legislation that has been passed in the entire nation by anyone, Republican or Democrat."

Giuliani also marched in June's Gay Pride parade, where he was booed and heckled, ostensibly for breaking into the parade and disrupting a minority contingent. Given the mayor's already strained relationship with the African American community after the Abner Louima and Amadou Diallo tragedies, it's not entirely surprising that minority groups disdained Giuliani's efforts to appear at Gay Pride and, in their view, make a political bid out of it. Simply because he is a Republican, it's also not surprising that Giuliani has been unpopular among left-wing gay and lesbian groups.

But the Republican stance on gays has softened remarkably in the last month, what with George W. Bush declaring in early August that he would

have no qualms about hiring homosexuals. In the same vein, Elizabeth Dole) whose husband curtly rejected a Log Cabin contribution to his presidential campaign in 1996) said that she would gladly accept money from a gay Republican group. The staid senator John McCain even went so far as to say that he could imagine there being a gay president someday.

Back in May, gay Republicans were in the news again when a public debate was sparked by a controversial piece written by Carol Lloyd that appeared in the online magazine Salon, questioning whether there was any truth to the rumor that Abraham Lincoln was gay. The rumor surfaced in a speech that writer-activist Larry Kramer gave last February in which he quoted the diaries and letters of Lincoln's longtime pal Joshua Speed: "He often kisses me when I tease him, often to shut me up. He would grab me up by his long arms and hug and hug. Yes, our Abe is like a schoolgirl."

In light of recent publicity, then, Mayor Giuliani's appearance at the Log Cabin convention may well have been only the latest, if perhaps the most auspicious, sign in a series of signs that Republicans are courting the gay vote. But early in his speech Saturday night, the mayor offered an unequivocal handshake to the gay and lesbian community. "It comes down to respect for human freedom," he said. "That is why it is not at all inconsistent for me to say that a Republican should support gay rights legislation. Republicans should basically say that our party is all about economic freedom, personal freedom, and therefore with regard to people's sexual orientation, with regard to the decisions they make about their lives, their personal lives, government should be as far removed from that as we possibly can."

He went on to praise the activities of the Log Cabin Republicans specifically. "Your presence in the Republican Party, in a very, very important philosophical way, keeps pushing all of us toward the very highest and the very best mission of this party. I can't thank you enough for being willing to remain in a party in which, and this is an understatement, not everyone shares the views that I have."

Despite Saturday night's disruptions of their banquet, and the vaguely besmirching media swirl that has surrounded it, Log Cabiners are more committed than ever to supporting Republican candidates for state and national public office. At the end of their meeting on Sunday, while FUQ activists were still holding press conferences and pacing the sidewalk outside the hotel, Log Cabiners announced the results of a straw poll they had taken earlier in the day among conference attendees in New York City. Senator John McCain was a clear winner with 57 votes. George W. Bush came in second with 43 votes, and Elizabeth Dole brought up the rear with only five votes.

If this weekend's internecine clash between the right and left wings of gay activism is any indication of things to come, gays of all stripes may be in for a rough ride in the next year. Democrats, who, in the last two decades, have virtually taken the gay vote for granted, and who, in 2000, will be leaving gays with a checkered legacy that includes the homophobic "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy and the Defense of Marriage Act, may be forced to consider the question most gay voters are starting to ask of all candidates, Republicans and Democrats: What have you done for me lately? Republicans, on the other hand, may seem to be warming up to gays, but as the Human Rights Campaign's Stachelberg warned last weekend, gays shouldn't count their chickens too soon. "The tone and tenor of much of the Republican Party and of many Republicans has changed," she said.

"There's an acknowledgment that didn't exist before that there are gay men and lesbians in everyone's district across this country. And this is a very positive sign. . . . But we have to be careful not to make too much of that. It's important that we get results."

In a tone that seemed to express both his excitement about the campaign trail ahead, and his sadness about some gay activists' apparent unwillingness to work together, Rich Tafel agreed with Stachelberg.

"We've got a long year ahead of us," he said.

Tell us what you think. editor@villagevoice.com

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-SEP-1999 01:32:07.00

SUBJECT: Blood, Sweat, and Fed Up Queers at the LCR Conference

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Village Voice, September 1-7, 1999

(<http://www.villagevoice.com>)

Confronting the Pride Divide

Blood, Sweat, and Fed Up Queers at the Log Cabin Republican Conference

Last Saturday evening at Midtown's Roosevelt Hotel, Mayor Rudolph Giuliani gave the keynote address at the annual leadership conference of the

Log Cabin Republicans, a national gay and lesbian conservative group. But an

evening that began with the most supportive gesture that any Republican politician has ever made toward gays and lesbians ended in violence, when a small group of protesters calling themselves Fed Up Queers (FUQ) stormed the

hotel lobby and were forcibly removed from the premises by hotel security.

When this weekend's boisterous bipartisanship inside the Roosevelt Hotel had

runneth over) and the blood, sweat, and tears outside the hotel had been mopped up) two things were clear: the gay vote is not a foregone conclusion

for the Democrats in 2000, and more important it is by no means predictably or sheepishly monolithic. Gays may now be more divided politically than they have ever been.

Something significant has shifted in queer politics. On a weekend when the traditionally gay-friendly probable Democratic candidate for the New York

Senate, Hillary Rodham Clinton, was fundraising among moneyed heteros in the

Hamptons, the usually hard-boiled Republican contender, Mayor Giuliani, was extending a sizable olive branch to gay New Yorkers. On a weekend that also

saw an unprecedentedly wide array of gay activists joining forces, the straight media had its first strong hint that gays feel almost as betrayed by

one another as they do by the Christian right) and that they may be one another's worst enemies in the year 2000.

A third of the way through the mayor's speech to Log Cabin members and VIPs on Saturday, a thunderous banging erupted in the back of the hotel ballroom as FUQ protesters, some of whom reportedly pushed their way through

one of the hotel's kitchens to gain entry, pounded on the ballroom's closed

doors. "Here come my protesters," quipped the mayor in response to the noise. "Now I feel at home." After a few moments the din quieted, and the mayor delivered the remainder of his speech, then left the hotel without incident.

Soon after his departure, however, and unbeknownst to banquet attendees, a melee broke out downstairs in the hotel lobby between FUQ members and hotel staff. The protesters, who had made their way up to the ballroom, were apparently being herded back downstairs when things got ugly on the main floor of the hotel. One protester who had forced her way into the hotel, Suzy Lee Korn, kicked at a security guard as he tried to drag her back outside. The security guard then punched Korn in the face, bloodying her nose.

On Sunday morning, having been released from the hospital the previous night with minor cuts and bruises, Korn said she planned on pressing charges.

"I want to see a formal apology on behalf of the Log Cabin Republicans," she said.

Log Cabin's executive director, Rich Tafel, responded calmly but firmly to Korn's demands: "If anyone owes anyone an apology, it's a group that begins a violent action like that and escalates it into a media situation where they say they are the victims. We were organizing a peaceful convention with activists from all over the country who are on the front lines of gay and lesbian rights. We had people speaking on a panel from a variety of perspectives and things were conducted with mutual respect. If those people wanted to exercise their First Amendment rights, they should have done it across the street."

When Tafel heard about what was happening on the street Saturday night, he left the banquet midway through dinner, went out to the front of the hotel, and attempted to talk with the handful of remaining FUQ protesters, who were still shouting anti-Giuliani slogans and attempting, largely unsuccessfully, to file complaints with the police. (For the purposes of full disclosure, I should add that earlier that afternoon I delivered a speech at the conference. Though I am not a member of the Log Cabin Republicans, I attended the banquet.)

Such diplomacy is typical of Tafel. In fact, at a conference plenary Saturday morning, he made a point of dissuading anyone from hissing, booing, or otherwise disrupting conference proceedings. "We're here to talk to each other in a civilized manner," he said. Panelists at this session, entitled "Visions for the Movement's Future," included representatives from across the gay political spectrum: outspoken progressive Urvashi Vaid, director of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Policy Institute; libertarian Jonathan Rauch, a correspondent for National Journal; Brian Bond, executive director of the Gay and Lesbian Victory Fund; Winnie Stachelberg, political director of the bipartisan Human Rights Campaign (HRC); and State Representative Steve May (Republican of Arizona). (May, who also serves part-time in the army reserves, was front-page news in The New York Times last week when the army

announced its intention to investigate him under the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy, because he came out as gay during a bitter dispute in the Arizona legislature over a bill that would have denied the use of public funds to pay health benefits to same-sex partners.)

Though Tafel didn't witness the climactic kicking and punching on Saturday night, he saw it on the news that evening. On Sunday morning he had this to say about what he'd seen: "Someone kicked a security guard. That is not a peaceful demonstration. Violence begets violence. I would denounce violence on both sides."

Corroborating the allegation that protesters had initiated the violence, a security guard who asked not to be named said: "They bum rushed us. They were carrying chains." Protesters intended to use the chains to lash themselves to hotel furniture.

However, one witness, LGNY journalist Ann Northrop, who was standing outside the hotel when the violence was at its height, claims to have seen a security guard choking a protester while screaming "motherfucker."

At a press conference held on Sunday morning, Clarence Patton, a representative of the Anti-Violence Project, a counseling and advocacy service for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered, and HIV-positive victims of violent crime, voiced his concerns, but he did so, interestingly enough, without acknowledging FUQ's role in provoking the brawl. "The questions we'd like answered are whether these people were harmed simply because they were peacefully demonstrating or if it was escalated because they were in fact lesbians and gay men," he said.

By the end of the evening, police had arrested five protesters, including Korn, but as of press time, they had yet to arrest anyone from the hotel staff, even though the news channels have repeatedly aired footage of a hotel employee punching Korn in the face and her bleeding on the ground afterward. The hotel has declined to comment on the incident, but the NYPD have said that they will accept a complaint against the hotel if one is filed. Still, FUQ members see this as too little too late (one protester said she tried to file a complaint on the spot Saturday night but the police were not cooperating), and they see the NYPD's failure to protect the protesters or to arrest hotel staffers as just another example of what they deem the NYPD's discriminatory policies toward minority groups.

At an impromptu press conference held late Saturday night, FUQ spokeswoman Sue King defended her group, saying that she and her fellow protesters had shown up at the Roosevelt to make it clear that not all gays and lesbians support Giuliani or Log Cabin's endorsement of him in New

York's
2000 Senate race. "Giuliani is not a friend of gays and lesbians," said King.

But, in response, Rich Tafel insisted that the gay far left is spreading a myth that the mayor is antigay. By way of evidence, Tafel pointed to legislation the mayor wrote and passed in 1997 that extended domestic partner benefits to lesbians and gays. Tafel called it "the most sweeping domestic partnership legislation that has been passed in the entire nation by anyone, Republican or Democrat."

Giuliani also marched in June's Gay Pride parade, where he was booed and heckled, ostensibly for breaking into the parade and disrupting a minority contingent. Given the mayor's already strained relationship with the African American community after the Abner Louima and Amadou Diallo tragedies, it's not entirely surprising that minority groups disdained Giuliani's efforts to appear at Gay Pride and, in their view, make a political bid out of it. Simply because he is a Republican, it's also not surprising that Giuliani has been unpopular among left-wing gay and lesbian groups.

But the Republican stance on gays has softened remarkably in the last month, what with George W. Bush declaring in early August that he would have no qualms about hiring homosexuals. In the same vein, Elizabeth Dole) whose husband curtly rejected a Log Cabin contribution to his presidential campaign in 1996) said that she would gladly accept money from a gay Republican group. The staid senator John McCain even went so far as to say that he could imagine there being a gay president someday.

Back in May, gay Republicans were in the news again when a public debate was sparked by a controversial piece written by Carol Lloyd that appeared in the online magazine Salon, questioning whether there was any truth to the rumor that Abraham Lincoln was gay. The rumor surfaced in a speech that writer-activist Larry Kramer gave last February in which he quoted the diaries and letters of Lincoln's longtime pal Joshua Speed: "He often kisses me when I tease him, often to shut me up. He would grab me up by his long arms and hug and hug. Yes, our Abe is like a schoolgirl."

In light of recent publicity, then, Mayor Giuliani's appearance at the Log Cabin convention may well have been only the latest, if perhaps the most auspicious, sign in a series of signs that Republicans are courting the gay vote. But early in his speech Saturday night, the mayor offered an unequivocal handshake to the gay and lesbian community. "It comes down to respect for human freedom," he said. "That is why it is not at all inconsistent for me to say that a Republican should support gay rights legislation. Republicans should basically say that our party is all about

economic freedom, personal freedom, and therefore with regard to people's sexual orientation, with regard to the decisions they make about their lives, their personal lives, government should be as far removed from that as we possibly can."

He went on to praise the activities of the Log Cabin Republicans specifically. "Your presence in the Republican Party, in a very, very important philosophical way, keeps pushing all of us toward the very highest and the very best mission of this party. I can't thank you enough for being willing to remain in a party in which, and this is an understatement, not everyone shares the views that I have."

Despite Saturday night's disruptions of their banquet, and the vaguely besmirching media swirl that has surrounded it, Log Cabiners are more committed than ever to supporting Republican candidates for state and national public office. At the end of their meeting on Sunday, while FUQ activists were still holding press conferences and pacing the sidewalk outside the hotel, Log Cabiners announced the results of a straw poll they had taken earlier in the day among conference attendees in New York City. Senator John McCain was a clear winner with 57 votes. George W. Bush came in second with 43 votes, and Elizabeth Dole brought up the rear with only five votes.

If this weekend's internecine clash between the right and left wings of gay activism is any indication of things to come, gays of all stripes may be in for a rough ride in the next year. Democrats, who, in the last two decades, have virtually taken the gay vote for granted, and who, in 2000, will be leaving gays with a checkered legacy that includes the homophobic "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy and the Defense of Marriage Act, may be forced to consider the question most gay voters are starting to ask of all candidates, Republicans and Democrats: What have you done for me lately? Republicans, on the other hand, may seem to be warming up to gays, but as the Human Rights Campaign's Stachelberg warned last weekend, gays shouldn't count their chickens too soon. "The tone and tenor of much of the Republican Party and of many Republicans has changed," she said. "There's an acknowledgment that didn't exist before that there are gay men and lesbians in everyone's district across this country. And this is a very positive sign. . . . But we have to be careful not to make too much of that. It's important that we get results."

In a tone that seemed to express both his excitement about the campaign trail ahead, and his sadness about some gay activists' apparent unwillingness to work together, Rich Tafel agreed with Stachelberg. "We've got a long year ahead of us," he said.

Tell us what you think. editor@villagevoice.com

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 anyplace 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
1)

SUBJECT: NC10955: Winchell murder update

READ:UNKNOWN

[illegible][illegible]

August 31, 1999

FORT CAMPBELL, Ky.) An Army soldier charged as an accomplice in the bludgeoning death of his barracks roommate allegedly planned the attack, a fellow soldier says.

Spec. Carlos Rodríguez testified during the first day of a military investigative hearing Monday that Pvt. Calvin N. Glover, who is charged with premeditated murder, told Rodriguez soon after the killing that the idea for the attack actually came from Spec. Justin R. Fisher.

Fisher, 25, of Lincoln, Neb., is charged as an accomplice in the assault on Pfc. Barry L. Winchell, his roommate at Fort Campbell. Fisher also is accused of acting as an accessory after the fact, making false statements to Army investigators and obstructing the investigation into Winchell's death.

Winchell, 21, of Kansas City, Mo., was bludgeoned with a baseball bat in his barracks early on July 5 and died the next day at a hospital in Nashville, Tenn.

Gay-rights advocates say anti-homosexual feelings may have been behind, or at least contributed to, the killing. Winchell was perceived as gay by some soldiers in his unit and friends contend he was beginning to explore the gay lifestyle when he died.

On Monday, Rodriguez, who faces no charges, testified Glover told him after the killing that Fisher had suggested the attack and proposed dumping Winchell's body in a river.

"Glover told me it was Fisher's idea," he said.

Hearsay testimony may be presented as evidence at such hearings, which are similar to grand jury investigations in civilian criminal cases.

Military trial counselors, who are similar to prosecutors, say the killing occurred two days after a drunken Glover, 18, picked a fight with Winchell, 21, at a July 3 party at Fort Campbell.

Members of Glover's defense counsel say much of the Army's case against their client rests on Fisher's accusatory testimony against Glover.

Earlier this month, a two-day investigative hearing was held for Glover, 18, of Sulphur, Okla. No decision has been made about whether the case will go to a general court-martial.

The trial counsel, or prosecutor, in Glover's hearing said that revenge was the motive behind Winchell's killing. Capt. Gregg Engler argued that Glover attacked Winchell because Glover recently had lost a fight to him at a party.

Neither the Army nor Winchell's family have commented on the dead soldier's sexuality. Witnesses at Glover's hearing testified that Winchell was ridiculed in his unit about being homosexual.

Weeks after Winchell's death, the Pentagon updated its "don't ask, don't tell" policy for gays in the military, requiring mandatory training on anti-harassment guidelines for all troops, beginning with boot camp.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: winnie stachelberg <winnie.stachelberg@mail.hrc.org> (winnie stachelberg
<winnie.stachelberg@mail.hrc.org> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-SEP-1999 09:46:28.00

SUBJECT: Fwd:Blood, Sweat, and Fed Up Queers at the LCR Conference

TO: mtdbos@aol.com (mtdbos@aol.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: msberman@ibm.net (msberman@ibm.net [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ntanden@hillary2000NY.org (ntanden@hillary2000NY.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: timothy.boggs@twi.com (timothy.boggs@twi.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
fyi

Forward Header

Subject: Blood, Sweat, and Fed Up Queers at the LCR Conference
Author: LGBT Activists List <Doug.Case@sdsu.edu>
Date: 9/1/99 1:26 AM

Village Voice, September 1-7, 1999
(<http://www.villagevoice.com>)
Confronting the Pride Divide
Blood, Sweat, and Fed Up Queers at the Log Cabin Republican Conference
Last Saturday evening at Midtown's Roosevelt Hotel, Mayor Rudolph Giuliani gave the keynote address at the annual leadership conference of the Log Cabin Republicans, a national gay and lesbian conservative group. But a= n evening that began with the most supportive gesture that any Republican politician has ever made toward gays and lesbians ended in violence, when a small group of protesters calling themselves Fed Up Queers (FUQ) stormed the hotel lobby and were forcibly removed from the premises by hotel security. When this weekend's boisterous bipartisanship inside the Roosevelt Hotel had runneth over =96 and the blood, sweat, and tears outside the hotel had been mopped up =96 two things were clear: the gay vote is not a foregone conclus= ion

for the Democrats in 2000, and more important it is by no means predictably or sheepishly monolithic. Gays may now be more divided politically than they have ever been.

Something significant has shifted in queer politics. On a weekend when the traditionally gay-friendly probable Democratic candidate for the New York Senate, Hillary Rodham Clinton, was fundraising among moneyed heteros in the Hamptons, the usually hard-boiled Republican contender, Mayor Giuliani, was extending a sizable olive branch to gay New Yorkers. On a weekend that also saw an unprecedentedly wide array of gay activists joining forces, the straight media had its first strong hint that gays feel almost as betrayed by one another as they do by the Christian right and that they may be one another's worst enemies in the year 2000.

A third of the way through the mayor's speech to Log Cabin members and VIPs on Saturday, a thunderous banging erupted in the back of the hotel ballroom as FUQ protesters, some of whom reportedly pushed their way through one of the hotel's kitchens to gain entry, pounded on the ballroom's closed doors. "Here come my protesters," quipped the mayor in response to the noise. "Now I feel at home." After a few moments the din quieted, and the mayor delivered the remainder of his speech, then left the hotel without incident.

Soon after his departure, however, and unbeknownst to banquet attendees, a melee broke out downstairs in the hotel lobby between FUQ members and hotel staff. The protesters, who had made their way up to the ballroom, were apparently being herded back downstairs when things got ugly on the main floor of the hotel. One protester who had forced her way into the hotel, Suzy Lee Korn, kicked at a security guard as he tried to drag her back outside. The security guard then punched Korn in the face, bloodying her nose.

On Sunday morning, having been released from the hospital the previous night with minor cuts and bruises, Korn said she planned on pressing charges.

"I want to see a formal apology on behalf of the Log Cabin Republicans," she said.

Log Cabin's executive director, Rich Tafel, responded calmly but firmly to Korn's demands: "If anyone owes anyone an apology, it's a group that begins a violent action like that and escalates it into a media situation where they say they are the victims. We were organizing a peaceful convention with activists from all over the country who are on the front lines of gay and lesbian rights. We had people speaking on a panel from a

variety of perspectives and things were conducted with mutual respect. If those people wanted to exercise their First Amendment rights, they should have done it across the street."

When Tafel heard about what was happening on the street Saturday night, he left the banquet midway through dinner, went out to the front of the hotel, and attempted to talk with the handful of remaining FUQ protesters, who were still shouting anti-Giuliani slogans and attempting, largely unsuccessfully, to file complaints with the police. (For the purposes of full disclosure, I should add that earlier that afternoon I delivered a speech at the conference. Though I am not a member of the Log Cabin Republicans, I attended the banquet.)

Such diplomacy is typical of Tafel. In fact, at a conference plenary Saturday morning, he made a point of dissuading anyone from hissing, booing, or otherwise disrupting conference proceedings. "We're here to talk to each

other in a civilized manner," he said. Panelists at this session, entitled "Visions for the Movement's Future," included representatives from across the

gay political spectrum: outspoken progressive Urvashi Vaid, director of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Policy Institute; libertarian Jonathan Rauch, a correspondent for National Journal; Brian Bond, executive director of the Gay and Lesbian Victory Fund; Winnie Stachelberg, political director of the bipartisan Human Rights Campaign (HRC); and State Representative Steve

May (Republican of Arizona). (May, who also serves part-time in the army reserves, was front-page news in The New York Times last week when the army announced its intention to investigate him under the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell"

policy, because he came out as gay during a bitter dispute in the Arizona legislature over a bill that would have denied the use of public funds to pay

health benefits to same-sex partners.)

Though Tafel didn't witness the climactic kicking and punching on Saturday night, he saw it on the news that evening. On Sunday morning he

had this to say about what he'd seen: "Someone kicked a security guard. That is

not a peaceful demonstration. Violence begets violence. I would denounce violence on both sides."

Corroborating the allegation that protesters had initiated the violence, a security guard who asked not to be named said: "They bum rushed us. They were carrying chains." Protesters intended to use the chains to lash themselves to hotel furniture.

However, one witness, LGNY journalist Ann Northrop, who was standing outside the hotel when the violence was at its height, claims to have seen

a
security guard choking a protester while screaming "motherfucker."

At a press conference held on Sunday morning, Clarence Patton, a representative of the Anti-Violence Project, a counseling and advocacy service for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered, and HIV-positive victims of violent crime, voiced his concerns, but he did so, interestingly enough, without acknowledging FUQ's role in provoking the brawl. "The questions we'=

d
like answered are whether these people were harmed simply because they were peacefully demonstrating or if it was escalated because they were in fact lesbians and gay men," he said.

By the end of the evening, police had arrested five protesters, includin=

g
Korn, but as of press time, they had yet to arrest anyone from the hotel staff, even though the news channels have repeatedly aired footage of a hote=

l
employee punching Korn in the face and her bleeding on the ground afterward.

The hotel has declined to comment on the incident, but the NYPD have said that they will accept a complaint against the hotel if one is filed.

Still,
=46UQ members see this as too little too late (one protester said she tried =

to
file a complaint on the spot Saturday night but the police were not cooperating), and they see the NYPD's failure to protect the protesters or t=

o
arrest hotel staffers as just another example of what they deem the NYPD's discriminatory policies toward minority groups.

At an impromptu press conference held late Saturday night, FUQ spokeswoman Sue King defended her group, saying that she and her fellow protesters had shown up at the Roosevelt to make it clear that not all gays and lesbians support Giuliani or Log Cabin's endorsement of him in New York'=

s
2000 Senate race. "Giuliani is not a friend of gays and lesbians," said King.

But, in response, Rich Tafel insisted that the gay far left is spreading

a myth that the mayor is antigay. By way of evidence, Tafel pointed to legislation the mayor wrote and passed in 1997 that extended domestic partne=

r
benefits to lesbians and gays. Tafel called it "the most sweeping domestic partnership legislation that has been passed in the entire nation by anyone, Republican or Democrat."

Giuliani also marched in June's Gay Pride parade, where he was booed and heckled, ostensibly for breaking into the parade and disrupting a minority

contingent. Given the mayor's already strained relationship with the
Africa=

n

American community after the Abner Louima and Amadou Diallo tragedies, it's
not entirely surprising that minority groups disdained Giuliani's efforts
to

appear at Gay Pride and, in their view, make a political bid out of it.
Simply because he is a Republican, it's also not surprising that Giuliani
ha=

s

been unpopular among left-wing gay and lesbian groups.

But the Republican stance on gays has softened remarkably in the last
month, what with George W. Bush declaring in early August that he would
have

no qualms about hiring homosexuals. In the same vein, Elizabeth Dole =96
wh=

ose

husband curtly rejected a Log Cabin contribution to his presidential
campaign=

n

in 1996 =96 said that she would gladly accept money from a gay Republican
group. The staid senator John McCain even went so far as to say that he
could imagine there being a gay president someday.

Back in May, gay Republicans were in the news again when a public
debate

was sparked by a controversial piece written by Carol Lloyd that appeared
in

the online magazine Salon, questioning whether there was any truth to the
rumor that Abraham Lincoln was gay. The rumor surfaced in a speech that
writer-activist Larry Kramer gave last February in which he quoted the
diaries and letters of Lincoln's longtime pal Joshua Speed: "He often
kisse=

s

me when I tease him, often to shut me up. He would grab me up by his long
arms and hug and hug. Yes, our Abe is like a schoolgirl."

In light of recent publicity, then, Mayor Giuliani's appearance at the
Log Cabin convention may well have been only the latest, if perhaps the
most

auspicious, sign in a series of signs that Republicans are courting the gay
vote. But early in his speech Saturday night, the mayor offered an
unequivocal handshake to the gay and lesbian community. "It comes down to
respect for human freedom," he said. "That is why it is not at all
inconsistent for me to say that a Republican should support gay rights
legislation. Republicans should basically say that our party is all about
economic freedom, personal freedom, and therefore with regard to people's
sexual orientation, with regard to the decisions they make about their
lives=

,

their personal lives, government should be as far removed from that as we
possibly can."

He went on to praise the activities of the Log Cabin Republicans
specifically. "Your presence in the Republican Party, in a very, very
important philosophical way, keeps pushing all of us toward the very
highest

and the very best mission of this party. I can't thank you enough for being willing to remain in a party in which, and this is an understatement, not everyone shares the views that I have."

Despite Saturday night's disruptions of their banquet, and the vaguely besmirching media swirl that has surrounded it, Log Cabiners are more committed than ever to supporting Republican candidates for state and national public office. At the end of their meeting on Sunday, while FUQ activists were still holding press conferences and pacing the sidewalk outside the hotel, Log Cabiners announced the results of a straw poll they had taken earlier in the day among conference attendees in New York City. Senator John McCain was a clear winner with 57 votes. George W. Bush came

second with 43 votes, and Elizabeth Dole brought up the rear with only five votes.

If this weekend's internecine clash between the right and left wings of gay activism is any indication of things to come, gays of all stripes may be in for a rough ride in the next year. Democrats, who, in the last two decades, have virtually taken the gay vote for granted, and who, in 2000, will be leaving gays with a checkered legacy that includes the homophobic "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy and the Defense of Marriage Act, may be

to consider the question most gay voters are starting to ask of all candidates, Republicans and Democrats: What have you done for me lately? Republicans, on the other hand, may seem to be warming up to gays, but as

Human Rights Campaign's Stachelberg warned last weekend, gays shouldn't

their chickens too soon. "The tone and tenor of much of the Republican

and of many Republicans has changed," she said. "There's an acknowledgment that didn't exist before that there are gay men and lesbians in everyone's district across this country. And this is a very positive sign. . . . But we have to be careful not to make too much of that. It's important that we get results."

In a tone that seemed to express both his excitement about the campaign trail ahead, and his sadness about some gay activists' apparent

to work together, Rich Tafel agreed with Stachelberg. "We've got a long ahead of us," he said.

Tell us what you think. editor@villagevoice.com

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 anyplace 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: 1-SEP-1999 12:23:29.00

SUBJECT: very tough stuff here -- da/dt

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:

Wednesday, September 1, 1999 Copyright , 1999, Arkansas
Democrat-Gazette, Inc.

Don't ask, don't tell: And don't
make sense

IT HAD TO happen, given this administration's perverse
policy toward

homosexuals in the armed forces: A legislator in Arizona
who's also an

officer in the Reserves spoke up in defense of
homosexuals--indeed, state

Representative Steve May never made a secret of his own
homosexuality--and now he may be kicked out of the
service because he

did. That'll teach him to discuss a public issue in
public.

This may be the clearest example yet of how the new
"Don't Ask, Don't

Tell" policy conflicts with an American's freedom of
speech. And with

common sense.

This confusing new policy is also supposed to
include "Don't Pursue," but

who can blame Mr. May for feeling hunted? Agree or
disagree with his

opinions as a state legislator, doesn't he have a right
to express them without

being deemed unworthy of wearing his country's uniform?

Nobody has expressed any dissatisfaction with Steve
May's military

service, only with his sexual orientation. Or maybe just
with his talking about

it. It's all as confusing as it is unsatisfactory, like
so many of this

administration's ways.

Lieutenant May's treatment is only one of the
strange results of a policy

that increasingly eludes understanding, and always
defied reason. It seems

the armed forces are still supposed to discharge
homosexuals but not to

seek them out. ("Don't ask.") For their part,
homosexuals are not supposed

to say they are, or even hint they are, in public.
("Don't tell.") In short, the

administration will defend the right of homosexuals to
serve their country

right up to the minute they're found out and
court-martialed.

As if this policy weren't sufficiently ambiguous,
homosexuals also aren't
supposed to be harassed because of their sexual
orientation. Expelling them
from the military because of it evidently isn't
considered harassment. You
explain it.

HERE IS a policy that was supposed to make it easier
for homosexuals
to serve their country. Instead, military discharges for
homosexuality have
increased under the new policy. The number of servicemen
discharged for
homosexuality had been declining steadily--from 1,998 in
1982 to 617 in
1994. But the number has increased steadily since the
new policy went into
confused effect. Last year the number of such discharges
was the highest it's
been since 1987: 1,145. The less people ask, and the
less people tell, it
seems the more people are discharged.

In a typical clintonesque compromise, a once clear
choice (let
homosexuals wear the uniform or don't) has been turned
into an
indecipherable legal muddle: Members of the armed
services aren't
supposed to be punished because of their sexual
orientation, but may be
discharged because of an unapproved sexual "propensity."
Even if they
haven't acted on it. You figure it out; we'd rather not.
These rarefied
distinctions used to be left to psychiatrists instead of
commanding officers.

It was clear where all this was going back in 1993,
when the new
president was going to eliminate discrimination against
homosexuals in the
armed forces, another promise he didn't keep. Because
instead of this
commander-in-chief simply issuing an order and having
the generals execute
it, he started bargaining with the Joint Chiefs of
Staff, the Senate Armed
Services Committee, and everybody else in sight--as if
command were just
another form of negotiation.

The result is a policy that avoids the issue instead
of solving it. Naturally
so vague a system has to be constantly explained,
amended, and "clarified,"
and just as naturally it grows more confusing. Because

the whole aim of this
muddle of a policy was to avoid a clear choice and
please all sides. What it
seems to have done is confuse and irritate all sides,
when it isn't
embarrassing them.
Or at least all sides should be embarrassed. Where
we were headed
should have been painfully clear when this new system
was first explained by
Jamie Gorelick in 1993, when she was general counsel and
a general source
of bewilderment for the Department of Defense. At one
point, when she was
asked how someone accused of homosexuality might offer a
defense, Ms.
Gorelick gamely replied:
"In one instance a woman was alleged to have said
that she was a lesbian.
She came in and said essentially that the statement had
been misunderstood.
. . . And actually, she introduced evidence--she brought
in boyfriends who
testified essentially that she was heterosexual--and the
conclusion was
reached that she would be retained."
Goodness gracious. And essentially the supposed
adults on the
congressional committee she was addressing just sat
there, as if it were the
most natural thing in the world for a military court to
be asking these
questions and staging this kind of peep show. We don't
want to think about
any part of it, let alone the supposed efficacy of the
questions asked in this
oh-so-scientific investigation. This must have been a
bizarre undertaking for
even what has always been laughingly known as military
"justice." The real
corruption, it seems to us, is that the civilians on
that House committee just
sat there and listened to Jamie Gorelick as if she were
making perfect sense.
But given the administration's new policy, such
scenes have become
unavoidable and, soon enough, accepted, normal, just
part of American life.
As unavoidable as kicking a state legislator out of the
Reserves because of
something he said in public debate. This is how the
clintonesque becomes
part of the normal thought process of a whole society,
if you could call it

thought.

Why is it that other countries don't seem to have
this hang-up with
homosexuals in their armies? Belgium, Canada, Denmark,
Finland,

Germany, Israel, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain,
Switzerland, Sweden . . .

None of those nations find it necessary to tie
themselves in legal and political
knots over this oh-so-crucial question. For that matter,
it's common

knowledge that any number of homosexuals have served
honorably in, yes,
the armed forces of the United States.

TO SUM up, this is a very queer policy, and the
results are anything but
gay. (We try not to miss any opportunity to use those
adjectives in the
old-style way, before they were expropriated by today's
language police for
their own narrow purposes.) What should have remained a
private-matter-in

any decent, neo-Victorian society now has become an
excuse for a lot of
public spin by our always nimble pols, with the result
that neither justice nor
reason has been advanced. And certainly not the language.

Instead, we get spectacles like the vice president's
complaining the other
day that the spirit of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" had been
ignored. Al Gore was
prudent enough not to say which administration was
responsible for ignoring
it, or how a policy so contradictory in its aims (punish
but tolerate) could
have any spirit to ignore.

Isn't it time to simply expect all members of the
armed services--
homosexual, heterosexual or neither--to conduct
themselves as ladies and
gentlemen, and leave it at that?

Surely, lewd behavior can be punished and propriety
insisted upon
regardless of sexual orientation. Instead, we seem to
have substituted a kind
of legalized haze for what was once an unfair but at
least a clear, simple
prejudice. Now we seem to have instituted the worst of
both worlds:

injustice and confusion. Could we please just Get Over
It?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-SEP-1999 09:19:38.00

SUBJECT: Re: Don't Ask, Don't Tell Meeting -- TODAY

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Hi, Karen: yesterday's internal WH meeting was canceled because Cheryl was unavailable. I'll keep you posted. we are going to try to do it today, Wed.

Karen Tramontano
09/01/99 08:06:54 AM
Record Type: Record

To: Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP@EOP
cc:
Subject: Don't Ask, Don't Tell Meeting -- TODAY

what's this?

----- Forwarded by Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP on 09/01/99
08:06 AM -----

Edward W. Correia
08/31/99 04:04:58 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: Don't Ask, Don't Tell Meeting -- TODAY

We'll have to reschedule the meeting for today at 4:30. Sorry.

Message Sent

To: _____
Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP
Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP

Charles Allen/NSC/EOP
Peter Rundlet/WHO/EOP
Charles W. Burson/OVP @ OVP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-SEP-1999 09:21:05.00

SUBJECT: NC10956: More Winchell updates

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

----- Forwarded by Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP on 09/01/99
09:20 AM -----

09/01/99 02:57:00 AM

To: Richard Socarides@EOP

Subject: NC10956: More Winchell updates

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.

Lead story, page A-1 top

WITNESS DESCRIBES SCENE OF SOLDIER'S BEATING

By Chris Poynter, The Courier-Journal

FORT CAMPBELL, Ky. -- As Pfc. Barry Winchell's mother and stepfather sat in a military courtroom yesterday, a sergeant described how their son was so badly beaten that he gurgled on his own blood, struggling to breathe while unconscious.

"He had raccoon eyes, and both eyes were black," Staff Sgt. Bradley Hardin testified yesterday at a hearing for Spc. Justin Fisher, accused of acting as an accomplice in the beating death of the gay soldier earlier this summer.

Winchell's mother, Patricia Kutteles of Kansas City, Mo., sat quietly, at times taking notes on a pad of paper. Her husband, Wally Kutteles, hugged her and rubbed her arm as they listened to eight witnesses who took the stand yesterday in the Article 32 hearing, the military equivalent of a grand jury and preliminary hearing. The hearing continues this morning at Fort Campbell.

Winchell's mother and stepfather declined to comment after leaving the courtroom.

Hardin said he was on duty the morning of July 5 and rushed to the scene outside Winchell's barracks to find the 21-year-old near death after being struck several times with a wooden baseball bat. He testified blood coated the cot where Winchell was sleeping, as well as his comforter and the walls. Winchell was taken to a hospital in Nashville, Tenn., where he died the next day.

Pfc. Calvin Glover is accused of premeditated murder and, at his Article 32 earlier this month, the Army acknowledged that the killing was

motivated, in part, because Winchell was gay. Investigators also say Glover killed Winchell as revenge because Winchell beat Glover in a fight two days earlier.

The case outraged homosexuals and gay-rights organizations across the nation and, in part, led the military to announce revisions to its "don't ask, don't tell" policy on gays in the military.

Fisher, Winchell's roommate, is accused of encouraging Glover to strike Winchell. The Lincoln, Neb., native is also charged with making false statements to Army investigators and obstructing the investigation.

No testimony surfaced yesterday about the role Fisher may have played in the killing. The circumstances could surface today or when military prosecutors summarize their case for an investigating officer, who will recommend if the case should proceed to a court martial. The commanding general at Fort Campbell will eventually decide if Glover and Fisher face a court martial. No decision has been made in either case.

Testimony yesterday revealed Glover attempted to blame Fisher, saying Fisher hatched the plan to kill Winchell, then dump his body into a river. Sgt. Carlos Rodriguez testified Glover described such a plot after he had been arrested. The comments surfaced as Rodriguez was guarding Glover at a jail cell at Fort Campbell, the sergeant testified. Glover also made similar comments to another soldier who was guarding him, according to yesterday's hearing.

The most graphic testimony of the day came from the last witness, Staff Sgt. Hardin, who said he realized something was wrong when he heard Fisher yelling, "Oh, God, help me, I think he's dying."

Hardin said he rushed to Winchell's barracks and saw Fisher covered in blood, holding Winchell under his arms and trying to drag him down a flight of stairs to get help. Hardin said Winchell was bleeding from his left ear. Hardin and another soldier tried to stop the bleeding by applying pressure and placing a field dressing on the wound.

Hardin testified Fisher was visibly upset and "freaking out." Other soldiers testified Fisher was running around the barracks, screaming for help and asking people to hope that Winchell would pull through.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Peter Rundlet (CN=Peter Rundlet/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-SEP-1999 10:08:01.00

SUBJECT: Re: NAFTA mtg.

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Top of the morning to you Melissa.

Cheryl called and said this meeting (sans Gene) is to take place on Friday at 9:15. Is that your understanding?

Also, do you know what time the Don't Ask/Don't Tell meeting got rescheduled for? Ben called to say that it was not happening yesterday and that he thought it would sometime on Friday, but was not sure. Do you have any idea?

As always, you are the best.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-SEP-1999 09:22:59.00

SUBJECT: more on Steve May

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

----- Forwarded by Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP on 09/01/99
09:22 AM -----

To: Richard Socarides@EOP
cc:
Subject: NC10953: Good piece on Steve May (rising gay star)

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.

<http://www.salon1999.com/>

Don't ask, he'll tell

An openly gay Mormon Republican flouts the Clinton administration's gays-in-the-military policy.

By Amy Silverman

PHOENIX) The investigation by the U.S. Army Reserve into Lt. Steve May's alleged homosexuality is the biggest waste of taxpayer dollars since the \$640 toilet seat, since May has been openly gay for the last three years. But May's challenge to the Army's prohibition against openly gay soldiers could be the biggest threat to the Clinton administration's "don't ask, don't tell" policy since it was implemented in 1993.

May admits he has probably violated the "don't tell" part of the policy, which resulted in the discharge of more than 1,000 gay men and women from the armed forces last year, because he has certainly told) and told and told and told. But May came out as openly gay not as an Army reserve officer, but as a Republican candidate for the Arizona Legislature, where he took office last January.

His openness has led to an Army Reserve investigation) and a new status as national media star. The Service Members Legal Defense Fund has taken his case, and his plight has been featured in media coast to coast. "I just did a press conference with CNN, all the networks, probably 20 reporters," he told me from New York, where he was attending a weekend meeting of the Log Cabin Republicans, a gay GOP group. He'd been on MSNBC and "Good Morning America" already, but had to turn down other offers because he'd promised Larry King an exclusive on Monday night.

May's being gay is not news. The Arizona Mormon, who is 27, ran for

the Legislature in 1996. He was outed by the local Log Cabin Republicans during the campaign. He lost the race but ran again in 1998, and won, this time as an openly gay candidate.

Earlier, while in college, he had served in the Navy and Army ROTC. In 1993, after graduation, he was called to active duty in the Army) about the same time that "don't ask, don't tell" was implemented. He kept his mouth shut about his homosexuality, which up till then he'd mentioned only to a few family members and close friends. May's service ended in 1995, though he remained eligible to be called up in a military crisis.

A year later, he was outed during his campaign for the Legislature. And since his election, he has talked openly about his homosexuality. As a freshman lawmaker in Arizona's conservative Legislature) and its first openly gay Republican) he caused a small uproar when he put a Tinky Winky doll on his desk on the House floor. A member of the GOP leadership staff gently suggested it wasn't such a good idea to decorate that way, so May removed the doll. (Actually, it was removed for him by some snarky Democrats, who doll-napped Tinky and returned him days later, with a cigarette in his mouth. May didn't bother to put the doll back on his desk.)

Sort of "don't ask, don't tell," civilian-style.

Earlier this year he took a leading role fighting social conservatives who were trying to outlaw health benefits to same-sex partners, with arguments comparing homosexuality to cannibalism, and declaring that the life expectancy of a gay man is 42. May called their efforts "an attack on my family, an attack on my freedom. This Legislature takes my gay tax dollars and my gay tax dollars spend the same as your straight tax dollars."

Shortly after that impassioned speech, May got a letter in the mail. The crisis in the Balkans was escalating, and Uncle Sam wanted him back.

The same week in April that I published a profile of him in the Phoenix New Times, May reported for his first weekend of duty as a reservist. He saw soldiers passing the article around, but didn't hear from Army brass until July, when he was told the article had been sent to his commander with a complaint. (An Army Reserve investigator confirms this.) A formal investigation was launched in August.

May readily admits he's likely violated the basic tenets of "don't ask, don't tell." That's not the issue, he says.

"I don't know that there's a legal case at all," says May. "I'm just saying the policy's wrong. I should be allowed to live my life openly, honestly and with integrity ... Integrity has consequences ... I'm willing to suffer the consequences of living my life with integrity."

May says his soldiers treat him with respect, and he's been getting encouraging e-mail from men he served with in the early 1990s when he was still in the closet. He's been told, he says, to pretend the investigation isn't happening and to continue to lead his troops. He is up for a promotion to captain this fall.

"This could take forever, because they only take action one weekend a month, because everyone who's involved is a reservist," he says.

Talking to the press probably constitutes a violation of the "don't ask, don't tell policy," says May.

"But that's not the point," he says. "My point is that the policy is wrong."

About the writer: Amy Silverman is a staff writer for Phoenix New Times.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Yandylove@aol.com (Yandylove@aol.com [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-SEP-1999 18:36:26.00

SUBJECT: Fwd: Gore Featured On Gay.com Today

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

TO: Philip G Dufour@OVP (Philip G Dufour@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Hi guys:

Just wanted to make sure you saw this announcement that went out to all of
the subscribers at gay.com

paul

Return-path: JWSTOLLER@aol.com

Date: Thu, 2 Sep 1999 16:46:52 EDT

From: JWSTOLLER@aol.com

Subject: Fwd: Gore Featured On Gay.com Today

To: jonathan@a-gFinancial.com

Message-id: <b4376453.25003c3c@aol.com>

MIME-version: 1.0

X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 21

Content-type: MULTIPART/MIXED;

BOUNDARY="Boundary_(ID_yJJg0XZbQMTbyt87egmxxg)"

Full-name: JWSTOLLER

Thought you might find this interesting...

Return-path: <lselvin@onlinepartners.com>

Received: from rly-yb02.mx.aol.com (rly-yb02.mail.aol.com [172.18.146.2])
by air-yb02.mail.aol.com (v60.28) with ESMTP; Thu, 02 Sep 1999 16:05:03
-0400

Received: from set.logx.com ([63.76.46.56]) by rly-yb02.mx.aol.com
(v60.28) with ESMTP; Thu, 02 Sep 1999 16:04:50 -0400

Received: (qmail 2136 invoked from network); 2 Sep 1999 20:04:43 -0000

Received: from wall.logx.com (HELO lowell) (63.76.46.65) by set.logx.com
with SMTP; 2 Sep 1999 20:04:43 -0000

Date: Thu, 02 Sep 1999 13:05:42 -0700

From: Lowell Selvin <lselvin@onlinepartners.com>

Subject: Gore Featured On Gay.com Today

X-Sender: lselvin@mail.onlinepartners.com

To: (Recipient list suppressed)

Message-id: <3.0.3.32.19990902130542.03d9adfc@mail.onlinepartners.com>

MIME-version: 1.0

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)

Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Dear Friend

Gay.com is featuring the Vice President on our web site today at <http://www.gay.com>. BTW, we've implemented all new, easier site navigation and full integration with Looksmart (not yet announced to the public.) Check us out!

Here's an excerpt from a letter to the Gore 2000 campaign from gay.com co-founder Jeff Bennett:

We are proud to spread Al Gore's message to the 250,000 people who will visit our site today. Another million people will have the chance to view the article during the month.

Published by our partner, The Advocate, the article highlights Gore's stance on same-sex marriage and gays in the military.

We have invited the Vice President to participate in Gay.com's Vote 2000 interactive chat series. Vote 2000 provides the opportunity for candidates from all parties to be our guest in a moderated event environment. The Gore 2000 team will have full control of questions and statements posted during the event.

In honor of the Vice President's unprecedented support of the gay and lesbian community, we have reserved the first interactive chat for him! We expect Bill Bradley and George W. Bush to participate in this program as well.

Jeff

Jeff Bennett
Co-founder & Director of Community, Gay.com
<http://www.gay.com>
415-252-6700 x219

Lowell R. Selvin
Chief Executive Officer
Online Partners
[gay.com, gay.net, onQ on AOL]
P.O. Box 410612
San Francisco, CA 94141
T (415)252-6700 ext 227
F (415)252-6738
lselvin@onlinepartners.com

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-SEP-1999 23:03:27.00

SUBJECT: Wayne Friday column, 9/2/99

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Initiative pits state GOP House members against Sacto lawmakers

by Wayne Friday

An initiative headed for the March 2000 ballot that is officially sponsored by a taxpayers group known as People's Advocates, which has financial backing by the California Republican House delegation, would take the power to reshape California's congressional districts from the Legislature and hand it over to the state's seven Supreme Court justices. Redistricting of the House districts is done every 10 years - after the census - and with Democrats firmly in control of both the Legislature and the governor's office, Republicans in Congress are solidly behind the nationally watched initiative since they are fearful of losing their own seats, or even control of the entire U.S. House of Representatives in future elections.

California House Republicans are shaking at the thought that the Sacramento Democratic-controlled Legislature will reshape House seats that would be very favorable to that party, meaning the GOP could lose as many as six or eight Republican-held House seats. House Republicans are said to be ready to pump millions of dollars into the March 2000 initiative in order to pass the scheme drummed up by the taxpayers group.

To sweeten the plan for voters, the initiative would also kick state legislators in the teeth by not only taking away a December 1998 pay raise - from the previous \$78,624 to \$99,000 annually - that was awarded them by the California Citizens Compensation Commission, but would roll their annual salary back to a permanent \$75,000, and reduce their tax-free expense payments from its present \$30,000 to no more than \$9,000. The initiative would also state that any future raises for state lawmakers would have to be approved by voters. While \$75,000 annually looks like a pretty good salary to most of us, it is not excessive considering that most state legislators must maintain a residence of some kind in Sacramento as well as in their home districts. It should also be noted that the nonpartisan California Citizens Compensation Commission purposely declared that the higher salary of \$99,000 was necessary in this era of term limits to attract qualified candidates who aren't independently wealthy.

Incidentally, while Republicans in Congress are only too happy to roll back the pay of California state lawmakers as an inducement to get support for a plan that might save their own political futures, the Congress itself only recently voted themselves a hefty pay raise. The fact that the California

Constitution has long given the power of redistricting to duly elected state legislators seems to be of no concern to those Republican House members who have successfully managed to badly split their own party on the plan that is sure to qualify for the March 2000 ballot, pitting Republicans in the House against fellow GOP members serving in Sacramento. Hypocrisy is the name of this one and you can look for at least a couple of Republican state legislators to switch parties by the time voters act on this power-grabbing plan in March.

Politics and people

The next mayoral debate pitting Mayor Willie Brown against principal challengers Frank Jordan and Clint Reilly is set for this Wednesday, September 8, at Mission High School, sponsored by the League of Women Voters. Meanwhile, I'm hearing that negotiations are about to get started that would allow for similar debates for the district attorney's race as well.

Speaking of which, the Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club last week endorsed District Attorney Terence Hallinan for re-election; former longtime District Attorney Arlo Smith, who endorsed Hallinan in the runoff four years ago, will serve as a co-chair of the Steve Castleman for district attorney campaign this time around.

What goes around: Representative Bob Barr (R-Georgia), the homophobic, Clinton-hating, right wing House member who one reporter called "the most hateful SOB in Congress," and a constant critic of Democratic fundraising practices, has quietly agreed to pay more than \$28,000 in fines to settle charges arising from a Federal Election Commission audit of his 1994 and 1996 congressional campaigns.

Republicans from across the country, desperate to win next year and convinced they have that winner in Texas Governor George W. Bush, are frantically trying to sweep Bush's apparent past cocaine habit under the rug, calling the issue "history and irrelevant." The Reverend Jesse Jackson, however, is taking a "wait a minute here" attitude. Jackson correctly points out that a majority of the 149,000 people in Texas prisons are serving time for non-violent drug offenses and says, "you cannot say it's not the business of the press or the public when it's actually public policy; you cannot enforce a law that you yourself likely did not adhere to." It should be noted that Bush, who says he has definitely been drug-free for at least a number of years, has lived in Texas since 1968, when that state had some of the nation's toughest and unforgiving drug laws.

And how about Senator Orrin Hatch (R-Utah) "apologizing" to the NAACP for a statement he made recently contrasting gay rights and black issues; the GOP presidential hopeful was widely criticized earlier this month for saying "people of color can't do anything about their color; I do believe that gay people have a choice to live within the legal rules or not - that's why we have civil rights to protect African Americans from discrimination." Like gay Americans don't need protection from discrimination of people like Hatch and his ilk? Only last week the New York Times carried a front-page story about openly gay Arizona state Representative Steve May, a

27-year-old Republican, who faces getting stripped of his lieutenant bars from the Army Reserve and booted out of the military under President Bill Clinton's infamous "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy simply because he had the guts to admit his sexuality (a fact long known to his Phoenix constituents) by responding to a homophobic attack from a fellow Republican lawmaker on the floor of the state House of Representatives. Arizona's other openly gay legislator, Representative Ken Cheuvront, is a Democrat.

Look for the Vermont Supreme Court to soon decide if that state's constitution allows for gay marriages; observers feel that the somewhat liberal state justices are inclined to favor such unions, and that could make Vermont the first jurisdiction in the country to allow fully equal marriage rights to homosexual couples.

San Francisco Sheriff Mike Hennessey, one of the best public servants around, is easily headed for another four years in office since he's running unopposed in November.

Reports have it that San Francisco Public Defender Jeff Brown, another man I have a lot of respect for, is likely to be appointed to the bench by Governor Gray Davis, possibly within the next year.

Los Angeles City Councilwoman Jackie Goldberg, a highly respected lesbian, is seeking the Democratic nomination next year for the state Assembly in that city's 45th District

The California Republican Party will hold its state convention at the Anaheim Marriott Hotel September 24-26, and even the party leaders are saying that it will be impossible to avoid a war between battling factions.

An unusual amount of mail recently from readers so let me take this opportunity to thank those who write; I appreciate your time and interest.

And how was your week?

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-SEP-1999 00:26:15.00

SUBJECT: NC10970: Andy Humm is pissed at the Village Voice

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

TEXT:

Dear Rex,

Since you circulated Norah's article, you might want to share my response with your readers. I have submitted it to the Voice as a letter and article, and will run in LGNY if they don't want it.

Andy

Response to Norah Vincent's "Village Voice" article on Log Cabin convention by Andy Humm
andyhummm@aol.com

Norah Vincent, the neo-conservative lesbian columnist, provided the Voice's "news" coverage of the Log Cabin Republican convention in New York (September 7). What's next? Pat Buchanan from the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia next year? The times, they are a changin'.

I covered Log Cabin for the Gay Cable Network and saw a very different event. (For the record, I am a very disloyal and critical member of the Democratic Party.)

Vincent repeatedly quotes Log Cabiners calling the demonstration by Fed Up Queers against Mayor Giuliani's speech there as being "violent." I covered the demonstration inside and outside the Roosevelt Hotel. It was certainly boisterous, but no demonstrator physically attacked any of the hotel's security force which was completely out of control.

Anyone who saw the TV news that night witnessed FUQ's Suzy Lee Korn flailing while security tried to drag her down the stairs and out of the lobby. Her leg and foot may have glanced off a guard's leg. She clearly did not "kick a security guard" as Log Cabin director Rich Tafel asserts and Vincent repeats. Vincent then seeks--ta-da!--a quote from a security guard to "corroborate" Tafel's interpretation. Alberto Santiago, the "lobby ambassador" who smashed Korn in the face, flatly denied to me that any security guard hit anyone in the incident--despite being caught on tape doing just that.

Vincent also fails to address the most critical civil liberties issue related to this action. At least ten NYPD officers stood by and did nothing as the Roosevelt's security staff-untrained in dealing with civil disobedience-manhandled the Fed Up Queers. One chief did demand that Santiago leave the scene after he clocked Korn, but he then allowed the security staff to continue to conduct the ejection of the demonstrators from the lobby, allowing for the further violence (seen on TV) of them

being dragged down a long flight of stairs, heads banging on each step. Police failure to intervene was the story and Vincent ignored it.

As to the convention itself: Whatever your ideology, describing--in her lead paragraph--Mayor Giuliani's speech as "the most supportive gesture that any Republican politician has ever made toward gays and lesbians" is completely ahistorical. Barry Goldwater's defiance of his party's opposition to gays in the military in 1993 was infinitely more courageous. Massachusetts Gov. Bill Weld initiated education programs on gay issues in public schools--the same kind of programs that Giuliani has dismantled in New York. More than ten years ago, Lowell Weicker, as a Republican Senator from Connecticut, was the keynote speaker at the then-Human Rights Campaign Fund (the gay PAC) dinner at the Waldorf, was received enthusiastically, and was unequivocal in his support for lesbian and gay rights. (When Mayor Giuliani appeared at the dinner of the New York PAC, the Empire State Pride Agenda, several years ago he received a good chorus of boos mixed with applause because of his decidedly mixed record on gay issues.) And almost thirty years ago, John Lindsay, still a Republican, issued an executive order banning anti-gay discrimination in mayoral agencies.

Vincent quotes Tafel as insisting that "the gay far left is spreading a myth that the Mayor is antigay." He goes on to cite Giuliani's domestic partners law as "the most sweeping in the country." Anyone with even a casual knowledge of developments on the domestic partnership front knows that San Francisco's law, which also requires contractors who do business with the city to provide such benefits, is infinitely more far-reaching. As a result of San Francisco's leadership, hundreds of entities have begun to provide these benefits, including the Catholic Archdiocese. What's more, it has prompted national and worldwide corporations that do some business with that city to make these benefits available worldwide. Contractors legislation in New York, first introduced by Council Member (now State Senator) Tom Duane several years ago, is going nowhere because it is opposed by Speaker Vallone and Mayor Giuliani.

Almost all of the domestic partner rights in the Giuliani law already existed in New York because of a court case settled by Mayor Dinkins. Giuliani resisted such codification by the City Council in 1997, but eventually agreed to go along with it after his re-election in exchange for the neutrality of the Empire State Pride Agenda in his race against longtime gay rights supporter Ruth Messinger. When Giuliani first ran for Mayor in 1989, he criticized Mayor Koch's executive order allowing gay people to visit their partners in hospitals and take bereavement leave after a partner died. In his second run, he condemned Dinkins's settlement of the Gay Teachers case that gave city employees such benefits in 1993. And unlike every other candidate for Mayor in 1997, Giuliani opposes same sex marriage.

Vincent writes that Giuliani marches in the Gay Pride Parade, but fails to note that he pointedly avoids marching with us past St. Patrick's Cathedral, condemning gay marchers for being "disrespectful" to the church, seat of Cardinal O'Connor who has taken the lead in opposing virtually every gay right initiative of the past 15 years. Giuliani also drops out of the parade at 23rd Street, not risking a walk past the large gay crowds in the Village. Compare this to his behavior in the St. Patrick's Day Parade which excludes the Irish Lesbian and Gay Organization. He proudly marches the route three times and refuses to give a permit to ILGO to hold a protest march in the morning, arresting

anyone who tries.

I covered the Fed Up Queers demonstration outside the Roosevelt, but my Gay Cable Network colleague Ann Northrop said that during Giuliani's speech inside, he received enthusiastic applause for his stances on welfare reform and crime fighting and only polite applause when he championed hate crime and non-discrimination legislation. Like most Republicans, they do not seem enthusiastic about basic civil rights protections from the government. They embrace a broadly conservative agenda and just want Republicans to be a little more polite.

Vincent says that "the Republican stance on gays has softened remarkably in the last month," citing George W. Bush's claim that he would "have no qualms about hiring homosexuals" (a quaint term for the Voice) and John McCain saying "he could imagine a gay president." Bush is governor of Texas and has no open gays on his staff, opposes gay adoptions, refused to sign a hate crime bill including sexual orientation, and believes that jail terms are justified when two people of the same sex make love (otherwise known as the Texas sodomy statute). McCain, whom the Log Cabinites supported with 57% of their vote in a straw poll for President, believes that his friend, out gay Arizona legislator Steve May, should be thrown out of the Army reserves because of his homosexuality and voted against the Employment Non-Discrimination Act in 1996 to ban anti-gay discrimination in most jobs. The Republican Party Platform of 1996, which Log Cabin makes excuses for, explicitly opposes any protections on the basis of sexual orientation.

Vincent never once mentions that the convention was about 98% white and 98% male, a striking and obvious fact that even the sleepest or most ideologically biased reporter might have noted. When I asked Vincent, who, as she did write, was a speaker at the confab, about the lack of women, she said, "Most of the lesbian community is very conformist." Before women, people of color, or gays and lesbians consider the Republican Party as an alternative to the less-than-inspiring Democrats, they need a fair and clear picture of where Republicans stand on gay issues. Vincent's article completely distorted the party's continuing anti-gay record. The Voice's readers deserve better.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-SEP-1999 19:16:43.00

SUBJECT: Why Same-Sex Marriage Is the Crucial Issue

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

New York Times, September 5, 1999

(<http://www.nytimes.com>)

EDITORIAL OBSERVER

Why Same-Sex Marriage Is the Crucial Issue

By BRENT STAPLES

The civil rights movement had made spectacular gains in the courts) including Brown v. Board of Education) before Rosa Parks galvanized public opinion in a way that lawsuits had not. Ms. Parks became an emblematic figure when she was arrested in Montgomery, Ala., for refusing to sit in the

"colored only" section of a bus. The sight of this dignified woman being denied the simplest courtesy because she was black crystallized the dehumanizing nature of segregation and rallied people against it.

Racism began to wane as white Americans were introduced to members of the

black minority whom they could identify as "just like us." A similar introduction is underway for gay Americans, but the realization that they are

"just like us" has yet to sink in. When it finally does, the important transitional figures will include State Representative Steve May, a 27-year-old Republican from Arizona.

Mr. May is a solid conservative who supports issues like vouchers and charter schools. He was raised a Mormon and recalls himself as the kid who "had to go out and bring in the wayward souls." He is also a former active-duty soldier and an Army reservist, whose record shows that he could have moved up swiftly and been given a command.

But Mr. May is about to be hounded out of the Reserve for publicly admitting that he loves and shares his life with another man. This acknowledgment came last winter during a heated exchange in the Arizona Legislature over a bill that would have barred counties from offering domestic-partner benefits, stripping them from gay couples who currently enjoy them.

Mr. May could have sat quietly, protecting his career. Instead he exposed the provision as bigoted and told the Arizona House: "It is an attack on my family, an attack on my freedom.

. . . My gay tax dollars are the same as your straight tax dollars. If you are not going to treat me fairly, stop taking my tax dollars.

. . . I'm not asking for the right to marry, but I'd like to ask this Legislature to leave my family alone."

When Rosa Parks declined to yield her seat on that bus, she was telling Alabama that she was not just a colored person, but a human being who

deserved the respect and protection of the law. Mr. May's words in the Arizona House were similarly clarifying. Fearful of a backlash, gay politicians rarely mention their mates in public) and shy away from speaking of them in terms that might disturb even constituents who know that they are gay. But by framing his argument in the context of "the family," Mr. May disarmed his bigoted colleagues and took the debate on same-sex unions exactly where it needed to go.

When Mr. May's comments became public, the Army Reserve began an investigation that legal experts say will certainly end in discharge. Lieutenant May will then become a casualty of "don't ask, don't tell," which ended more than 1,100 military careers in 1998, on the grounds that homosexuals who reveal the fact are no longer fit to serve.

This is a staggering loss at a time when the armed services are canvassing strip malls and lowering entrance requirements to find personnel. By the time this policy is abandoned, thousands of talented Americans will have been lost to a purge that will come to be recognized as contrary to the public good and morally wrong.

Republicans began the 1990's refusing campaign contributions from gay organizations and demonizing homosexuals for political gain. But in the race for 2000, the most prominent candidates are accepting the money and say that they would hire gay workers as long as they refrained from pressing "a gay agenda") a code phrase for keeping quiet about issues of same-sex intimacy, up to and including marriage. The trouble with this approach is that legitimacy for same-sex unions is the heart of the matter. By denying that legitimacy, we declare gay love less valid than heterosexual love and gay people less human. We cut them off from the rituals of family and marriage that bind us together as a culture.

The legislator who wished to revoke benefits from same-sex partners in Arizona viewed those partnerships as culturally alien and morally illegitimate. The military establishment may force Mr. May out of the service) despite an exemplary record) because his family consists of two men who are indistinguishable from their neighbors, except that they sleep together.

This persecution finds a parallel in statutes that made it illegal for blacks and whites to get married up until 1967, when the Supreme Court declared the laws unconstitutional. The laws were based on the primitive belief that blacks and whites were set apart on the tree of life by God Himself. Interracial couples were initially seen as a threat to the social order and to the institution of marriage. Over time, the culture began to discard the filter of race, viewing the couples as "just like the rest of us." The same process will probably work out for same-sex couples) but only after an extended battle. When the matter is settled, historians will look back at people like Steve May, who declined to go quietly to the back of the

American bus.

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 anyplace 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: Lisa M. Brown (CN=Lisa M. Brown/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-SEP-1999 17:55:25.00

SUBJECT: Re: DOD and Don't Ask, Don't Tell

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

TEXT:
works for me

Edward W. Correia@EOP

09/07/99 05:46:04 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc: Melissa J. Prober/WHO/EOP@EOP, Carolyn T. Wu/WHO/EOP@EOP
Subject: DOD and Don't Ask, Don't Tell

We'd like to meet at 3:30 tomorrow (room to be announced) on DOD and Don't Ask/Don't Tell. We'll discuss the latest developments stemming from the Ft. Campbell matter (though not the investigation of the homicide itself) and other related policy issues.

Message Sent

To: _____
Beth Nolan/WHO/EOP@EOP
Cheryl D. Mills/WHO/EOP@EOP
Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP@EOP
Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mara E. Rudman/NSC/EOP@EOP
James E. Baker/NSC/EOP@EOP
Lisa M. Brown/OVP@OVP